



ACADEMIC SENATE

TO: Members of the Academic Senate
FROM: Christina Chin-Newman, Chair, Academic Senate
SUBJECT: Academic Senate Meeting Agenda
MEETING DATE: Tuesday, February 6, 2024, 12:45-2:30pm via Zoom
[PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK](#) (opens 12:30pm)
Meeting ID: 956 9552 9684
Passcode: 118310

APPROVED MINUTES

Senators Present: Alex Makarevich, Amy June Rowley, Andrew Kelly, Arran Phipps, Ayona Chatterjee, Chandra Ganesh, Christina Chin-Newman, Dana Rucker, Donna Wiley, Duke Austin, Erik Helgren, Fay Zhong, Hongmin Li, Ian Pollock, Jennifer Sherwood, Jenny O, Jerome Narvaez, John Tan, Kate Bell, Kathleen Wong Lau, Kaumudi Misra, Kevin Pina, Kim Greer, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Lan Wang, Li Zou, Lisa Handwerker, Maureen Scharberg, Meiling Wu, Michael Lee, Michael Schmeltz, Michelle Gravier, Michelle Rippy, Michelle St. George, Monique Manopoulos, Murray Horne, Nina Haft, Patrick Fleming, Paul Carpenter, Ryan Heryford, Sarah Borjas, Sara McDaniel, Sarah Nielsen, Sharon Radcliff, Somak Paul, Stephanie Alexander, Talya Kemper, Terry Buttchen, Trinie Dalton, Tristan Garcia, Vanessa Yingling, Vibha Puri, Wendy Rummerfield, ASI CLASS Elijah-Immanuel Quineri, ASI CSCI Charan Reddy Doolam

Guests: Mark Robinson, Jeff Newcomb, Julie Mielke, Kelley Ramos, Chandra Khan, Sophie Bloch, Tiggy Moa, Michael Rowley, Shahar Sansani, Andrea Lum, ShEfi Lubliner, Ram Kandasamy, Lisa Booker, Crystal Perez, Arun Rasiah, Carmen Davis, Balvinder Kumar, Filippo Rebessi, Tony Marks-Block, Dania Massey, Kelsi Perttula, Elena Dukhovny, Andrea Arauza Rivera, Elizabeth Bergman, JP Horn, Daisy Muralles, Eric Ray, Jason Singley, Keri O'Neal, Kristina Wharton, Thomas Tyner, Jeanne Dittman, Karen Mucci, Shubha Kashinath, Richard T. Moala, Patrica Drew, Mike Hedrick, Julie Glass, Eve Higby, Jocyl Sacramento, Meaghan McCollow, Mia Livaudais, Missy Wright, Sahar Nouredini, Christian Roessler, Claire Valderama-Wallace, Nidhi Khosla, Summer Jackson, RT, Linda Ivey

Senators Absent: Cathy Sandeen, ASI CBE Tanya Gupta, ASI CEAS Teresa Perez-Reyes

1. [Land acknowledgment](#) (short version) Tristan Garcia
2. Approval of the agenda

Christina Chin-Newman - We have quorum. Can we have a motion to approve the agenda?

Move: Michelle St. George Second: Ryan Heryford

Christina Chin-Newman - We actually have three Michelles and three Sarahs, so to make it easier for the Secretary I will try to use their last names. Any discussion of the agenda? We might want to modify something and formally approve adding the others.

Move: Nina Haft - I move that we save reports to the end of the agenda. Second: Kyzyl Fenno-Smith - second

Christina Chin-Newman - Vote Y if in favor of moving reports to the end. Coffee cup is an abstention. It looks like it is mostly Yes, over 30 Y, and 1 N, and 1 abstention since we need $\frac{2}{3}$. Motion passes

[Provost Greer: Could I provide a quick update on the power outage?]

Kaumudi Misra - Christina, I think the Provost wants to provide an update on the power outage if you see the chat.

Christina Chin-Newman - Thanks! Why don't we have another motion to keep the Provost report at beginning?

Move: Michelle Rippy Second: Sarah Nielsen

Christina Chin-Newman - Any objections? This is timely information for people who have to leave early. Not seeing any objections to that.

Christina Chin-Newman - Anyone wish to move to add FUFM-2 to the agenda? If we don't do that, we'll go with what is already on the agenda since it didn't originate with anyone on the committee. I am not seeing anything. If anyone wants to speak, or if I have missed anything... Otherwise, I would just say are there any objections to accepting the rest of the agenda.

Paul Carpenter - A question, really a point of information, if we add it to the agenda because of the timing of this but could it be put on the agenda for a subsequent meeting?

Christina Chin-Newman - It could. It is a little more of a rush doing things this way. If originators want to bring it to ExCom, we could do it that way. It is a place where we can address some of the concerns. There were some questions about whether we can resolve something that rescinds another resolution.

Paul Carpenter - That was my procedural question. In order to do this, we need to put it on the floor. Do we have any Senators who drafted it on the floor?

Christina Chin-Newman - Senator Talya may not be present today. I am reading this as trying to read the will of the body as a kind of abstention. In that case, for now, we will go ahead with the agenda as we have it. People can move randomly to rescind the resolution from before, but will need $\frac{2}{3}$ approval to do that.

Christina Chin-Newman - Any other aspects to discuss?

Paul Carpenter - Given the issues that have been raised, personally I am a little bit uncomfortable not to have it on the agenda. So I will formally move, and seek a second.

Christina Chin-Newman - And so again, so you know, deciding to discuss it in the Senate doesn't necessarily mean you support it, but that you feel like it should have its chance to be discussed in Senate rather than like a postponing point of order.

Kevin Pina - In his motion, can he please spell out about which resolution?

Paul Carpenter - FUFM 2

Move: Paul Carpenter Second: Erik Helgren

Christina Chin-Newman - Please vote with your Zoom reactions.

Kevin Pina - Are we voting on this without a discussion?

Christina Chin-Newman - Thank you, we can discuss whether to add this motion to the agenda. I apologize. Mark will clear the votes.

Kevin Pina - I don't understand the rationale, background, purpose or motivation of the resolution. You said Talya Kemper?

Christina Chin-Newman - I think your question is kind of procedure-wise, is that correct? We have had resolutions from the floor, which means it comes from the University Faculty. It means people who are not currently Senators or members of Standing Committees can propose it.

Kevin Pina - I don't understand why it is being proposed.

Christina Chin-Newman - My understanding is there were people opposed to the previous resolution. That is not something we normally do in Senate, we normally amend a document. We generally do not amend resolutions, and the President does not sign off on them.

[Murray Horne: I thought we were just voting to add it to the agenda. The motion to discuss and approve/not approve would come later.]

Paul - The question is quite straightforward. The question is whether we should add it to the agenda. I don't believe we should be discussing the context, contents or merits.

Kevin Pina - I do believe I have the right to question the merits since it is taking time from the meeting.

Christina Chin-Newman - Paul, are you calling the question, which would mean we would vote.

Paul Carpenter - I would like Senator Pina's concern to be addressed. I am not a Parliamentarian, but historically we don't discuss the merits if we have a motion to discuss it. It is not on the agenda yet so we cannot discuss it. We have to have it there to even have that conversation.

Christina Chin-Newman - Here is what I would suggest, that individual Senators vote on whether to discuss this item, for whatever reasons you have. I can wait until someone calls the question. Should it be on the agenda today or not, or should it take other pathways?

Amy June Rowley - I call the question.

Christina Chin-Newman - Why don't we have a second just to be sure.

[Kate Bell: I second]

[Charan Reddy: I remember there was announcement of a new grant award contract of \$23 million with a focus on addressing the budget gap. Can I get more details on that?]

Christina Chin-Newman - A yes vote is to add it to the agenda. A no vote is not adding it to the agenda today. An abstention means you'll allow others to decide.

[Sara Borgas: Real quick: Can someone tell me what is calling the question?]

[Stephanie Seitz: It's voting to end the discussion and begin the vote on the motion]

Christina Chin-Newman - It would help if all Senators weigh in on this.

[Ian Pollock: The vote is to add to the agenda]

Christina Chin-Newman - 80% are saying Y to adding this to the agenda.

[Guest Shefi Lubliner: People in favor of the resolution are coming on at 1:45pm.]

[Hongmin Li: I have a class in 10 mins, won't be able to vote or anything on this resolution.]

3. Approval of [1/23/24](#) minutes

Christina Chin-Newman - Do we have a motion to approve the minutes from Jan 23?

Move: Jennifer Sherwood Second: Elijah Quineri

Christina Chin-Newman - Any discussion of the minutes from our last Senate meeting? Ok, we'll accept these minutes.

4. Reports:¹

- a. Report of the Chair - moved to end of meeting
- b. Report of the President - moved to end of meeting
- c. Report of the Provost

Provost Greer - I'll be really brief, as we have a very full agenda. I assume the power outage is top of mind. My report is anticlimactic; we are monitoring the situation and plan a much more detailed message to the campus this afternoon. We've had activity in terms of working with PGE and outside vendors on this particular issue along with our own Facilities team. The message yesterday was short and sweet because we didn't have much info at that time. Obviously, for any of the faculty who are concerned, we are monitoring the generators in SCI closely that are keeping a lot of the research specimens safe, and

¹ Consider moving the reports later, after Information Items

doing checks really frequently. Thanks to all the faculty, staff and students for making a really sharp shift in instruction to remote. I really appreciate it.

[Tristan: Are the students in the dorms okay?]

[Derek Aitken: Yes, housing has power.]

Ian Pollock - The original campus closure message came out very late, and there seems to be some kind of disconnect about who is responsible. It is really important that messages are sent out immediately. The impact of someone getting it late was not grave, but had it been more critical or dangerous, that would have been a big problem. Let this serve as an alert that this system work better and extend to personal devices. I found out because someone sent me a copy of the Instagram post. This puts this on our screen so we can pay attention to it.

Provost Greer - It does take time to get communications out, and we were alerted pretty early in the morning. We realize that email messages don't work when there are power outages, especially where faculty and staff are living. Hence, more coming out via text.

[Andrew Kelly: What are the university policies regarding class modality when the decision about campus being open is made so late in the day?]

[Vanessa Yingling: And on phones and text]

[Maureen Scharberg: Which leads me to ask what is the state of our emergency response coordination?]

[Ian Pollock: THIS !]

[Tristan Garcia: Agreed Ian! Some people commute from as far as Sacramento is what I learned at an earlier meeting]

[Li Zou_stat: Many students already made to the university before they received the campus closure message.]

[Trinie Dalton: Yes can we ask to get practice emergency code red alert texts — can practice with news like outages]

Andrew Kelly - I have a question for Provost, if we are here at 4:30pm and have no access to our offices and power. What are the expectations for turning around an on-ground class to an online one. Expectations for faculty to notify students in a timely manner. It's 1:30 and we still don't know about tomorrow. Are there specific policies or guidance for faculty?

Provost Greer - Thank you for your point. I know that faculty do the best that they can. I don't know if we have a policy or practice in place, and even just getting in touch with students takes time. To your point, we are coming up on this afternoon, I assure you we'll get the message out as fast as we can. We do not expect faculty to turn on a dime. I know how important it is to get in touch with students, that is paramount. I'll stop.

Ian Pollock - I will raise a point about that. One thing I think helpful, oftentimes in absence of a clear policy or clear written commitment, is to give autonomy to faculty, especially lecturers. They might feel they have to do more than what is reasonably expected because they fear for future contracts and employment, so a clear policy of what you've said and that you'll not be penalized because campus is

closed. It should come from your office so department chairs and faculty are informed, and for our most vulnerable faculty without year-long entitlements and contracts, that would be an important piece here.

Provost Greer - I will definitely take your suggestion under advisement. I would think other people would want feedback or input into what is considered reasonable.

Ian Pollock - I don't have the language, it's just important to articulate it. Two hours clearly isn't reasonable.

Christina Chin-Newman - I do think we need to talk more about emergency preparedness. The safety of people is paramount, as we've discussed. There was a question about time modules. The Time Modules Task Force needs to work on this. That would be more for time slots for classes, schedules and separate from what we've voted on today. I wanted to acknowledge that.

- d. Report of the University Diversity Officer
- e. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
- f. [Report](#) of Student Government
- g. [Report](#) of the CFA

5. Election:

- a. Replacement ExCom member for Spring 2024
 - i. [Candidate statements](#)

Christina Chin-Newman - Moving on to the next thing on the agenda is the election. Thanks to those who are running for replacements.

Christina Chin-Newman - Mark will send you a ballot via Qualtrics so you'll need to check your email to get the ballot.

[Dana Rucker: Point of information: If I give my official resignation from ExCom, can we do away with this vote and allow both our ExCom candidates' approval onto the vacated spots on the committee?]

Christina Chin-Newman - I guess if we want to table the election, we could postpone this. If we end up voting someone in and there is another resignation, there might be another election by acclamation.

[Kevin Pina: I think it fair to open it to nominations for the vacate position]

[Ian Pollock: I think each vacancy should have application processes]

Christina Chin-Newman - Procedurewise, all would have an opportunity to run for future positions. Hearing from Senators that we should go ahead with the election. That is what I am hearing. Anyone else want to weigh in? If the will of the body is not to table the election, then we can go ahead and vote.

[Chandra Ganesh: The pool of candidates was for one position.]

Christina Chin-Newman - At least 3 people have not received their ballots as noted in chat. We can hold off on announcing the results and/or extend the voting period. An alternative is to private chat to Senate Office.

Christina Chin-Newman - Does someone wish to move to complete remaining votes over email by the end of the day?

Move: Ian Pollock Second: Kyzyl Fenno-Smith

Christina Chin-Newman - Any discussion? Any objections to extending voting period to email by the end of day without taking more time today? Not seeing any objections, let's move forward.

6. Consent Calendar:

- a. [1st appearance](#) [none at this time]
- b. [2nd appearance](#)

7. Business Items:²

- a. [23-24 BEC 15](#): Bylaws Amendments for the Committee on Research (*second reading*)
- b. [23-24 CIC 2](#): Online Synchronous approvals (*second reading*)
- c. [23-24 CIC 12](#): 2nd Composition Revised Learning Outcomes and Rubric (*second reading*)
- d. [23-24 BEC 16](#): Updates to Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (*second reading*)
- e. [23-24 FAC 7](#): Academic Work Day Definitions (*first reading*) (**time certain: 1:10 pm**)

BREAK @1:12pm

Christina Chin-Newman - FAC 7 goes with FAC 8 and days for Summer 2024 calendar. Right now we are talking about definitions. Senator Duke, please share how these were derived. We need to decide whether to waive a first reading. People are waiting for dates to set the summer calendar.

Duke Austin - FAC set out to provide a definition of academic duty days and instructional days. We've been grappling with this since semester conversion, and how we calculate them for Winter and Summer. When in quarters, Summer was same length as the other three quarters so no conversion was needed. There are not enough weeks in these other terms. Every time it's come up, we get caught up on the definitions. This document is based on existing definitions. Duty days is a term we've used for years but there is not a publicly agreed upon definition. I worked with FAC on this document, linked at the bottom of FAC 7, and for today we can discuss Part 1 and 2. Part 3- which comes to the calculations, we just met with Deputy Provost Hernandez who was calculating things from a different direction. He arrived at the same numbers we had in FAC but using a different formula or direction. Today we want to spend more time talking with Deputy Provost Hernandez to make sure we are calculating accurately. I have therefore moved to strike Part 3 of the document until FAC can produce a clean document and ensure that Academic Affairs and Senate are on the same page. So there are two parts; explaining FAC 7 and striking Part 3 with that understanding.

Christina Chin-Newman - We have to move to the second reading to strike Part 3. Given this is time sensitive, do you want to move to waive the first reading?

Duke Austin - For FAC 7 we do not need to do this.

² According to our standing rules, discussion at first readings should be limited to 10 minutes. A Senator can always move to extend discussion of an item by a certain number of minutes. We don't have enough time for 10 minutes for every item, so hopefully some items will go faster.

Christina Chin-Newman - I think there are two things we can do. Leave it as the first reading and later pass with Part 3 complete, or later move to second reading. Either pathway seems fine. Meiling can you weigh in?

Meiling Wu - I suggest we don't waive first reading. This allows FAC to meet tomorrow and fix it for second reading. Also the reason why we need FAC 7 is because FAC 8 is time pressing for Summer 2024, and that is why we need a clear definition to base our calendars upon.

Christina Chin-Newman- Any other discussion or questions? If it's a first reading, we don't want to go over 10 minutes.

Move: Erik Helgren Second: Meiling Wu

- f. [23-24 FAC 8](#): Summer 2024 Calendar (*first reading*) (**time certain: after FAC 7**)
 - i. [Calendar Explainer for Senate 2.6.24](#)

Move: Duke Austin Second: Elijah Quineri

Christina Chin-Newman - I am going to talk about this a little bit. You may wonder why are we changing these dates when there was some concern that it was late to do so. We want some quality control for summer session. As Senator Duke said, we now have a compressed summer session and want to ensure students can earn the same amount of credit, and for faculty to be paid fairly for that session. There might be other issues involved with student credit that we are not addressing today. One is whether faculty can be fairly compensated. For the past couple of years summer hasn't been quite right. We were a little off with the ratio of instructional and duty days. If we want summer to be compliant with systemwide guidelines, and for peace of mind have correct proportions, we cannot do what we did last summer. We've had many different conversations about this. A longer summer session was discussed but won't work. We've tried adding days at the end of summer, and that doesn't work either. We've arrived at adding three instructional days at the beginning. We've consulted with housing, registrar, bookstore and international education to make sure all will be ok. There are not obstacles to adding the 3 days at the beginning of summer. It will start on a Wednesday. Most summer classes that meet synchronously meet twice a week, so they may have one additional meeting. It means starting the week after Memorial Day instead of in June. We need to consider not just for this summer, but FAC will bring us other calendars for other summers. We are just looking at this one summer 2024 now.

Duke Austin - I'll add a couple of things. One of the reasons for adding instructional days was when we passed 22-23 CIC 50, we said students could take up to 14 credit units over the summer. This was passed to help the Teacher Education Department ensure that they were able to teach enough courses to meet their accrediting guidelines. In the summer, when CIC 50 was passed, the instructional days weren't increased at that point, necessitating the adding of a few instructional days to allow students to take 14 units.

Secondly, Deputy Provost Hernandez has come to the same conclusion, and that we need to add these days and he is in agreement with how many days and the best position for them. Thirdly, the CO has designated June 19th the Juneteenth holiday, so we had to adjust the calendar to reflect that. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman - Thank you, technically we are still in the first reading. Does anyone want to move to waive the first reading?

Move: Erik Helgren Second: Arrin Phipps

Christina Chin-Newman - We are well over $\frac{2}{3}$ of the body in favor of waiving the first reading. We are now in the 2nd reading. We can have three speakers for and against if a motion is controversial. If you want an amendment, this is the time.

Provost Greer - A quick question. Apologies for one more last minute question. I know you checked with International Education if we had dates posted for them, but do we cause a complication if we change that? Have you been able to close the loop with Thomas Tyner on that question?

Christina Chin-Newman- He kindly made time, and he is here if I've gotten anything wrong. For arriving international students, that would be the following Spring. It is Teacher Education students who start in the summer. They didn't know of specific students for whom it would cause problems for housing, and agreed it is better to have the days at the beginning. For those who want their OPT, optional practical training - who almost all want to do for hands on job experience - it is the beginning and end dates of their time here that are a problem. Changing the end date is problematic, but less problematic if the change is at the beginning of summer.

Thomas Tyner - I am the executive director for international programs. Perfect job, Christina. That's exactly what we talked about. Thank you.

[Meiling: Thank you all for the support of FAC 8 to allow all department Chairs to upload the summer 2024 schedule in time.]

[Meiling: FAC specially thank senator Duke Austin who spent a lot of time figuring out the definitions and schedules and solved the issues.]

[Murray Horne: Can we get new time modules for summer as well given the new time frame?]

Christina Chin-Newman - Thank you. Good to know. The registrar will adjust the add drop dates. The bookstore will adjust their dates too, that is not a problem. We are good to go in those departments. Any other discussion? Seeing none, I will call the question.

Christina Chin-Newman - We have 42 Yes, 0 No and 1 Abstention. The motion passes without dissent. Thanks everyone for weighing in on this. Of course, President Sandeen needs to sign off. Unfortunately, she is unable to be present today. The President has very kindly signed things a little more quickly than usual upon request. If it was something time sensitive, which would be

the case with this one. In terms of student learning, that topic about contact hours for on-ground classes will be for another day.

- g. [23-24 FUFM 2](#): Resolution Supporting Holocaust Remembrance Day and Supporting Jewish Students, Faculty, Staff, and Community Members (*first reading*) (time certain: 1:45 pm)

[Note from Senate Secretary: All chat comments during first reading of 23-24 FUFM 2 are collected at the end of the minutes in this section.]

Christina Chin-Newman - Thank you to all here today to bring this resolution. Guest Elizabeth, would you like to share the reason for the resolution? Many may wish to talk, please keep to three minutes.

Guest Elizabeth Bergman 00:58:55 - I speak in support of Senate endorsement of 23-24 FUFM 2. I'm here to speak on behalf of those that have lost friends, family, and loved ones in the Holocaust, and to convey how important the mantra of "never again" is, especially in these times.

I know well what the current chant of "from the river to the sea" means. It means the genocide of the Jewish people once again, and so I say, never again. Yet still to this day Syria, Iran, Iraq, Hezbollah in Lebanon, and Hamas in Gaza all call for wiping Israel off the map and the extermination of, the genocide of the Jewish people in Israel. Since the Hamas attack on Israel on October 7th, many of our Jewish students, employees, faculty staff have been in shock and are experiencing feelings of sadness, fear, and loss. Students and their parents have contacted our campus, UDO and President Sandeen to say that they do not feel safe here at East Bay.

The harsh reactions and hateful protests that we see across America, the ugly antisemitism and stereotyping of Jewish people are scary as this FUFM notes. President Biden spoke about how the events of October 7th have resulted in the rise of antisemitism. Sadly around the country there have been rallies, cheering terrorism and calling for the killing of Jews.

FBI data shows antisemitism, antisemitic hate crimes in the US are the highest since such data tracking began in 1991. Also notable is the fact that 20% of young Americans under 30 believe that the Holocaust is a myth, according to the Economist.

I hope that Senators will endorse this FUFM today to make a statement that the Senate and the campus do not support terrorists or terrorism. To be clear, the vote in November passing FDEC 2, to support Palestinians and their allies, was a vote supporting the Hamas terrorists.

In addition, the FDEC vote should not have been recorded as passing, because it did not have a majority. According to the University Bylaws, Article 5, Section 3.a. the rule requires a majority of the members be present.

There were 16 abstentions, 14 Yes, votes, and 1 No vote. This is not a majority of the 31 members present. The passage was declared based on only a majority of those voting 14 out of 15, which is not the rule in the Bylaws. In addition, the process was subverted, in a rush to bring the resolution to a vote, by waiving the second reading. We can see the rushing to vote was harmful, because 16 Senators felt they had to abstain. All these reasons, or any one of them, is sufficient justification to rescind FDEC 2.

I hope you agree that we all support our students, faculty and staff, that antisemitism and hatred will not be sanctioned or tolerated on this campus. Please vote Yes on this FUFM, and please do not abstain. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman - Okay, thank you. Do we have any other speakers? Sure. Let's see the 2 people I see are Guest Stephanie Seitz and Senator Michelle Rippy, and Guest Kelsi. Right now we're in first reading, so I will be calling on people in order. But if we were in second reading it would have to be three in favor, and three against. If time is pressing, we'll prioritize senators, but I think we can be okay with the guests. So I will ask if people can try to limit their comments to two minutes. Okay, Guest Stephanie.

GUEST Stephanie Seitz 01:03:03 - I am Jewish and I am the product of Holocaust survivors. So the comments that I'm about to share naturally come from my personal experiences as a Jewish American. I'm concerned that 23-24 FUFM 2 supporting Holocaust Remembrance Day seeks to rescind the previous resolution supporting Palestinians and their allies. I am particularly concerned with comments that seem to insist that supporting Palestinian community members and their allies is antisemitic.

While I disagree with a great deal of the factual premises of the resolution, I will leave that to other colleagues and I would just like to remind my colleagues of three main points. First, Israel is not synonymous with Judaism. Second, 23-24 FUFM 2 does not express the position of all, or even most Jews on this campus. In fact, it primarily expresses the position of Zionist Jews, and should be revised then for clarity. Third, social justice resolutions are meant to support oppressed members of the faculty. Jewish and Palestinian members of our campus community may both experience oppression. Supporting one oppressed group should not mean deleting the support of another. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:04:43 - Okay, thank you so much. Senator Michelle Rippy

Michelle Rippy 01:04:52 - Thank you so much. I am not speaking to or against the FUFM or FDEC 2, but I would like to note that we, with the diversity and lived experiences of our entire campus, community student staff faculty alum. I think it's really challenging for our Senate to take any sort of a stance, because we're going to be offending someone else on campus. And I know that through these resolutions, especially through FDEC 2, there was a lot of controversy with that. There were a lot of concerns just from speaking with others on campus, that they were feeling oppressed. And we shouldn't have that with our Senate resolutions, our Senate resolutions should not be oppressing any other party on campus. And there's also what Stephanie mentioned about the concern of this FUFM removing a prior FDEC, and just the body making sure that it follows the bylaws and policies and procedures. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:05:58 - Okay. Thank you. Next is Secretary Nina.

Nina Haft 01:06:03 I want to start by thanking my fellow Jewish colleagues today for bringing this conversation about antisemitism to our body, and I encourage everyone here and on our campus to read the statements submitted both in favor and in opposition to FUFM 2. I think it's really important, especially now, after October 7th, for us to listen really deeply to one another and I think part of why we're having this conversation about the Holocaust is that we have a lot of fresh grief and also grief that's part of an older story. As someone who has lost family members in state sanctioned violence targeting Jewish people, I firmly believe that we must remember the Holocaust, and that all people deserve comfort and respect as we mourn our dead. I also believe that commemoration of the Holocaust

is part of a very profoundly Jewish value, which is, that never again will there be a genocide. And I am among the Jews in this country and around the world who believe that never again means never again for anyone, and that includes Palestinians. My concerns echo Senator Seitz with my concerns about this resolution. They're not concerns about commemorating the Holocaust, they're concerns with binaries that are embedded in the calls to action.

I do not believe that unequivocal support for all people with ties to Israel is the same thing as you and me supporting Jewish people. Jews are not a monolith, and there are many of us who are critical of the state of Israel, and the state of Israel is not equivalent to the Jewish people. Also, I think, as an academic institution, understanding what happened in the Holocaust not does not require that we refuse to understand the perspective of Palestinians about the creation of the state of Israel. This is not the same thing as Holocaust denialism, and it's not a distortion of history. It's the story of a people who experienced what they call a catastrophe.

And when we listen to those losses it does not mean that we hate Jews or are antisemitic. It means that we hold the pain of lives lost in Israel, in Gaza, in the Holocaust, and I'm here to ask us to hold all of it, and to listen to more than one story. To rescind FDEC 2 is to put these in an either-or situation, and I don't believe it will achieve the goal of ending antisemitism. I think it will increase misunderstanding, and that is why I oppose the resolution in its current form. I would be happy to see it in an amended form. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:09:00 - Okay, thank you. Next guest Shahr.

GUEST Shahr Sansani 01:09:05 - Hi everybody, Shahr Sansani. I think most of the people I mean, I can't speak for everybody I can speak for myself, the opposition to FDEC 2 was not because it was pro-Palestinian. It wasn't because it protected the free speech of those people who are Palestinian, who support the Palestinians. The opposition was the complete disregard for the horrors that happened on October 7th.

People that were there, people that when they witnessed it said that they've been to many, many war zones, many, many places, and they have never seen anything like it. People who visit places where gender-based violence has been committed say that they've never seen anything like it. I'm not going to share some of the details of what happened. Whoever's interested can do that. The main thing is just completely distorting history, ignoring what happened on October 7th. A resolution that starts on October 8th is just abhorrent. It's abhorrent from a human decency standpoint. And it's also important from a factual standpoint looking at Israel's response to what happened on October 7th, and the severity of it, without looking at the severity of what caused that reaction is very, from an academic institution, just very ignorant right? It's ignorant of history, ignorant of what happened, and we can pretend October 7th didn't happen, but it did happen and it will have an effect on what's happening in the Middle East for decades to come so we can't ignore it just like the resolution ignored it. October 7th happened. And the reaction is in response to what happened, just like the U.S. response to World War II, you know, it's not just December 8th you know. In 1941, the US decided to respond to something that happened before it. What happened on October 7th was even worse than that. And then there's going to be a response. People can have free speech. People can support whoever they want. But changing history is not something that I think that an academic institution should be behind.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:11:29 - Okay, thank you. Next is Senator Paul.

Paul Carpenter - East Bay - he/him/his - 01:11:34 Thank you. I'm neither speaking for or against this this resolution, or FDEC 2. I have, what is much more, a procedural question for you as Senate chair. That is, with respect to the resolution, can we actually proceed with that approach when it has embedded in it several other aspects? One is the issue or question around the legitimacy of the vote of FDEC 2, and then also the procedural aspect or impetus or resolution. But it's effectively a motion to rescind that isn't being separated out and discussed separately.

I'm not quite sure how we proceed here. I think the conversation so far clearly indicates that this is a conversation you need to have, and probably is an ongoing conversation, but from a more pragmatic procedural point of view, which, probably from my perspective, is all I can speak to. I need to have the lived experience or the expertise to address the specifics of either resolution. So it's a procedural question.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:12:39 - So my understanding as the Senate chair was that we didn't violate our Standing Rules in the way that we voted. I have mentioned at ExCom and Senate if we want, we could change our Standing Rules to make it a little stricter about what we do pass in Senate. We could change them so that if we have too many abstentions, it wouldn't pass. So that's a possibility. I don't think we have to change the bylaws, but you know we can have a more detailed discussion of how that could work outside of the meeting.

When I was asked how to rescind a resolution my understanding was, according to the Robert's Rules, like regular parliamentary procedure, that a Senator could move to repeal, or rescind something, and so we could have a second and if we had 2/3 approval that we could do that. And so I did say that it might help senators to know the reasons for rescinding something. And so if it's embedded in a resolution, it might have some of those reasons anyway. So you know that that was one option. But then, the resolution would only really need to be passed by half of the people. So I would say, parliamentary procedure-wise is that it's like a loophole, you know that the Senate is comfortable with or maybe procedurally, it would be more correct to remove that and treat it as a separate motion? So that's all that I have to say at this moment. I'd like to move on to Guest Eric.

Guest Eric Kupers 01:14:19 - Hi! Thank you. My name is Eric Kupers. I teach in the theater and dance department. I am an Ashkenazi Jew, descended from ancestors who fled Russia and the Ukraine to escape violence, pogroms and great discrimination. My understanding of Jewish identity for me and my family is that it is based in social justice, and it is based in taking care of people who are oppressed and marginalized, and to remember the stranger, to remember those who are displaced. Ultimately, I think Judaism for me, and I'm sure there's many different Judaisms here. But for me it's about treating others how I want to be treated. And so the most Jewish thing that I think I can do at this point is to call for a ceasefire to criticize what the Israelis Government is doing, which I think is terrible, horrible, and needs to stop immediately.

When I say that I'm not ignoring October seventh. I'm not ignoring anything. I'm calling for a very specific thing, a ceasefire. I'm calling for an end to violence. To think that somehow this all started on October seventh is very short-sighted. These are deep, deep issues in our history. The history of our people. So I don't know a lot about the way Senate works, but I do know that I'm really concerned about the word antisemitism is being thrown around in our country. It is not antisemitic, in my opinion, at all

to criticize Israel, to call for a ceasefire, and I'm actually insulted and offended when people somehow associate Judaism with allowing this kind of carnage to go on.

The last thing is, I don't think that there's a way to not respond to this as a university, that it's so big what's happening right now that we can't say, oh, the Senate's not a place to respond to this. Any response is a response. So I'm in support of FDEC 2. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:16:34 - Thank you. Next guest. JP.

GUEST JP Horn (he/him/his) 01:16:38 - Hi, everyone I'm John Paul Horne. I'm from the Social Work department. I'm listed as the second author of this particular resolution. And I actually just want to talk about my reasoning for wanting to rescind FDEC 2, which is a separate issue from supporting Palestinian people. I made my position very clear in the discussion of FDEC, the fact that I do support human rights and social justice for all people, and that would include Palestinian people as well.

My issue is that, according to the Senate Constitution and bylaws, there is a discrepancy on what is considered to be actually a majority vote and based on the voting. It was, in my opinion, as somebody who has had a lot of experience in parliamentary procedure and parliamentary bodies, not a majority vote. So that was my opinion in terms of why I wanted to have FDEC 2 rescinded. I do think it's also very important to note that while we're the people who advanced this resolution, that the Senate holds the privilege of amending the resolution. And if there is a procedural issue within the resolution that it is the responsibility and the right of the Senate to address those particular procedural issues.

I know that it sounds like I'm undercutting the resolution, but I'd much rather not have the baby thrown out with the bathwater, so to speak in understanding that even if there are two issues with this particular resolution.

The idea that a Holocaust Remembrance resolution would be something of contest, I think, poses a big issue. And I think, as a Jewish person on campus, that we do have an obligation to our Jewish faculty, students and staff who exist within our community. And that I do ask the Senate to think about those particular procedural points. When you consider this resolution in its second reading. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:18:44 - Okay, thank you. Next we have Senate Vice Chair, DELO and FDEC Chair Kyzyl.

Kyzyl Fenno-Smith 01:18:50 - Thank you. JP. I want to thank all my colleagues who have spoken. I appreciate you bringing your voices and perspectives to the Senate. I believe the Senate is a place for this conversation, and for these issues to be addressed.

I am speaking as a culturally Christian, though non-adherent person, since others have identified their general orientation. To this I am not speaking in favor of this resolution. I am going to speak in favor of the voices, the diverse voices we have on our campus, and the conversations we need to have.

I am the diversity and equity liaison officer for the Senate, and also the chair of FDEC. And I believe deeply that this conversation has a place in the Academy, and that it affects everyone in our community, regardless of their identification with any particular point of view on the topic. Eric, I appreciated your comment. I do think that this is a conversation that we need to have in terms of the rules of the Senate. I think that that can be worked out. JP, I appreciate you parsing the issues. I cannot support this resolution in its current form, because I feel it denies voice.

To the concerns in FDEC 2 as an academic librarian, my research and my focus is always on what we can learn across every boundary, and in working with students for over 30 years on their research interests and their thoughts. I know that we need to have the conversation, and that that information needs to be available to everyone in our community to learn from. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:20:48 - Okay, thanks. Next is Guest Elena

GUEST Elena Dukhovny 01:20:55 - Thank you for taking the time to listen. This is a comment in support of resolution FUFM 2. To including its purpose to rescind resolution FDEC 2. As a couple of people have said, my comment is not about lack of empathy to Palestinian suffering. I do not believe that the academic senate of a university should be taking sides on a hotly contested long term, immensely complex international conflict. And certainly not without a transparent process that involves inviting professional expertise in the appropriate areas. I think you can see this from a lot of the opinions that are coming up here.

In fact, I don't think the University has traditionally made statements to take sides like this resolution, FDEC 2 did on various wars around the world beyond general statements of support to civilians impacted by conflicts and natural disasters. And FDEC 2, the way that it's written and the way that it's presented, regardless of what was its initial presumed intent, presents an extremely one-sided and in multiple places factually incorrect view of the conflict. Which is made immediately obvious, like Shahar mentioned by the fact that it entirely omits the Hamas attack of October 7th that began this conflict. So that particular resolution? I think it's just factually incorrect in many places and should receive a lot more scrutiny in that regard. Thank you for listening.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:22:52 - Okay, thank you. Next is Senator Lisa.

Lisa Handwerker 01:22:57 - Hi, thank you. I want to thank Eric and Stephanie for their comments. I also want to say that I, too, am culturally Jewish. I was named after my great uncle who died fighting the Nazis. I also have had relatives killed in the Holocaust and I also have been married to a Palestinian man.

And I think that what we're missing here is hearing the pain of both people and that to me is very concerning. And there are many Jewish people who are not Zionists, and we do support the rights of Palestinian citizens living in Israel and are horrified by what's going on in Gaza.

That also does not deny how we feel about the massacre. But this problem did not just start with the massacre. It's been going on for years. In the 1980s I already was working for peaceful resolutions. And I've been working on this subject for more than 30 years. As a culturally identified Jew, I again also, like Eric said, I consider my values to be ones of social justice and fighting for people who are oppressed all over the world, and I think, remembering the Holocaust. Yes, I am absolutely remembering the atrocities that have happened all over the world, and I also support calling for a cease fire in Gaza right now. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:24:44 - Thank you. Our next guest, Kelsi.

GUEST Kelsi Perttula 01:24:48 - Hi, everyone. Thank you for everyone who's spoken. I'm Kelsi Perttula. I'm an Assistant Professor in the Department of Public Health. I am Jewish with Jewish children, with friends and family in Israel, and members of a family who were lost in the Holocaust. I am one of the authors on this resolution. I'm like JP, open to amendments.

I seek consensus. That's a personality trait in general, I have. I think there's a lot that we can agree on. I think the quick passage of FDEC 2 was a mistake in the fact that, as many people pointed out, there are many factual inaccuracies that it does go from the Nakba to October 8th, with nothing in between, the many complicated peace processes that have come very close. And most importantly, it leaves off the massacre, the pogrom of October 7th where Jews, where other Israelis were killed in their homes, at a concert just for being Jewish. There was so much hatred, and genocidal intent that day that I can't explain how much it hurts to have that accusation thrown back.

And I understand where it comes from. But I think that the university should be supporting anyone who's affected by these conflicts right now, which includes Palestinian, Arab and Muslim students as well as Jewish and Israeli students. And I don't know why we had to rush through something that was so harmful, because it denies the massacre that happened on October 7th, which is already that denial and lies about that day are rippling through our country. You can see on Youtube the Oakland City Council people just saying it didn't happen, or Israel did it to itself. So it's really important to memorialize these things. Because there is a tendency to leave them off. And that that intent, I believe, is based in antisemitism. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:27:14 - Thanks. Next is Guest Linda.

GUEST Linda Ivey 01:27:17 - Hi! Thank you for letting me speak. I've long been a member of Senate, but I am not currently so I really appreciate the opportunity to address the Senate. At the top of the meeting, the chair referred to these resolutions as non-binding arguments, and I had often thought of resolutions in that way like, well, it's a resolution. What does it really mean? And I think this has shown us that the words that come out in these resolutions that are in theory representing the voices of the Senate, and therefore represented the voices of the faculty, can be quite raw and quite emotional and quite important.

I was not a fan of FDEC 2. I have to agree with Elena. The statement that I read yesterday, the new resolution, I could see how it came up in response to FDEC 2. But I feel like these two documents are now standing in opposition to each other, especially because the second one calls for the rescinding of the first, and that no way is this a move towards any kind of conversation or healing. And it's, you know, easy for me to say this because I'm not on the Senate. But I really feel like our Senate should develop, if we want to, a resolution that carefully balances the emotions of both sides, the emotions of the people versus the Government's and using our collective intelligence and empathy to put forth a document that doesn't make, you know, a chunk of the rest of the Senate feel unsafe. So that's what I put forward to you. I think this is really worth taking apart both of these documents and coming up with something entirely new. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:29:36 - Okay, thank you. Next is Senator Somak.

Somak Paul (he/him/his) 01:29:43 - Hi, everyone. I'm going to speak against the Resolution in its present form. I am in full support of commemorating Holocaust Remembrance Day on campus, as the resolution proposes. However, I have a major disagreement with the penultimate resolve clause. As a Senator and FDEC member I denounce the claim that FDEC 2, the resolution that passed FDEC unopposed, is racist and antisemitic. Such claim, made without any evidence, perpetuates the dangerous

narrative that anyone who speaks up for Palestinian rights or takes action to stop the current genocide in Gaza is antisemitic.

The FDEC 2 resolution demanded an immediate cease fire in Gaza, and protection of the students, faculty and staff advocating for justice in Palestine. Over 120 days into this genocide, and we are still witnessing staggering civilian casualties in Gaza, where one child is being killed every eight min. Two mothers are being executed every hour, and 10 children are losing one or both legs every day. Is this the right time to rescind the resolution that calls for immediate cease fire?

Just 200 miles down south in Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, students are being brutally beaten up and arrested for protesting on campus. Is this the time to even debate rescinding a resolution that demands protection of our students?

With the continued massacre of Palestinians in Gaza, and incessant attacks on the safety and academic freedom of the students and faculty in the US, I think the FDEC 2 resolution is even more relevant today than it was at the time it was written.

I am going to vote no on FUFM 2 resolution in its current form, because it reeks of Islamophobia with the suggestive use of the words terrorism and terrorists stifles any criticism of Israel's continued massacre in Gaza, and defames FDEC. And it sends a message to our students of Arab and Palestinian descent, and the Muslim students that they are not welcome here, and their safety is not a priority to us. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:31:50 - Okay, thank you. After the next three speakers, I need the last couple of minutes so we can take care of Senate business. So maybe we can move some things to an online vote. Senator Ian.

Ian Pollock 01:32:03 - I'll try and be short. I grew up in Germany for 20 years, and during my time in German High School, I went to, sorry, this is a bit hard, right? I went to our concentration camps several times, I think, a total of three times. And also as someone who has partial German heritage, I am in possession of special documents that all German citizens at that time had to carry that would prove that they were not Jewish. So this is a context in which I grew up. And the context really is that we see the consequences of an exclusionary apartheid state that then dehumanizes one group and then seeks to cleanse them from territories by one means or another, either by transfer or extermination.

I'm also aware of the United Nations resolution that is put on the floor every year, and has been, I think, for the last 30 years, and is voted down specifically about the peaceful resolution of the question of the State of Palestine, fixing the 1967 borders. The two parties that consistently oppose and veto this resolution are the United States and the State of Israel.

I think that what the resolution that is seeking to rescind this other one is expressing, is really a questioning of the Palestinian passport or the Palestinian identification in the green passport in the State of Israel. Right? A two-citizen state, an apartheid regime that is creating large carceral spaces in the State of Israel. One of them is called Gaza, and where calories are counted when they're not being bombed. Most of the weapons used in October 7th attack were recycled from bombs that had been dropped on Gaza. I forget the article where that was found. But basically, it's American bombs. So I refuse these statements that this started on October 7th. I think that the actions that were taken by Hamas on October 7th are horrible but I don't think that that was a singular context, and I think that as academics, we owe it to ourselves to educate ourselves, not to rely on foreign experts. There is lots of

material out there that we could all be discussing and exploring, and I think it's important to remember the Holocaust to remember the excesses of the German Nazi regime of the time which seek to dehumanize a group of people, and never again means that we, as a humanity, will never stand for dehumanizing another group of people, and to let these excesses be performed in the name of a State.

And so I would wholeheartedly, and would lovingly support any kind of Holocaust memorial, any kind of bill that that seeks to address antisemitism, but it should not be at the cost of Palestinian bodies, and so I will be voting against this resolution in its current form, and I hope that it will be resubmitted in another form that doesn't seek to silence voices that are equally important on our campus. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:35:45 - Okay, thanks. Does anyone want to move to extend the time of the meeting by five minutes?

Move: Kyzyl Fenno-Smith Second: Trini Dalton

Christina Chin-Newman Please vote Yes or No if you want to extend the time of meeting. If we extend then I think those last two people could have two minutes to speak. Ok, seeing the votes I would say there's 2/3 approval to extend. Let's give two min each, and then we'll finish up our business. So Guest Crystal, go ahead.

Guest Crystal Perez (she/her) 01:36:54 - Hi, good afternoon, everyone. I am an Assistant Professor in the English department, and I only want to add a few comments to express my opposition to the FUFM 2 Resolution. To be clear, to be very clear, I am not in opposition to the points on Holocaust Remembrance, or the ask for a multi-religious or Jewish center, as these points advocate for furthering support for our diversity and to deconstruct racism. I respect and appreciate the spirit of that aspect of the resolution.

And as an instructor who is committed to social justice and to serving all students of all races, genders, and religions, I want to see gains on that front, so I appreciate that that was included in that resolution.

However, my objection with FUFM 2 is that it disavows the previous CFA PAM resolution and its efforts to speak for Palestinian and Palestinian supporters in and outside of our campus community. The binaries that Nina mentioned earlier are not helpful for dialogue, or necessary in our current moment.

The inclusion of this latest resolution to rescind the previous one presupposes that pro-Palestinian support equals antisemitism and racism. This conflation is inaccurate and dangerous and breeds anti-Palestinian violence that has resulted in physical harm of Palestinian students and supporters at college campuses around the nation, and I am afraid that that will happen in our campus. I would like to see more campus resources devoted to providing spaces for education, information, and for thoughtful and inclusive dialogue about antisemitism, Islamophobia, which is also rising, and the ongoing bombardment of Gaza that can help us better navigate this difficult subject at our campus for any academic senators who are thinking about abstaining their vote. On this resolution I understand the fear and anxiety and your inclination to remain silent on this issue, given the push for censorship.

However, I would urge you to draw some courage to do what is logical, right, and just, and revisit the original CFA PAM resolution in support of Palestine, and notice that you will not find any antisemitic language. I will also note that there are no Palestinian faculty that I know of, and Senate, maybe even in our campus. And I ask yourself who can speak for them here today? As they are watching their people

be bombed, shot, and starved, and today I think the space is open for you to speak up on their behalf. Thank you.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:39:24 - Thanks. For our last speaker on this, for today, Senator Sara Borjas.

Sara Borjas 01:39:33 - Thank you everyone for offering your perspectives and your thoughts. I'm speaking in opposition to FUFM 2 mostly, because, as a professor here at East Bay, I feel the support of that resolution makes me feel unsafe and unwelcome to do my job as a professor, antiracist teacher and educator and to center social justice. I think that this resolution, as is currently written, selectively upholds atrocities and genocide committed against people who hold Jewish identities during the Holocaust at the cost of ongoing atrocities and ongoing genocide committed against indigenous people and Palestinian people.

I think that this is selective humanization. Should it be given credence implicates us all in that discrimination, and racism and bankrupts us of any credibility, moral authority, or claims of social justice and antiracism. This directly conflicts with the mission of the CSU and my personal values as a human being, a scholar and educator, practitioner, and an advocate of antiracist pedagogy.

I am not opposed to this resolution if amended. But this resolution, as it is, equates antisemitism with the belief and the right of Palestinians to live. It denies, it minimalizes the current genocide of indigenous peoples. The denialism and efforts to minimize the current size, one that echoes for indigenous people on the land we currently live, work, and learn on.

We recognize that we are guests here, and we need to remember that. Know that we are not here by choice, and I, personally, would not hit replay on the genocide, slaughter, scalping, maiming, sexual violence, rape, and violence of indigenous people. The settler colonists that brought us here to have this conversation in the first place. I am alive here at East Bay, directly because of this violence.

This resolution denies my experience and asks me to defend global oppression. Lastly, this resolution fails to hold racism in all its complexity, manifestations and applications, and its use is implied to only be treatment selectively applied to the state of Israel and people of Jewish identity, rather than all peoples. In this same sentence of the proposed resolution, it specifically denies Palestinian, Arab, and Muslim identities those same rights when it demands the university rescind the adopted resolution that acknowledges Palestinian Arab and Muslim people's right to live.

This resolution creates an unsafe, unwelcome, hostile, and discriminatory atmosphere. Here, at least for myself, for all indigenous people, for Palestine Arab and Muslim people, and any resolution that asked to recognize the humanity of one group with one eye closed and another eye to the humanity of another group is not the business of, or in the interest of, a university that leads with its commitment to be fair and just and create a future for everyone. So I will be voting against, a No against this resolution.

Christina Chin-Newman 01:42:35 - Okay, thanks everyone. I'm sorry I haven't been able to completely monitor the chat. I thank everyone for coming and trying to listen respectfully and speak respectfully, hopefully. I think right now, since we're between a first and second reading, and because the originators of the resolution did not intend to waive the first reading, that it will be up there on the table on the agenda. It would come as a second reading next time in between this Senate meeting and the next Senate meeting. We do have an ExCom meeting. I don't think I have to officially refer this to Excom, but I

would suggest that maybe I could put on as a discussion item discussing the procedural aspects of this resolution that has a resolve to rescind another red resolution.

I think at that time we can also discuss what the originator Guest Elizabeth Bergman mentioned that she thought the original vote was not legitimate. She and I have had many emails and a zoom conversation. And we didn't discuss those details, but I think in ExCom we can certainly do that. If there was a mistake we would review. If people want to bring forth a proposal to change the standing rules of the bylaws, I'm always happy to help people do what they want to do. But our conversations were more about the scope of how to get what she wanted done, and not changing the structural standing rules. It was like a proposal was going to come and nothing came yet, you know, with the standing rules, that sort of thing. We're always open to that.

CHAT during first reading of FUFM 2 follows here:

13:55:00 From Sara McDaniel (she/her) To Everyone: Well said, Stephanie. (7 ❤️, 2 ♥ and 2 🙌)

13:57:01 From Tristan Garcia To Everyone: Very well said Stephanie

14:00:50 From GUEST Stephanie Seitz To Everyone: It would be nice if we, as professional colleagues, could limit ourselves from calling others' well informed positions abhorrent or ignorant. (8 🙌)

14:02:18 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: I can call your opinion abhorrent, just as you can call mine abhorrent. I don't have to agree with you.

14:03:01 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: Ignoring October 7th in the context of history is ignorant.

14:03:13 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: Just like ignoring any other atrocity is.

14:05:15 From Christina Chin-Newman To Everyone: Please, let's not use the chat for side conversations. Thank you (1 ❤️ and 1 🙌)

14:05:22 From GUEST Michael Rowley To Everyone: Replying to "I can call your opin..." Do you mind if I write this - Stephanie did not say you couldn't, Shahar. She said it would be nice if we used more respectful language when describing each other as professional colleagues. It is, of course, up to you if you choose to be respectful or not. (1 ❤️)

14:06:14 From GUEST ShEfi Lubliner To Everyone: There was a ceasefire before Oct. 7 (1 🙌)

14:07:01 From vibha Puri To Everyone: Replying to "I can call your opin..." You spoke so well. This is truly a person who is universal. Thank you.

14:07:14 From GUEST ShEfi Lubliner To Everyone: What was your response to China's atrocities against the Uyghur's? None? Why not?

14:07:34 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: Replying to "I can call your opin..." Ignoring October 7th is very disrespectful.

14:12:55 From Sara Borjas To Everyone: I hope that this body and the endeavor to pursue knowledge understands that past practice does not equal best practice. (4 🇺🇸)

14:13:47 From Sara Borjas To Everyone: *I hope that this body understands the endeavor to pursue knowledge and that past practice does not equal best practice.

14:16:54 From Kevin Pina, CSUEB_Dept. of Communication To Everyone: The casualties on both sides of this conflict, according to several credible sources, is also very lopsided and my conscience will not allow me to conflate the slaughter of innocent children with Hamas terrorism. (2 👍)

14:19:34 From GUEST Elena Dukhovny To Everyone: There was this document:
<https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2023-2024/3659.pdf>

14:19:36 From Michelle St. George To Everyone: For guests, I want to note that on the same day that the senate passed 23-24 FDEC 2, we also supported ASCSU's Resolution Condemning Acts of Terrorism, War Crimes, Crimes Against Humanity, and Genocide Against all People, and Support for the California State University Community and Conversations, which explicitly discusses Oct. 7.
https://drive.google.com/file/d/18On3tOsm6N4MbFVOSAHRw9oTkl2_3444/view (2 👍)

14:19:57 From GUEST ShEfi Lubliner To Everyone: What the slaughter and sexual abuse of innocent Israeli children by Hamas?

14:20:50 From Kevin Pina, CSUEB_Dept. of Communication To Everyone: And how many Palestinian children's lives will sate that vengeance?

14:21:33 From GUEST Daisy (she/ella) To Everyone: Thank you, Somak! (1 ❤️ and 2 👍)

14:21:43 From GUEST ShEfi Lubliner To Everyone: Check your vocabulary! You use the word "genocide" for casualties of war.

14:22:11 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: The opposition to the resolution is not about criticism of Israel, it's about the omission of the atrocities of Hamas. (1 👍)

14:23:58 From Kevin Pina, CSUEB_Dept. of Communication To Everyone: Replying to "The opposition to th..." I don't see that critique included in this resolution as it is currently written.

14:25:56 From Tristan Garcia To Everyone: Cute dog Eric! (2 👍)

14:27:28 From GUEST - Eric Ray in NorCal: Ohlone & Pomo Lands To Everyone: Replying to "Cute dog Eric!" thx. i thought he might be able to help us soften in the midst of a very challenging moment. (6 ❤️)

14:28:24 From Tristan Garcia To Everyone: Replying to "Cute dog Eric!" I wish I had an emotional support dog right now. I have to settle for my kitties ;) (1 ❤️)

14:28:25 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: FDEC - 2 is very binary.

14:28:54 From GUEST - Eric Ray in NorCal: Ohlone & Pomo Lands To Everyone: Replying to "Cute dog Eric!" he's here to support us all. (1 ❤️)

14:29:03 From GUEST ShEfi Lubliner To Everyone: The problem with the PAM resolution is that is factually inaccurate. This is what Rabbi Wolpe identified as "intellectual slovenliness" when he resigned from the committee on antisemitism at Harvard. (1 ❤️ and 1 👍)

14:29:57 From Trinie Dalton (she/her) To Everyone: Thank you Crystal

14:30:10 From Kevin Pina, CSUEB_Dept. of Communication To Everyone: Bad example as they railroaded out the first Black woman president of Harvard for offering a balanced position of academic freedom.

14:30:29 From GUEST Elena Dukhovny To Everyone: Replying to "FDEC - 2 is very bin..." Yes. The other resolution, <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutions/2023-2024/3659.pdf>, is much better.

14:32:06 From GUEST ShEfi Lubliner To Everyone: So why don't you give your home back to the Native Americans? That's what you want Jews in Israel to do, right?

14:32:24 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: You did not have a problem with the slaughter of indigenous Jews.

14:32:41 From GUEST Claire Valderama-Wallace (she/siya) To Everyone: Your aggressive and reductive comments are truly concerning. (2 😞)

14:32:46 From GUEST Stephanie Seitz To Everyone: Shahar, this is completely inappropriate. Please stop attacking your colleagues. (2 👍)

14:33:06 From GUEST ShEfi Lubliner To Everyone: Shahar bears witness that you do not want to hear!

14:33:22 From Trinie Dalton (she/her) To Everyone: Thank you Sara (4 ❤️)

14:33:30 From Sara Borjas To Everyone: I do appreciate the conversation. I think this is one thing we are doing right and I am proud of that. (4 ❤️)

14:33:36 From GUEST Kelsi Perttula To Everyone: Replying to "For guests, I want t..." I think if this was the only resolution passed, we wouldn't be here. (1 ❤️)

14:33:42 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: I am pointing out that people have a double-standard.

14:33:46 From GUEST Stephanie Seitz To Everyone: Replying to "Shahar bears witness..." You are also acting inappropriately. (5 👍)

14:34:30 From Kevin Pina, CSUEB_Dept. of Communication To Everyone: I would remind Mr. Sansani he is a guest of the Senate and urge him to express himself without rhetorical provocations.

14:34:44 From GUEST Kelsi Perttula To Everyone: Replying to "FDEC - 2 is very bin..." If the other resolution was the only one that passed, I don't think there would be this division

14:35:07 From Sara Borjas To Everyone: Replying to "So why don't you giv..." Are you addressing me, Professor?

14:35:09 From GUEST JP Horn [he/him/his] To Everyone: Replying to "I do appreciate the ..." I also appreciate the deliberative process. When the process seems ambiguous, I call it into question. But I appreciate your contributions to the conversation and agree that it is a conversation worth having. (1 👍)

14:35:26 From GUEST Stephanie Seitz To Everyone: Can we please save this chat for the record? (4 👍)

14:35:46 From GUEST Shahar Sansani To Everyone: I am not going to remain silent while you deny, justify, and 'put into context' the atrocities of October 7th.

14:35:46 From Ian Pollock To Everyone: I second that

14:35:58 From Ian Pollock To Everyone: Replying to "I second that" Saving the chat

Christina Chin-Newman - Would a senator like to move to have Business Items to an online vote. BEC15, CIC2 and CIC12. Would anyone like that?

Move: Patrick Fleming Second: Amy June Rowley

Christina Chin-Newman - I do think we need to discuss whether to leave the chat on for the second reading. Let's vote whether to move these items to the online vote. Bylaws amendments for the CR, referring to online synchronous classes, and rubric learning outcomes for 2nd Comp. It is the second reading, and we've discussed before so if no new concerns or questions, we should be able to vote online. Seeing no NO votes, we can move forward.

8. Information Items:³

- a. [23-24 COBRA 7](#): CSUEB Budget Update #2
- b. [23-24 COBRA 8](#): Library Budget Update

9. Discussion:

- a.

10. Roundtable

11. Adjournment Move: Patrick Fleming Second: Elijah Quineri

³ Consider moving to accept all info items together at the same time. Alternatively, we can vote to accept information items via email after the meeting. Accepting info items means we acknowledge receiving them, not that we endorse them.

