

Academic Senate Minutes
Online Meeting
Tuesday, 20 October 2020; 2:30-4:30pm
<https://csuci.zoom.us/j/88339125519>

2: 37PM Meeting called to order by Academic Senate Chair, Gregory Wood

Approval of Agenda

Motion to Approve- Chair Gregory Wood
(Luna) **Motion to add** Resolution in Opposition to Chancellors Proposed Implementation of AB 1460 **before item 8a; First item of new business / move to second reading item**
(Wyels) *Second*
no indication of discussion; vote called

VOTE to add item to the agenda

Yay 70

Nay 4

Abstained 4

Item added to the agenda

Approval of the agenda

No opposition

Agenda approved by affirmation

Approval of the minutes

No opposition

Minutes approved by affirmation

Report from the Provost

(Say) Update on work of the spring planning taskforce is ongoing. There are a number of faculty representatives on the taskforce – get plan for primarily virtual spring semester in place – and make sure do not repeat missteps– There are members from exec and other faculty on the committee – If you have any questions, reach out to Exec

(Wood) membership and subcommittee memberships will be shared by email

(Say) For Chairs in the group: working with Faculty Affairs to put together programming for spring semester for Chair Development Series

First; a panel discussion sponsored by Chancellor’s Office experienced Chair – on faculty evaluation. Sheila Grant sent out information on that

Second; Topic will be conflict resolution; Mark Patterson conducting

Third; We are open to suggestions - contact Sheila Grant

Update on Provost Search – Search Committee completed work – evaluations of all candidates by search committee and included feedback from campus – forwarded to President - Working with search firm to do “deep and wide” due diligence on all candidates – End of month will be able to make announcement. Look forward to new Provost joining in spring semester. Thanks to

all involved in the search. Acknowledged that doing a virtual search is very difficult. We received good feedback, all were really engaged – thanks to committee who stuck through the long process.

Report from Statewide Senators

(Grzegorzcyk) Statewide Senate did not meet in last period; worked behind the scenes – implementation of AB 1460 / PowerPoint circulated to remind everyone that there are other state laws effecting the implementation of AB 1460 that Chancellor's Office must take into consideration – Board Of Trustees meeting, in order for the Chancellor's Office to issue Executive Order regarding implementation, first they must get input from Board Of Trustees then working on the draft – do not have a final version of the implementation. They are working on core competencies for the courses to be included in final core competencies.

Fiscal committee looked at state audit – some funds that were in secret accounts – state senate wants to look at this and see if it's possible to use those funds for next year to supplement needs and avoid furloughs.

Chancellor's Office issued GRE test suspension requirement / can waive at this time – up to the programs if they want to require this year or not

Asking campuses: in March Board of Trustees will deal with program planning – any changes to master plan – should be done now, to get on agenda in March

Report for CFA

(Yudelson) Shout out to Alison, Catherine, and John Griffin – postcards to North Carolina to encourage them to vote in upcoming election – there will be phone banking will be available through CFA for CA propositions and for those running that CFA is putting forward as best candidates

Meet and Confers concluded: Repopulate the campus with COVID: long negotiation – together with Administration put forth policies to make sure all faculty is safe and reporting requirements are giving to faculty on timely basis

Early Exit program: Faculty who would like to retire*: longer but mutually successfully negotiation / Thank to Sheila Grant and HR, Laurie Nichols, on their flexibility – able to get the tenure line and FT 3yr faculty all with 5 years plus – also got part-time faculty that have been here at least 10 years; to recognize that they also helped with this campus – thank Administration and Chancellor's Office. Good number may be CFA members that take advantage of the early exit program – bargaining coming up – many items coming up for consideration / only way to push back and that is through membership – Message to Chancellor's Office can be Channel Islands may be small but we have close to 80% membership one of the highest in the CSU.

Encourage to become members; important, one reason CFA is really embodying the whole idea of anti-racism and social justice

(Centino) First, if you missed but are interested in hearing the first Ethnic Studies speaker in the series – Zoom recording available; reach out and will send to you. Next one is on Nov 4 at 3pm Tracy Buenavista speaking on Ethnic Studies in K-12. Tadashi Dozono will provide more about event during announcement section.

Able to take CPAL – Family Leave in Fall – that was part of broader stimulus package; does not look like there will be another program like that until another stimulus bill is negotiated in Congress. If this is of concern to you or would like to chat with your colleagues about this, reach out to CFA to share your voice and opinions.

(Wood) agree that it was a very moving first speaker, fought for Ethnic Studies at San Francisco State and it was very moving

*(Say) One small correction about the EEP – not just for faculty / faculty and staff, for any employee of CI – not necessarily a retirement program – it is an early exit program, if you want to stop teaching at Channel Islands but do not necessarily want to retire at this time. Doesn't require retirement. Does require leaving employment at Channel Islands.

Report from the Senate Chair

Thanks to those engaged in Provost Search Committee: Isiah Ball (Student Government), Selenne Banuelos, LaSonya Davis, Genevieve Evans-Taylor (Chief of Staff to the President), Sheila Grant, Manami Gutierrez (Staff Representative), Debi Hoffman, Jim Meriwether, Osman Ozturgut (AVP and Dean of International Programs and Extended University), Ekin Pehlivan, Provost Say (Chaired committee), Richard Yao (VP of Student Affairs), and Jose Alamillo

GE Committee co-chaired Reha Kadakal by Bob Bleicher; found that over 50% of our GE courses are in upper division and cannot be more than 25% by Senate Policy 16-12 therefore they are not planning to accept additional upper divisional GE courses at this time.

Spring Planning Taskforce; two sub committees – communication and virtual instruction committee – did not have these for fall planning. Faculty on spring planning: Jeanne Grier, Nancy Mazingo, Nancy Deans, Jason Miller, Brittnee Veldman, Colleen Harris, Daniel Sandoval, and me (Gregory Wood) The Virtual Subcommittee: Jason Miller, Jeanne Grier, Nancy Mazingo, Maria Ballesteros-Sola, Daniel Sandoval, Nancy Deans, Lydia Dixon, and Colleen Harris. Communication Subcommittee: Brittnee Veldman and me (Gregory Wood)

Campus budget: SRPC received plan from Cabinet – that plan trims 4 million from other centrally managed funds in last year's budget and asks for a cut of about 1 million across divisional budget / 10% or \$100,000 from Academic Affairs / not every division takes a hit, they are not all equal in size. The proposal from cabinet is that BFA takes 50% / small cut to Academic Affairs. I am one of the representatives on SRPC, can offer feedback.

TASKFORCES UPDATE

Senate BLM Resolution Task Force

(Francois) result of work done through Zoom and Google folder – collaborative effort - drafting resolution for first reading today – thanks to all those who weighed in

(Grier) You will see before today a resolution- this is not sponsored by AB1460 taskforce, because we did not vote on it but there is much support for it – see a resolution pushing back regarding implementation of AB 1460 as lower division GE area F. We are identifying courses for fall for catalog to be compliant with the law prior to having a final decision from the Chancellor's Office– Jennie Luna is leading the taskforce and we will have more information for you as a first reading item.

(Wood) work of anti-racist committee taskforce before you today as a first reading item – ask for standing committee to be part of or Senate charge forever

(Adams) first cluster hire meeting Friday; gathering information – pull together what has already been done and looking at different models of cluster hires

Continuing Business

Senate Resolution - Continuity Amid Disruption by COVID-19: Use of Student Ratings of Teaching and Mode of Instruction in Academic Year 2020/21

Discussion

(Yao, R) – would like to offer a comment and a couple of questions. Looking at Resolution and listening to discussion and speaking with students – appreciate the resolution trying to find that middle ground of faculty support and ensuring student voice is still heard – appreciate that one of the faculty committees were interested in running a survey and making sure that data is collected.

1. In 2 1/2 years there has been a great deal about accountability, shared governance and accountability in almost every discussion I have and while this is really a faculty issue I wondered if student government leaders were consulted? Effects how their feedback is utilized – and is an important thing for students to be aware of
2. If the reasons for resolution are similar to circumstances we had in spring – I wonder if students provided same flexibility in their work – flexibility was withdrawal date being extending but had not heard anything in discussions if the rationale is the same.
3. Feedback gathered / how will it be utilized to ensure feedback is incorporated to ensure online instruction is at a higher level for those students that require it?

(Wood) In the past the drop date extended – students could also ask for C/NC

(Yudelson) [propose amendment](#)

[on line 35; after “suspends Senate Policy 14-14” –amend to “Senate Policy 12-10, “](#)

(Perchuk) Second

(Yudelson) makes consistent with next resolution – this is the policy on lecturer evaluations, so that when we are looking at student evaluations of effectiveness, and what is known as Peer Observations, that they will also be suspended for the Academic Year, if don't do this, there will be a conflict between this Resolution and the next resolution

(Anderson, Sean) changing things with best of intentions – people working in dynamic environment; I frequently get push back and am frequently told we can't do that because CBA says we must behave a certain way and follow a certain guideline – bottom line of this states, all here valid unless it goes against the CBA – but CBA states we must do the evaluations – legally I am confused

(Yudelson) Sean you are right in most cases, but CBA does allow for the President or his/her designee to suspend a requirement / discussion in CFA and Provost – if Senate passes it she will honor it as the designee for President in Academic Affairs

(Anderson, Sean) Thank you for clearing it up

(Grier) amendment to suspend entire policy or just portions relevant to student evaluations....as written now it will suspend the entire policy

(Yudelson) yes, suspend the entire policy – the policy basically comes down to two main things; student evaluations and peer observations / other things considered but in terms of equity if suspending tenure line, only fair that lecture faculty be covered in the same way – if desired, we can call out specifics

(Meriwether) John, I asked Jeanne for clarification: seems like a broad brush stroke to suspend a whole senate policy – I suggest that the relevant portions to what the resolution speaks to – not asking for multiple votes

(Yudelson) The policy goes...everything from philosophy and criteria for evaluations are all entwined, one could call out in general specifics, basically, entire policy is on lecturer evaluations

(Perchuk) In general, ask question for informational purposes: if we suspend for one group should suspend for other groups – lecturers have possibility of adding a year on tenure clock, in effect could delay issuing of permanent contract for 1 year – I have never been a chair and there is much I could learn about how lecturer faculty earn their rights to units and earn their right to a contract – wonder if conversation about ramifications of suspending evaluations for last spring and this year – effectively 3 semesters for lecture faculty that receive unit credit for permanency without the benefit of having the review / we do need to consider – defer to those with more experience with matter than I do.

VOTE on amendment

Yay 38

Nay 21

Abstained 25

Amendment passes

Discussion on Policy as amended

(Harris) Bring up something that was brought during first reading - For tenure track or lecturer faculty to have empty jackets for spring and fall and again spring makes it difficult for Chairs, who need to be able to fairly evaluate work going on in the department with the understanding that these were extraordinary circumstances – chances are high that a bunch of chairs will get empty jackets to evaluate which makes things really difficult

(Anderson, Sean) agree – need to have some way to assess quality of assessment – we can pause the CBA as the Senate so deems / not in favor of either but if they were passed, my request would be to also suspend the credit that they would get towards third year contract or entitlements / want to be supportive of people, I know that times are tough, but as someone who was here in the early days when it was very difficult to get assessments done. There were some people who got into the 3-semester cycle because of time-crunches that truly were not the best instructors for our students, but we were locked into them for a long time. My request is that if we have the ability to suspend the assessment of instructional evaluations, that the semester or year that they chose to not have those would also not count towards their entitlements or progress towards a 3rd year contract.

(Salazar) lecturer representative – Have two-part question: given the timeline on the deadlines for submission of our portfolios and WPAFs – how are we going to pass if we don't do in the next one or two senate meetings?

Suggest some alternate; instead of removing the criteria – my feeling is that it is not “Business as Usual” at this time – would be an injustice to treat our current circumstance as though it were business as usual – it would be awkward situation for anyone to be evaluated based on what my colleague is calling an empty jacket and leaves room for abuse – easy in empty jacket situation, to believe “I don’t like this lecturer” and don’t need to base it on anything else but the lack of content – we, as lecturers, at least I do, look to our evaluations on guidance to show improvement

(Deans) Sean, CBA states that the President has the ability to decide how many and which classes SRTs are distributed – the CBA does not allow for putting a hold on entitlements – could not pass in the Senate

(Say) We are not the only campus having this conversation – system wide – bi weekly meeting with Provosts – many for reason Yao pointed out – if students being held accountable for the work they do then shouldn’t students be able to hold faculty accountable for work they do – equity approach to how we evaluate the work of one another – some suggestion to have statement be put into files that evaluations be treated holistically and humanely not punitively – provide guidance (as noted by Christina) for improvements and to department chairs in decision making, not taking in isolation but in context of faculty members whole body of work

(Wood) next resolution has a statement to put a letter in people files – does not delineate language, but is the spirit of it

(Veldman) Appreciate the Chairs speaking about this and the feedback. Point out if resolution passed, all except maybe 5 of us faculty sitting in the room have significantly more job security than any of our lecturers – Appreciate the hard work of the Chairs to evaluate and to make sure we have quality faculty. It takes 6 years for someone to earn a 3-year contract – it is upsetting to hear how easy it is for us to put that hardship above the fact of people and their careers – this resolution would give me the right to not have SRT counts and if my lecturer colleagues did not have the same privilege, I would be disappointed

(Klompfen) With all due respect to the AVP and the Provost, all of us that are teaching – we are making many accommodations for students. In our grading, in our interactions, in our assignments to take into account of the current situation- every day we have things we do – yardstick being used for performance – problematic in any situation and in this one even more problematic / important to look at how highly problematic those evaluations are

(Deans) Statewide Academic Senate passed a resolution - Ask John or Ivona to speak to the resolution that pertains to what we are talking about

(Yudelson) Don’t have it in front of me, but essence of resolution – ask Chancellor’s Office to let all Presidents to know to act in a humane way / not just students but for faculty. Kathleen said so admirably we are all making huge sacrifices. And understand the chairs frustration of how to evaluate. We understand that. Hope the Chairs understand that we are all taking tremendous accommodations / interacting with students outside of class, outside of office hours, offer C/NC, extending due dates, being as flexibility as we can be – I speak for myself: I am not as technically as competent as I could be. However, if I were evaluated after being here for 18 years and in the CSU for 30 years, where I normally got good reviews – I maybe a little worried, because I am not as technically competent as I could be. This is a year for us to “get through” and act as humanely as possible – not to give Chairs headaches, but using what we used in the past is a good option for this year. Act humanly, do our best, stay safe stay well and get through the year.

(Wood) Don't want to lose Rich's 3 points: Student voice consulted and reasons similar can we extend same courtesy to students (Drop date and grades change to C/NC), and third, how will the feedback be used?

(Eskridge) Speak to John's point about evaluations – this concept of humane and technology being a problem in that arena. librarians use a chat service that students are able to use to rate after each interaction – on the ground seeing how students are responding – worry that if student evaluations are weighed heavy could be not an evaluation of one's teaching ability but may reflect on the student's level of frustration with technology-facilitated education
On our side, we see – we may have the answer, but technology being the buffer between the two, the student is frustrated, reflects negatively in how they report or discuss it. I worry that if “humane” is not defined in policy, that when this data is captured and used later, that whoever makes this arbitrary decision of “humane” may be problematic moving forward.

(Salazar, C) Lecturer Rep: this is definitely an intense issue – appreciate that the 5 lecturers have spoken to the issue – point out that this is not just about discomfort with technology, we are intelligent and capable of learning – we are not under normal circumstances in regards to work and work environment – I have a child at home and cannot perform up to same expectations as I have in the past / this is my circumstance, but we all have something, all kinds of care-giving expectations performing under a very rigorous work – think false equivalency accountability to students that would be possibly accounted for in a student evaluation of teaching and the review – because we are trying to advocate that students be given the same leeway – Completely agree with my colleague, Kathleen Klompfen, at this moment, see first-hand way our faculty have accommodated our students to work in this environment – professional lives are at stake based on a really unavoidable circumstance

(Perchuk) Pick up on what Christina was saying and what Rich Yao was saying earlier – I agree false equivalency – leniency for faculty and for students – not set policy for us to be lenient – be more than happy to take as C/NC this semester or any semester, but I do not have that flexibility as an instructor. Decision made at a higher level. we can have these conversations, needs to be held separate – Conversation now is how do we evaluate our colleagues and how do we ask students to make evaluations and how do we use those evaluations – see other ways other than suspending policies – developing a more specific survey metric that will shape the questions to the environment we are in currently – re-design of the SRTs for this year that takes into consideration these greater challenges and maybe even ask – Is your perception of this instructor influenced by circumstances in your home situation or your instructor's home situation.

Capture in a better way of the strengths and weaknesses of this instructor in these circumstances. Put a letter in every file that states – this is the COVID year recommend that data for this year not be used as a sole factor, only in advisory capacity not evaluative capacity – instead of allowing for an empty jacket, rather make use of the data correct the data in a way

(Yao) Apologize for not being explicit enough – no intention for inference to be that faculty are not working with their students individually– I know faculty are doing many things individually – I pose the question, not because I was necessarily in support of a larger policy, but because it was a larger policy issue – I imagined there is a lot of individual variability amongst the faculty – some are very flexible and others more rigid, and that is ok – your right as a faculty, but raised the question to have overarching blanket policy at a higher level to ensure there is not that level

of individual variability. Second piece, seems some concerns with student evaluations – that has always been up for debate and would hope it would be separate – back to shared governance piece, I see this as a shared governance issue – that is why I brought it up.

(Wood) for time sake need to move forward

(Perchuk) [Motion to amend](#)

[Be it also Resolved that a “annus horribilis” letter be put in each file](#)

(Wood) that is included in the next resolution

(Perchuk) Yes, I understand that but I think there should be a separate one for the student ratings

(Perchuk) [copy the language from the other one into this one ... “to student evaluations”](#)

(Yudelson) [accept as a friendly amendment](#)

VOTE Senate Resolution - Continuity Amid Disruption by COVID-19: Use of Student Ratings of Teaching and Mode of Instruction in Academic Year 2020/21 (*as amended*)

Yay 50

Nay 22

Abstain 8

Resolution passed

Senate Resolution - Continuity Amid Disruption by COVID-19: Tenure Clock and Peer Evaluations in Academic Year 2020/21

(Adler) [Motion to add post-tenure review to this resolution](#)

(Harris) *second*

(Wood) idea is to delay post-tenure review for one year, not granting of tenure or promotion, that will proceed, this will only lighten the load for those reviewing

Discussion on amendment

(Yudelson) in favor of the amendment– fair and equitable, show humaneness state senate was intending

Friendly amendment – without objection

Discussion

(O’Connor) Question for the author, why these two issues were put into one resolution? They strike me as very different and there may be those who are in favor of one part but not the other part. If can they be pulled apart so there are two separate resolutions?

Second question has to do with last year’s resolution – allowed tenure track faculty to add a year to clock – I just want to clarify that this is saying that they can add a second year –

(Wood) yes, that is the intent

(O’Connor) I would ask for a friendly amendment to add some language that explains this is an additional year above and beyond what was allowed in that previous Senate Policy (*it was a resolution, not a policy*)

(Wood) I would interpret that this intent was clearly to allow a second year

(Grier) efficiency thing to put together

(Wood) One could ask for an amendment to strike the part they don’t like and then we could vote on just one part. That is a method to disaggregate them. It is best to leave as a single document

instead of taking it apart, would be complicated in a parliamentary sense, but the amendment to strike a part of it is the will then it can be done.

(O'Connor) [amendment to strike the aspect of it the additional year to the tenure clock but come back to that and have in form of another resolution.](#)

(Wood) amendment – strike the language to add additional year to tenure clock

If struck here it could certainly come back. If we are talking about adding a year – it isn't particularly time sensitive

(O'Connor) yes, strike and focus on peer observations first because we need to get going on those

(O'Connor)

[Motion to strike Line 39 - 41](#)

(Perchuk) *second*

(Wood) note we have 23 minutes left in Senate – vote on just the amendment

Discussion

(Grier) would like to include Jackie's comment - Also strike the tenure clock from title of resolution if passed

(Wood) yes, that is important

VOTE on amendment

Yay 57

Nay 11

Abstain 8

Amendment passed

Discussion of resolution (*as amended*) Peer evaluation and Post-tenure Review

(Anderson, Sean) when some programs have tried to come up with an alternative instrument to provide better feedback, we have been held up by the CBA and are told that all peer evaluation instruments must be done by week 2 of semester – suggest some text that when programs are interested in developing some alternative instruments- as long as majority of program approves we can introduce these instruments after week 2 of the semester

time constraints have been a problem, especially with all happening; suggest as amendment

(Deans) Would violate CBA – You could do that for spring if you did it now and voted on it now and provided that to faculty – have to provide evaluation criteria no later than 2 weeks after the start of the semester – vote on now and let faculty know about changes at the beginning of the spring semester. One way you could do that,

(Anderson, Sean) I am wondering why not if we can suspend some things. Why if the President can change some of the evaluation criteria

(Deans) because there are specific things in the CBA that the President has purview over and that the President does not have purview over

(O'Connor) FDAC would like to propose a couple of friendly amendment to this. FDAC has two concerns about language in resolution that peer observations will happen but faculty choice to include them – concerned about asking faculty to go through process (time consuming) and then have nothing happen to that peer observation. Best use of faculty time right now?

Concerned about evaluators taking a look at the file and knowing the observation was done but it is not included and some biases that might crop up, even with a letter included. FDAC thought that Suggest the observations themselves be optional

(Wood) motion that the faculty or chair / how would that happen – faculty requests or department decision?

(O'Connor) our thought would be that it would be the faculty member's purview

(Wood) [amendment to first Be it therefore resolved – add faculty be permitted to ask not to be evaluated; and if evaluated can opt to not include](#) any objections?

(Grier) I am torn – as a Chair, if I am still being asked to evaluate faculty and have zero data to make those decisions /the balance of protections and jeopardizing something - unclear how Chairs proceed having no data to conduct decisions

(Wood) call amendment to vote

[faculty may be permitted to forgo peer observations this year and if observed may permanently exclude the observation](#)

(Alamillo) [Motion to extend Academic Senate by 15 minutes](#)

VOTE – to extend Senate by 15 minutes

Yay 55

Nay 9

Abstain 2

Meeting extended

(Wood) no objections to the amendment. We will continue to vote on resolution as amended

VOTE Senate Resolution - Continuity Amid Disruption by COVID-19: Peer Observations in Academic Year 2020/21

Yay 50

Nay 22

Abstain 2

Resolution passed (as amended)

New Business

Resolution in Opposition to Chancellors Proposed Implementation of AB 1460

(Pereira) [Motion to discuss](#)

(Perchuk, A) *Second*

(Wood) on the floor for discussion

Jennie Luna shared screen - resolution

(Luna) In line with 8 other CSU campuses – we are pushing back on Ethnic Studies on our campus only being a lower division GE requirement. We want the ability to have the freedom on our campus to determine how it would be best be implemented; the Ethnic Studies graduation requirement – asking senate to support the Ethnic Studies faculty on our campus – in line with CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council – would like to be able to determine how this graduation

requirement is implemented on our campus and want to make a motion to make a second reading item.

(Grzegorzcyk) I am little confused about this resolution. Understand we are supposed to give our input to the Chancellor's Office about what we think – we are not required to make a resolution – it is a formal thing, we are sending out to world – Chancellor's Office is asking what we want – I am not sure a resolution is the way to go. We are required to obey by existing clause – one of them is making transfer students their pathways easy, community colleges will offer Ethnic Studies requirements and students will take Ethnic Studies courses at community college. Can could offer something upper division but need an option for lower division for transfers. I don't think it is clear from what is written that this is an option – if we do not give this option, then we are violating transfer requirement;

(Wood) It is in there in the second “Be it therefore resolved” it says lower or upper in this resolution

(Grzegorzcyk) Yeah, but does not specifically say that we will offer that lower division and no guarantee they will be in lower division, if you are using “or” language. It has to say we will offer lower division but will also have upper division option.

(Wood) we have a motion to move to a second reading

(Luna) [Motion to move to as Second Reading](#)

(Alamillo) *second*

VOTE to move to Second Reading Item

Yay 54

Nay 6

Abstain 2

Motion passed

(Grier) Ivona is correct the Chancellor's Office is soliciting feedback on this and Senate Executive did not want to make a decision on behalf of all of Senate, so this is why this is coming as a resolution to garner support for the resolution to give us the latitude to let us decide how to implement on our campus. Doesn't preclude that it could be lower division, we don't know. We have to make those kinds of determinations. We have an AB1460 taskforce – has started that work and looking at the options. We are just asking the Chancellor's Office for latitude on how we interpret this on our campus – So that an extra GE area F will impact 80% of the majors, because you are losing an area D course in order to fit this in and it may not be ethnic studies – want to make sure we are having the best possible option for all of our students in all of our programs – this will express the will of the Senate in this document to the Chancellor's Office

(Luna) in the work that the taskforce is doing in these conversations we have already established we four undergraduate, lower division courses that would fulfill the ethnic studies and have a long list of upper division course as well starting the fall of next year – passing the resolution will help us move this work forward – knowing that we have the support of our Senate. We can put a stronger process of how we are going to implement this on our campus and be able to give options that align with what this resolution states. supporting it allows us to move more efficiently in implementing the requirement by next year

(Grzegorzcyk) the way it is written, it is not clear – that is what my point was

(Wyers) Jeanne and Jennie made some points that I want reemphasize: that a resolution allows to speak with the strongest possible voice – particularly valuable should we choose to affirm this, given the drama over the summer between the state lobbying considering what the Chancellor was passing something without consultation with faculty, so I think we want to speak with a strong voice to this point. And again, the resolution allows us to bring our campus expertise and our knowledge of our local issues to the issue.

(Alamillo) thank taskforce for work on this - Chancellor's Office never consulted with Ethnic Studies faculty – this week was the first time they sat down with Council of Ethnic Studies –lack of collaboration coming from the Chancellor's Office and passing these Executive Orders - really important that we exert Shared Governance, speak back to the Chancellor's Office that we need to be consulted – the expert of Ethnic Studies need to be consulted

(Grier) one comment – to speak what Ivona was saying - possible typo in Resolution ... Whereas AB 1460 does not specify..., page 2,

[Propose to change to General Education](#)

(Perchuk) Jeanne it is important that it remain – that is part of the problem of the Chancellor's Office that they have mandated that it be a lower division requirement. We need to point out that that's not what is in AB 1460. Cindy has pointed out - resolve that student be given flexibility with either lower division or upper division course as determined by our campus faculty. I do not see the logic contradiction that Ivona sees, I'm not trained logician - Looks like exactly what we want – I would hope that as we work on our own campus implementation that we would accept those transfer credits, having satisfied this requirement, but on our campus, we may decide to offer in upper division if we want, Jennie has already stated we have some in lower division, – don't see a problem with the language – fully support

(Wood) call for vote

VOTE Resolution in Opposition to Chancellors Proposed Implementation of AB 1460

Yay 67

Nay 4

Abstain 2

Resolution passed

(Wood) need a motion to discuss next item or a motion to adjourn; or a motion to bring any items that are time sensitive.

(Grzegorzcyk) [Motion to Adjourn](#)

(Harris) *second*