

**California State University, Chico**

Academic Senate  
(530) 898-6201, Zip 020  
MEMORANDUM

**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

Thursday, February 13, 2020, 2:30 p.m., KNDL-207/209

*Academic Senate meetings are recorded. Traditionally the written minutes consist of a summary of topics discussed. For more detail, listen to the audio file [here](#). Time stamps for each agenda item are provided in brackets for convenience. CSU, Chico is committed to making its resources accessible for all audiences. If you have accessibility-related difficulties with any of these documents, please email [oats@csuchico.edu](mailto:oats@csuchico.edu).*

**PRESENT:** Adamian, Alfaro Ramirez, Allen, Altfeld, Boyd (Sistrunk), Boura, Buffardi, Connolly, Day (Underwood), Ferrari (Chair), Ford (Kaiser), Gruber, Guthrie (Alfaro Ramirez), Herman, Hidalgo, Horst, Hutchinson, Irish, Kaiser, Larson, Livingston, Medic, Millard, Ormond, Paiva, Parsons-Ellis, Peterson (Westbay), Schartmueller (Hidalgo), Seipel, Shepherd, Sherman, Sistrunk, Sparks, Underwood, Westbay

**ABSENT:** Bailey, Holbert, Hostetter-Lewis, Perez, Teague-Miller, Trailer, Wright, Wyrick, Zartman

Ferrari called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. [6:07-6:24]

1. **Approve [Minutes of January 30, 2019](#)** [6:25-6:48]

Minutes were approved.

2. **Approve [Agenda](#)**. [6:49-8:17]

Kaiser moved to put Announcement as Item 3. Seconded/passed

Adamian moved to amend item 7 so that it is a time certain item at 4:00 p.m. Seconded/passed

Ferrari observed that this would allow the Academic Student Senate representatives to join us.

Amended Agenda was approved.

3. **Announcements** [8:18-11:43]

- Kaiser noted that the League of Women voters has free food at the Masonic center at 6:00 there will be a presentation on the Census.
- Gruber announced the Study Abroad Fair will be held on Wednesday, February 26 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. on the Trinity Commons Lawn –snacks, prizes and live dj. Encourage students to attend.
- Ferrari announced that there will be three Green Dot Violence Prevention Strategy Overview sessions:
  - February 25, 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. in Colusa 100B

- Wednesday March 25 11:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m. in Colusa 100A
- Tuesday, April 21, 1:00-2:00 p.m. in Colusa 100B

The Green Dot program promotes the vital role that campus employees play in establishing and reinforcing two particular norms: 1) power-based personal violence won't be tolerated, and 2) everyone does their part to keep the campus free from violence and the fear of violence. \

- Allen said that this year is the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the passage of the 19<sup>th</sup> Amendment that gave women the right to vote. She passed around a flyer describing activities and august speakers planned for next week.

#### **4. Chair's Prerogative [11:46-51:58]**

Ferrari introduced Holly Ferguson (Admin. Analyst/Specialist, Academic Publications & Scheduling) to give an update on the Academic Scheduling Pilot. This has been presented at EPPC and FASP [and other groups listed on page 2] and some suggestions have been incorporated (these are not marked).

- **Academic Scheduling Pilot (Ferguson)**

Holly Ferguson introduced herself as the Co-Chair of the Scheduling Task Force along with Tyson Henry (Chair, Computer Science). They will discuss this document that the Task Force has worked on for the last three months. She explained that the first introductory 3 pages of the document describe who they are and what they were trying to accomplish with a timeline of their activity.

Holly Ferguson noted that much of the procedure defined in the document is what scheduling practice has been all along at Chico, but has never been set down. She gave the example of the responsibilities of Academic Publications and Scheduling Services to work in collaboration with the department heads/Chairs to make classroom assignments. (page 4, section 1, bullet a). The task force identified the department schedulers (usually the ASC), but the committee could not assign a specific classification for this because the departments do this designation themselves.

Herman pointed out that certain professions on campus work 24/7 every day without stopping and utilize spaces without closing (like nurses working in Hospitals). Has there been data gathered to consider creating two shifts or tiers on campus? Maybe there are groups of students and faculty who would prefer to work 3:00pm-11:00am rather than 7:00am-3:00pm which could utilize the same spaces more efficiently.

Holly Ferguson answered that this task force only worked within the already established business hours of the university. This is an example of ideas that might help us as Butte Hall goes off line, but this workgroup only looked at scheduling conventions. They did not treat long-term space strategies. This idea would be a much bigger conversation about energy use, and many other matters.

Ferrari pointed out that there are two conversations ongoing. 1) Responding to the urgency of Butte Hall going off line is one problem requiring thinking outside the box which must be informed by data and best practices. 2) Holly Ferguson noted that this task force is also thinking long term about creating scheduling conventions for future use.

Hutchinson pointed out that we have a practical problem to face in promoting student progress because our classes are jam packed on T-Th. This impacts everyone's parking, etc. and other ideas might include working on Saturdays. She hoped we could collect the questions about thinking outside the box.

LaDawn Haws said that Jeff Bell's research shows that overcrowding is really limited to a few specific time slots and if we can spread out our scheduling until 6:00 or 7:00pm the problem would be solved. We don't need to consider extreme answers or changes yet.

Kaiser suggested that this policy language become part of an official EM so that the colleges are all carefully represented and the policy can get a full purview.

Sistrunk noted that Boyd had thought it would be efficient to discuss this information item as an introduction item today which could then pass and move to an action item eventually. In this way it moves into the calendar since the subject is serious and important. If the sense is that it is still in a pilot phase, we could name it an interim policy which implies that it will be worked on in the future. He invited comments about the idea.

Hutchinson thought this was being presented as a pilot that could be made permanent down the road, she did not see the value in seeing this as policy yet.

Sistrunk thought the regular senate process was best practice and represented what we have done before. We could just leave it a policy being worked on, but moving it to introduction as an interim policy would encompass it in the senate process more formally. It does not inhibit future conversation or change.

Hutchinson thought this was more of a case study while we are figuring out how to accommodate a very large building. We can learn a lot from this and then proceed to permanent EM writing.

Ferrari said she was seeing three possible options about how to treat this pilot information.

1. We don't do anything and this is a pilot that the university is moving forward
2. The Senate could endorse this document without moving it to be an interim policy
3. We could move to consider this an interim policy that will come back as an introduction item

Allen observed that it is a pilot, and she would be extremely hesitant to move it as a policy.

Larson thought we should endorse the document with some protective language added so that this is not the next EM exactly. She thought we should remove the word "policy" throughout the document. There should be a stronger introductory statement in the fourth paragraph that "this is particularly to accommodate Butte Hall coming off line and the new Multipurpose building absorbing faculty overflow. What is learned from this implementation shall be used to form the future development of a policy." This will make our efforts more timely.

She wanted to emphasize that this is not intended to be future policy, but will inform the development of future policy around academic scheduling.

Allen and Kaiser strongly agreed.

Livingston wanted to know what the effect of an endorsement of an amended policy would be.

Ferrari thought a senate endorsement would give the document more prestige at a university level, it does not imply that it went through the proper formal senate process, but guarantees that it will.

Larson thought endorsing an amended policy demonstrates that we are participating in a contemplative shared governance practice because this will be a difficult undertaking. This vetting and airing process will show everyone involved that these are challenging conversations that must be undertaken.

Ferrari wondered if the document should be revised in the way suggested and brought back on March 12 for endorsement.

There was discussion about reserving hours especially for innovative teaching in prime time and the percentage of lecture courses that may actually be taken out of primetime (5%). This means 19 of 20 lecturer classes will be staying in the same time. Holly Ferguson noted that the colleges will decide these kind of questions about who and what gets moved.

Sherman appreciated all the responsive feedback to faculty concerns and thought the assertion that this is a pilot that recognizes that constraints and unintended consequences will emerge that cannot be predicted was useful.

Sistrunk moved to endorse the document and suspend it until the next Senate meeting and it can be amended.

Holly Ferguson wondered what authority this document would have with a Senate endorsement and whether waiting until March 12 would be too long as her team needs to work on scheduling for Spring 21 and there should be strong recommendations that the departments start considering these constraints now. Jennifer Aceves reiterated this and emphasized that a shortened time frame would delay the spring 2021 schedule build, which had not started yet, and require changes to her published schedule of build deadlines.

Herman moved that we endorse the document today with the extra language contemplated by the Provost. Seconded.

Ferrari clarified that this meant adding the amendments Larson articulated, including deleting the word “policy” from the document and adding some kind of time limit.

Underwood asked if this gave the task force what they needed and received a “yes” answer.

Allen said she is concerned about the Spring 21. She noted her department had already finished this work. She did not want to have to redo all the departmental meetings and processes again. She knew that the pilot was being run on Butte Hall in the past, and she did not know why it couldn't be

done when the Hall actually goes offline. She has also heard that there might be delays because of the state fire marshal whose process may allow us to stay in Butte hall even longer into the Fall of 2021.

She wanted to hear more about the necessity of running this pilot this way now. She would also like to hear more discussion of the 50% rule (page 6, point 4, section a). How flexible is it?

Sherman said that the fire marshal schedule requiring a six month inspection period is a delay for the Multi-purpose building maybe. She will find more information about the impact on Butte Hall.

Tyson Henry said the document does not say you have to follow the 50% rule. The recommendation is that you start looking forward. He said as a Chair, himself, he would like to divide his faculty between primetime and other times reasonably. He can tell his faculty this needs to be done and start working on getting ready for fall of 2021. Starting in Spring 2021 will make the actual move easier.

Holly Ferguson said this is a recommendation that departments start thinking about this so the jump to Fall is not so difficult.

She said that the 50% rule was not always exactly 50% after looking at our practice in many ways. She said this is our best assessment based on the data that we have been able to look at. She noted that within the pilot they would assess the impact of this rule. She is happy to share the data Jeff Bell has collected. This percentage came from calculating the number of sections that would have to move when Butte goes offline. This is not really that far from what we do now.

Jeff Bell described this data and said we currently use 55% of our lecture classrooms (not labs, or auditoriums). We have @120 lecture rooms across campus and Butte has 24 of these. This is 20%. On Tuesday/Thursday at 11:00 we are using about 120 lecture classrooms. If you take 24 classes from this you have to move the rest.

One reason for piloting this beforehand is that we are aware there are many downstream effects when you move a class. It impacts where students are, what other classes are being taken in other departments, etc. Our current schedule has been worked out by trial and error for a hundred years to find out where everything fit. Moving a bunch of classes to 8:00am will have consequences. There are places other than 8:00am to move these. We have enough room to move people, but we must move 100 to 80 lecture classes.

We need to start this process before we have no choice. We may end up with empty classrooms in Butte in the Spring test-run period, but that is not serious since we still have flexibility.

Ferrari reiterated the motion again and added some clarification:

The Senate endorses the amended document, which will eliminate the word policy and add a timeframe about how long it will be valid which will then go to EC. If the document is suitable to EC, it will be sent back to the Senate as an information item.

Motion passed.

**5. Proposed Revisions to FPPP 2.0 (clean version) – FASP – Action Item [51:58-57:00]**

Underwood explained that based on comments from the last meeting, a few changes were made and she offered a substitute document to consider today.

- The words “and effectively” in section 2.5, line one, were struck.
- She said the language in section 2.3 about our institution as an equal opportunity employer was not exactly the same as our policy but matched the spirit of it.

The substitute document was accepted.

There was discussion about the meaning of section 2.5, lines 1 and 2.

Action Item passed.

**6. Name Change from University Farm/Agricultural Teaching and Research Center to Paul L. Byrne Memorial University Farm – EPPC - Introduction Item [57:01-1:02:37]**

Allen provided some background information for this name change. In 1960, the University Farm was dedicated and recognized as the Paul L. Byrne Memorial Farm. In the 1990’s, faculty added Agricultural Teaching and Research Center to the name. It has had many names over the years since. In the meantime our EM governing complementary units (EM 19-026) requires centers to be auxiliary units. This motion renames the Farm and removes the term “center” especially.

She noted that this is not an attempt to actually change the name of the facility itself, which would require the Board of Trustees approval. This is a name change to the academic program side of things.

She introduced Dave Dailey, (College of Agriculture and Administrator at the University Farm), to add perspective. He said in the mid-90’s, Chico was primarily a teaching institution and new faculty were applying for funding for research and added the words “Agricultural Teaching and Research Center” to the name to underline what they were doing.

This name was never formally vetted and the Farm has not really served as a center. It is an integral part of the educational mission of the college and there are currently 50 sections of laboratories and courses being conducted out there with 15 state staff. This is not a separate center, it is an integral part of campus.

Boura said from a branding perspective that the name Chico State always needed to be part of the naming. Dave Daily said the place is always called the Chico State University Farm. Boura noted that Advancement would work to integrate this appellation into the naming to provide context for honoring Paul L. Byrne as well.

Introduction Item passed.

Ferrari observed that the measure may still need Chancellor's Office and/or Board of Trustees approval. Locally this can proceed, but the College of Agriculture will need to pursue this.

**7. Ethnic Studies Requirement Implementation (Grassian) – Discussion Item [1:02:38-1:31:18]**

- [ASCSU resolution AS-403-19/AA](#)
- [ASCSU Recommended Implementation of a California State University \(CSU\) Ethnic Studies Requirement](#)
- [CSU, Chico DRAFT response](#)

Ferrari explained why discussion of the Ethnic Studies Requirement was back on our agenda. There have been conversations in FASP, EPPC and Senate and our state-wide senators have collected productive and informative feedback from our campus. That information was used to bring our perspective to the ASCSU and after the ASCSU collected such feedback from across the system, they wrote a resolution about how to proceed with this requirement (AS-403-19/AA above).

The Chancellor's Office has now asked campus administrations to send an official response from each campus (see Vice Chancellor letter above). Our statewide senators and Daniel Grassian, (Vice Provost for Academic Programs) and representatives of the AS leadership have been writing our response (see DRAFT response above).

Ferrari highlighted two passages of the questionnaire in particular that need senate feedback. .

Page 1, question 3:

“Does your campus support a broader systemwide 3-unit Diversity/Social Justice requirement (which would include courses in ethnic studies as well as those that examine race and ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, and/or age)? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No”

Page 3, section B, number 2:

3. The secondary ethnic studies requirement is a reflective element (reinforcing any two of ethnic studies outcomes 2-5) in the upper-division. This secondary requirement will start in the 2027-28 academic year. (The ASCSU resolution AS-3403-20 included an explanatory footnote that was lost in the copy-paste into this form. It reads “This secondary requirement is not a 3 semester unit course; rather, the requirement could be integrated in to a major or non-major course. Campuses will have discretion how to implement this upper-division requirement.”)

Ferrari thanked Daniel Grassian, the statewide senators, and the students for coming together so quickly to address how we would answer the questionnaire.

Daniel Grassian gave an overview of why we were discussing the Ethnic Studies requirement. He noted a legislative process to require an Ethnic Studies course had begun almost a year ago and that the bill that mandated this course had been stalled while the legislature considered the economic costs of doing this. The Chancellor's Office is taking this time to collect more information.

We must determine as a campus whether we want to have a collective response to their inquiries (from the administration, faculty and students) or whether each of these should make its own. He said the students are deliberating about what their position will be. He and the statewide academic senators had already largely worked together responding to previous information gathering.

He adumbrated our campus feedback thus far and asked for responses to the highlighted sections in particular.

About Page 1, question 3, he noted that the Chancellor's Office had developed this query separate from the resolution of the ASCSU. He thought they were concerned especially about the **systemwide** nature of a "3-unit Diversity/Social Justice requirement". He said he and the statewide senators did not know what our collective answer would be to this question.

He characterized the other responses to the rest of the questionnaire concluding that we, as a campus, support the requirement in general, but wanted to maintain our autonomy about establishing particular SLOs to address this kind of general requirement. He also noted that we would have to determine in the future who would evaluate this kind of requirement – an "ethnic studies" faculty or other kinds of experts. On the final page, the team posited different impacts based on what future developments might unfold.

Daniel Grassian noted the deadlines required by a quick response to these questions (we must respond by February 28). Larson observed that the Chancellor's Office would like a quick turn-around because they are interacting with the legislature about the bill.

Different questions and comments were raised:

- We should not let an Ethnic Studies requirement be overly prescriptive
- The learning outcomes (on page 2, section A) might be too broad for a single course
- How many class sections do we have right now that already meet an ethnic studies requirement?
- How many classes would we have to add each year and how many professors, where will the funding come?

Daniel Grassian answered that it depends on what our ethnic studies requirement will be. If we just overlay SLOs on existing courses the expense will not be much, if we must have everything in a single class, it will be more expensive

- It was pointed out that the five extensive SLOs listed on page 2 are not part of what the legislation itself requires, these come from the ASCSU –the legislation is more flexible
- The effort to have the ASCSU speak out and the Chancellor's Office weighing in is actually creating a lot narrower way of understanding the requirement

Daniel Grassian thought that applying these SLOs rigorously might be more burdensome than teaching the four historically identified groups

- If we do not support having an ethnic studies requirement systemwide, what is it that holds the system together? Don't we need a course or some common SLOs?
- If the SLOs were conceived as providing an over-arching framework, the requirement could work



- There was fear that the legislation would end up producing one cookie-cutter course that everyone must offer
- What is the difference between the “Diversity/Social Justice requirement” and the diversity requirement we already have? Ferrari did not know if every campus had a US Diversity requirement as we do.
- Shouldn’t we answer Page 1, question 3 “yes” because we already have this requirement?
- It was pointed out that our US Diversity requirement is much broader than this
- Campus autonomy should be preserved in every point in this document including the SLOs just out of principle because it seems impossible to do this the same way for all 23 campuses which have different populations and service areas

Ferrari thought the sentiment seemed to say “no” to this question. She also said she is hearing concerns about the SLOs listed in the ASVCSU resolution and how they would be implemented or whether they are all strictly required? Can we come up with our own SLOs? Will those listed water down the nature of Ethnic Studies?

Jason Nice (History, Curriculum Advisory Board Chair) noted that we do not have any SLOs for US Diversity currently, and that if we had them campus-wide, CAB is not set up to assess them. He thought something like the University Writing Committee should be established by policy if this became a campus-wide requirement.

The language on Page 3, section B, question 2, that describes a secondary requirement that is “reflective” is unclear. Does this imply in our local context that we must require two US Diversity courses to meet this mandate?

Ferrari explained that his questionnaire will go to EC. If any senator has more thoughts, please reach out to Daniel Grassian.

**8. [Academic Senate and Student Senate Statement of Support in Service for and with Students of Color \(Adamian\) - Action Item](#) (time certain 4:00) [1:31:18-2:53:33]**

- [Substitute document](#) (edits)
- [Substitute document](#) (clean)

Ferrari asked if all the Student Academic Senate members were in attendance now and was told all but one were.

She recalled how the Academic Senate had considered the student’s [Resolution Condemning White Supremacy and Hate Speech at C.S.U., Chico](#) at our December 12, 2019, Senate meeting and had passed a resolution supporting them [Academic Senate Statement of Support in Service for and with Students of Color](#). We had also expressed a desire to figure out how both bodies could endorse this supportive document together as a powerful symbolic act.

She did not know exactly how a truly joint resolution could be passed in concert because both bodies have their own mandates and authority that do not mix. To address this, it had been decided that the Student Academic Senate could join us in discussion, and be recognized by anyone on our Senate if they

wanted to make amendments. After our business is concluded, they will then assemble right away in this chamber and vote on whether they want to endorse our resolution. Thus, there will be two different votes, but symbolically a common resolution.

Ferrari reminded senators that today's resolution had passed as an introduction item in December, and the committee that wrote it responded to comments and offered a substitute document.

Adamian moved to bring forward the substitute document as an action item. Seconded

Adamian gave an overview of the changes. The first changes correct the name of the student assembly to the Student Academic Senate.

The fourth resolution clause was substantially altered and she recognized members of the community and Mary Wallmark (Student Life and Leadership) for their comments and suggestions.

- Some of the language was simply moved around
- The call to develop an EM to address the issues instead of other rules changes and discussions of Student Conduct policy was posited because of Title V constraints
- They thought there is more space and possibilities to develop student behavior language in this venue
- Because there were concerns about Title V and the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment, the qualifying proviso "subject to and limited by federal and state law" was added
- Language about building trust was added
- There was encouragement added that administrators be more receptive/conscious to student conduct violation complaints
- The language trying to protect student even if they did not engage in a judicial process was removed

Questions and observations were raised or addressed and clarification was sought:

- Doubt was expressed about clause 4 since we don't want to violate Title V or and Executive Orders.
- We cannot write speech rules, for example, on top of our conduct code, but we could leverage this code and create understanding about how to protect each other better
- We need to make sure this can be operationalized
- There should be reference to EO's 1096, 1097 and 1098 that touch on harassment and discrimination and fit these intentions in what we already have system-wide
- This resolution is not writing policy, it is giving space to a task force to work on it and develop the language to promote positive behavior
- Since we can create language that is "race neutral" that supports our white students, we should be able to create ways to do that for our students of color
- Does the use of the word "condemn" in the first resolution clause violate free speech rights?
- Are we already using the tools we have available to us enough? There is concern that the student conduct rules are not being receptive to students of color, but perhaps the data from people in the process would tell a different story
- We should look for nuts and bolts hands on practical changes that can be made

- Title V or freedom of speech will not be violated by an EM, that is pretty apparent and should not need to be repeated over and over
- Shouldn't we recognize what we are already doing?
- An EM space gives the community a lot of chance to weigh in
- This resolution does not mean to take away from what we are already doing
- A resolution can be about expressing discomfort and concern and call for addressing these, we should not get caught up in too much of the details
- We will never be able to fully protect every student on campus from harmful behaviors (as called for in clause 4), we can support them if this happens
- When we say we want the administration to be more receptive –what is the comparison to (more than what, or who) –where is the evidence this is already lacking?
- This resolution is not to make policy, but to let students know that we stand with them and that they are heard. This is a great first step

It was moved to change the word “condemn” in the second resolution clause and replace it with “denounce”. Seconded.

Motion passed.

As secretary, since this is an action item, Sistrunk encouraged people to make concrete motions to change language specifically as they might wish or not.

Commentary and conversation continued:

- Writing language down can be misconstrued by people, so one needs to be sure that what they write is what they mean
- The intention of the fourth resolution clause is to seek ways to develop concrete policy as a call to action
- We owe the committee and our students support of this type of resolution – it is a stance, an opinion, and a position
- We might support the reasons people have given to support the resolution, some of the comments about parts of it are different than that –it will be hard to implement

Since no task force is actually mentioned in the document, was moved to change the wording in resolution clause four from “...to develop new policies resulting in an Executive Memorandum(s) that protects students of color from...” to develop a new taskforce to examine existing policies and craft new Executive Memorandum(s) to support and protects-students of color....” Seconded.

Motion passed.

Conversation turned to the wording in resolution clause four: “that protects students of color from experiencing”

- The resolution aims to protect students from different things like “experiencing racially antagonizing....”

- We should take out many of the examples listed in the parentheses since they just distract from setting up the taskforce
- Resolutions like this are symbolic work that are meant to express commitments that don't need to be tied to specific actions
- Many faculty and students on campus will appreciate this resolution since it really takes up the call to support students and faculty of color
- It is important to name things as the list in the parentheses does

It was moved to add the word “strive” to the fourth clause as in “strive to protect students of color...”  
 Seconded.

Motion passed.

- There was an objection to the use of the word “strive” since it implied we will just attempt this which is different from doing it and this weakens the document

Ferrari decided we should vote about this motion again, since she had not allowed adequate discussion. She asked for more comments on this amendment.

The motion did not pass.

- It was suggested that the motion to add language about a taskforce was contrary to the spirit of the resolution which was not about creating actionable items. This is a message to our students of color, right now
- The fourth clause shows that the document is more than a statement of solidarity, there is action contemplated by it -there were at least 4 actions suggested in this clause
- The taskforce seems to imply that we are contemplating future action, not that we are doing it now
- Who do we want to take this action?
- A taskforce might be the way the university will take action
- A taskforce may not be the clear action to solve our problems –we should think about other opportunities and not just define them now
- This taskforce will create the Executive Memorandum(s) called for
- Some people are hearing that this is prescriptive some are saying it is ore general then that
- The forth resolution clause is urging our administration to take action –the language of a taskforce reflects the intention of the administration alongside our university community

26 members were present which represented a quorum.

It was moved to delete the amendment passed above: “to develop a new taskforce to examine existing policies and craft new Executive Memorandum(s) to support and protects-students of color....”  
 Seconded.

- A resolution is not necessary to create a taskforce.

The motion to remove this language passed.

The question was called. A 2/3<sup>rd</sup> vote is required to end debate. This passed.

The resolution was passed by the Academic Senate. Clapping was general!

The Student Academic Senate approved the Resolution.

Items 8-13 were not treated because of the loss of a quorum and because there was nothing to vote on left

**13. Adjourn.** [2:53:58]

Meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tim Sistrunk, Secretary