



Browne asks Parsons to clarify the nature of the Curriculum Committee concerns. “It’s not clear to me exactly what the concern was.”

Parsons says one concern was that the meeting was enormous, there were like 50 people there, all the Deans, some members of the committee felt it was a difficult situation and they couldn’t ask questions or feel comfortable raising points with all of the Deans there, etc.

Moradmand: is that normal? I thought the purpose of a committee was to have an ensemble, not everyone.

Parsons: it was very unusual in that way

Moradmand: how long was the meeting?

Parsons: approximately 90 minutes

Burback comments that she was in the meeting and invited people to ask questions. There was space. It was a long enough meeting and I believe there was adequate space for discussion or at least for comment for how the discussion should continue in a different format. I felt it was more than adequate.

Yip: The characterization was that “the operational dynamics were unusual” and prevented people from commenting. But takes Burback’s point that there *was* time. Concerned that due to some of the personalities in the room – particularly the deans – that there was pressure. Yip asks if Curriculum Committee determined that information was missing or assumed by the Committee members.

Parsons says she doesn’t know if anyone who raised these issues would have changed their vote, but there was some sense that members thought that S&M and MT had met over the summer, and that was expressed that it *just happened* in the meeting. There was some misunderstanding of a few things. I would not be comfortable speaking for anyone on the committee and saying they didn’t understand the material they had read. In our previous committee I feel like someone suggested we voted on a thing we didn’t read, and that is not what happened.

Lewis says he doesn’t believe it’s necessary to “shame” the committee for being unprepared. If majority of committee members feel that this process didn’t go as it should, that seems like enough for the Senate to take another look at it.

time to respond on the DQ? I think it would be helpful if we state simply for people who are hearing about this for the first time what specific parts of the policy may have been violated.

Yip says that's one of the concerns. Another concern is that the number of units changed from 144 units to 148. A new CCR form seemed to get substituted in the middle of the process.

The new CCR (listing 148 units) is dated Sept 1, while the packet sent to L&S dean for commentary (sent on Aug 19) included the old CCR dated Feb 26 (indicating 144 units). The response letter from the MTLM dean in response to his packet specifically mentions 148 units. There is a question of the inconsistency of documents provided to different deans at this parallel stage of the process.

What is clear is that the CCR that was presented to S&M (in February) and the L&S dean (in August) is materially different than the one voted on by the Curriculum Committee on Sept 8

The packet of documents sent to the L&S dean also did not include any documentation about the opinion of GSMA as an af

department and explained why he couldn't take the her recommendation for me as Chair and he pointed to enrollment and retention problems that were particularly troubling relative to the rest of the University. Dr. Kamdar took it on herself to refute that in a letter that was well supported, and effectively refuted the President's claims [about IBL having the worst enrollment figures on campus]. The President did not respond to any of those critiques in a material way and seems to have now shifted and slandered me on the Senate Floor by saying that there are two issues in my HR record that would preclude me from being Chair. I suspect that the president is hiding behind the fact that the HR record is private. I have received my HR record from HR, I reviewed it carefully and there is nothing in there that could possibly support what the President said. I propose, so that we can determine, has the president lied to the Senate and slandered a Senator in front of his colleagues, I propose to make my sterling HR record public."

Hanson: "I don't have a follow up to that. Wow. What a move! I have a side-issue I'm going to

