

**2022-2023 Academic Senate Minutes  
December 5, 2022**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Fifty-One Senators were present.

<b>Ex Officio:</b> Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Chuang, McKee Absent: None	<b>CHHS Representatives:</b> Present: Sen, Smith, Chang, Baur Absent: None
<b>Administrative Representatives:</b> Present: Perez, Faas, Day, Del Casino Absent: Wong(Lau)	<b>COB Representatives:</b> Present: Tian Absent: Chen
<b>Deans / AVPs:</b> Present: Ehman, Meth, d'Alarcao, Kaufman Absent: None	<b>COED Representatives:</b> Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz Absent: None
<b>Students:</b> Present: Saif, Treseler, Rapanot, Herrlin, Sheta Absent: Chadwick	<b>ENGR Representatives:</b> Present: Kao, Wong, Sullivan-Green Absent: None
<b>Alumni Representative:</b> Absent: Vacant	<b>H&amp;A Representatives:</b> Present: Khan, Frazier, Kataoka, Lee, Riley, Han Absent: None
<b>Emeritus Representative:</b> Present: Jochim	<b>COS Representatives:</b> Present: French, Andreopoulos, Shaffer Absent: Muller
<b>Honorary Representatives:</b> Present: Peter, Lessow-Hurley Absent: Buzanski	<b>COSS Representatives:</b> Present: Sasikumar, Haverfield, Pinnell, Raman, Gomez, Hart Absent: None
<b>General Unit Representatives:</b> Present: Monday, Higgins, Masegian, Flandez, Lee Absent: None	

II. **Land Acknowledgement:** Interim President Perez presented the Land Acknowledgement.

III. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**  
 The Senate Minutes of November 7, 2022 were approved as amended (36-0-1).

IV. **Communications and Questions –**  
**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair McKee thanked Interim President Perez for his leadership over the past year.

Chair McKee announced Senator Sabalius' nomination for Faculty Trustee from SJSU. Last month I sent out a call for nominations for faculty trustee and only Dr. Sabalius submitted a nomination. According to Senate and CSU policies, I'm reporting this to the Senate as required. Two weeks are required after this notification during which time additional nominations can be submitted before we must report to the CSU on or before January 9, 2023.

We have an open policy committee chair seat for the Curriculum and Research Committee for Spring 2023. Thank you, Senator Haverfield for serving as chair for Fall 2022. Chair McKee sent out that notification for statements of interest on November 29, 2022. Please submit your statement of interest to Chair McKee or Senate Administrator Joice.

Chair McKee announced that we will return to in-person Senate meetings for Spring 2023.

**Questions:**

Q: Given what will be presented today on modality, would you reconsider having in person meetings for Spring 2023 if the Senate passes the resolution?

A: [Chair McKee] The decision to go to in-person meetings was made in consultation with many parties throughout Fall 2022. There are too many back-end issues not visible to Senators regarding scheduling and other issues to implement hybrid Senate meetings in Spring 2023.

Q: Given that for the past two years we have had virtual meetings and there is no other requirement to make changes, why are we defaulting to in-person meetings? I know people are conflicted about hybrid meetings, but we have demonstrated we can do virtual meetings. I'm wondering if you can make public the back-end issues and then people can make up their minds and vote accordingly?

A: Originally, the standing rule requirement for in-person Senate meetings was suspended in March 2020 due to COVID. The world has changed since then. There are just too many issues for Spring 2023.

Q: In the event that AS 1832 passes, my understanding is the decision on modality would no longer be up to the chair but would be up to the body. Is this a correct interpretation?

A: Correct.

Q: Then isn't it premature to make a definitive determination about modality until after the resolution has been voted on?

A: This is a legitimate question. What I think people totally don't understand is the back-end process that is invisible, thanks in part to the Senate Administrator, and to any Senate Chair holding the office. It is the logistics involved in making those things happen. Again, the modality on the approved calendar for this academic year was Zoom *until further notice*. That is what I'm sticking with. I totally understand your question, however.

Q: Why is this being done in the middle of the academic year? We have said we can't impose changes in modality on students mid-year, but now it is being imposed on Senators. What if a Senator somewhere has taken on an assignment and can't make it to the in-person meeting? I do not understand why we can't complete this academic year online as we have been this past semester. What do people do now that cannot attend the in-person Senate meetings?

A: Again, this is a totally legitimate question. The Senate already has provisions in place for people that may need to miss a full Senate meeting. I think we have gotten used to the emergency suspension of the standing rule that requires in-person Senate meetings. It is the normal practice of the Senate to meet in person. This could change today. What we are requesting is that during these five meetings in Spring 2023, Senators make accommodations to attend the meetings. However, I live several hours away from campus so I understand

C: This should be considered when AS 1832 comes up for debate and not during questions for the chair.

C: I'd like to encourage Senators to save these conversations for debate on the resolution, so that we can move on to other items on the agenda.

C: I just wanted to say that many of us, including myself, have not experienced an in-person Senate meeting. I think it would be useful to experience that before we make up our minds in the event the resolution passes and we are then required to vote on modality.

A: I appreciate that. If we could move forward please. I appreciate your responses.

**B. From the President:**

[Interim President Perez] Thank you Chair McKee. I'm looking forward to the debate later in this meeting on modality. First let me say thank you for your kind words and those I received in the chat. It has been my honor and privilege to work here over the past year. It is a tremendous university made up of great students, faculty, and staff that are people that care a lot. It is no wonder we are able to do great things here.

I want to wish everyone Happy Holidays! We are rolling through them. We are close to the end of the semester. I think tomorrow is the last day of instruction. Commencement is coming up and we will have 4,500 students graduating. If Fall Commencement is anything like Spring was, we are going to have great fun. It is really a special time.

Also I just wanted to address again that we have released our response to the Title IX investigation allegations from 2009 and 2010. You have the report I

have. We sent it out the day we got it. It shows we failed in a few ways. We know those failures have had lasting harm on individuals and for that we are very, very sorry as a university. We appreciate people's courage in bringing those allegations forward. It takes a lot of courage and bravery, but from it we learn. We've learned how to get better. We've been working for years on building a Title IX Office and a campus where individuals that experience harassment, retaliation, sexual abuse, etc. can feel comfortable reporting to and feel like they are being heard. We are well on our way to doing this. I want to thank Peter Lim and all those that have been involved in our improvements over the last several years. I think we are building a system that very well could be the model for the CSU. We've made great strides and I'm proud of where we are right now.

Questions:

Q: I too would like to add my voice thanking you for your service. I was glad to see the report you shared with the campus last week. I have two questions about the report. First, I went from the link to the summary of the larger report. Will we see the full report at some time? The second question is in regard to conclusions on the first page of the report. Two of the conclusions begin with "SJSU failed" and I am very curious to know who at SJSU failed, because I was employed at SJSU during this time? When I read the report, there was only one individual named and he is deceased. There are two units mentioned by name, but they have many individuals in them. My question is have the individuals that failed been identified? Are they still employed by SJSU? Have their cases been handled? Most importantly, what steps have been put in place to ensure this doesn't happen again?

A: [Interim President Perez] This is the only report that I have, we weren't given another one. That is why we felt it was important to share it right away in the name of transparency. I will say that some of your questions are leaning towards personnel actions and I cannot discuss that. We have done a number of things to prevent this from happening again, not the least of which is restructuring the Title IX Office. We have been hiring staff members for that office. We still aren't up to the six staff members we hope to have, but we are working on it. We are facing the same staffing shortages they are seeing across the state and country. We've redone our intake process in the Title IX Office to try to make sure that investigators show a level of care for those coming in after trauma. We are a university and if someone brings something to us we are going to investigate it.

Q: [Senator Sen] I want to read something so I don't misrepresent it. This is an email the student's Sexual Assault Group brought to me to share with you. It was in response to an email that went out from your office. Some of the concerns were also brought up by Senator Sasikumar. "The actions we have taken because of this matter will better strengthen our practices and protocols for the entire Spartan community. We continue to be committed to fostering equity for students in an environment conducive to furthering their academic

growth and development. The student leadership team is dedicated to ensuring that our campus is welcoming, inclusive, and safe now and in the future. It is our opinion that now is the time to push for further action.” The group also says that they have been attempting to meet with the president and the Title IX Office for over a month now and despite previously working very closely with us, they have canceled the meetings we’ve had scheduled.” They also advocated for not having the Title IX Office where other administrators are on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor of Clark Hall. They do not feel it is a safe place for students. They have not seen any improvement or efforts since the Department of Justice (DOJ) visit. They have not seen the release of the campus-wide survey that was to be sent by the Title IX Office, and finally they say the responsible staff are still holding positions in our community. These are some pretty strong words. I’m not sure if you can respond to any of this?  
A: [Interim President Perez] Those students have reached out to me and we have reached back out to them and tried to set up meetings on any number of occasions. I’m more than willing to meet whenever it is possible. I don’t know that they are referring to a meeting with me that was canceled. I don’t think so, but if it was it would have been due to an emergency. I’ve been trying to work with those students and I’m happy to do so because it is important to be responsive when students are reaching out and saying they aren’t feeling safe. I would encourage them to send their questions and concerns directly to me. I’d be happy to meet with them as I have done all year.

Q: Thank you, but what about the other issues they have brought up like moving Title IX to Clark Hall and the survey? I understand you can’t speak on personnel issues.

A: [Interim President Perez] I don’t know about the survey. You’d have to ask Director Lim. This is also the first I’ve heard that people don’t think Clark Hall is a good location.

C: OK. I’ll take that back to them. I’d encourage you to have them reach out directly to me so you don’t have to be the go between.

Q: Thank you for your leadership as we navigated these difficult waters. I also wanted to say I appreciated the fact that you did send out a message to the campus. Although there will always be criticisms about the nature or the length of the communication, I appreciate that there is communication and I hope that SJSU will continue that legacy of communicating openly with the campus. In your email to the campus when I clicked on the link it didn’t really take me to the actions. It took me to some resources and information on how you report. I think it might behoove you to work with the Title IX Office to create a link where you can go to see a list of what actions have been taken. I do want to also emphasize that people have for years been concerned about the proximity of the Title IX Office to the President’s Office. Even tenured faculty were concerned even though they are somewhat protected. They are nervous and reluctant to report incidents, even when encouraged by the Senate Chair, because they are worried that information will get back to the

President's Office. The proximity of the Title IX Office to the President's Office is critical. I know there was a reorganization and the Title IX Office was moved into Institutional Affairs and those actions occurred, but there has actually been very little messaging to the campus as a whole. The Senate gets reports from the Title IX Office, but the rest of the campus doesn't. I think people really want to know the answers to questions like what kind of training is being done for staff, etc., so we can tell the parents of the students that they are safe. I know you are probably writing a transition memo and that may be something you want to add to that memo.

A: [Interim President Perez] Thank you. I appreciate that. It is helpful.

Q: With the Title IX outcome does SJSU run the risk of facing repercussions from the NCAA or other Athletic Organizations?

A: [Interim President Perez] Athletically speaking, we are a part of the Mountain West Conference and we participate as part of the NCAA. What happened in the past was terrible, but these findings don't impact our ability to compete within the rules and regulations of those two bodies to my knowledge.

Q: As you write the letter to the incoming president, I think you have been exemplary in terms of involvement with the Senate. I would encourage you to share your experiences with shared governance with the incoming president.

A: Thank you very much.

Q: Thank you for your engagement, not only with the Senate, but also with students. I would just like to encourage you to talk to the incoming president know about transparency, especially with students and processes like Title IX. These are really important to students. Let us continue with shared governance with students as well.

A: Let me just say that it has been a pleasure not only to work with the Senate, but also with the Associated Students President and Board of Directors. They are really engaged and hard workers.

C: Chair McKee expressed how grateful she was to Interim President and Senator Perez.

## **V. Executive Committee Report:**

### **A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:**

#### **Executive Committee Minutes of October 31, 2022**

Questions:

Q: It was noted in the minutes that International students are sometimes prevented from joining committees. Can that be explained more to the Senate? This is new news to me.

A: [AS President Chuang] A situation occurred where a student applied for a Senate committee and was appointed but was told by their department chair

that there were policies restricting him/her from serving on a Senate committee. I just want to thank the AVC for her work on collaboration in clearing up some misunderstanding about department policies as well as really clearing up these issues with International students. I had a conversation with the International House and spoke with them about what it means to be an engaged Spartan on our campus. International students already face barriers to being a student on this campus. It is important for us as a Senate to support them. When there is miscommunication here, the first impact is on the student.

Q: Just to be clear, there is no University policy prohibiting International students from serving on a committee. Correct?

A: [AS President Chuang] Yes.

A: [Chair McKee] Senator Chuang has been doing a very good job researching the policies. She and I are in contact about this, and a shout-out to AVC Kataoka.

#### **B. Consent Calendar:**

AVC Katoaka presented the Consent Calendar of December 5, 2022. There was no dissent to the consent calendar. Chair McKee acknowledged and thanked Senator Raman for her hard work beating the bushes to get members for the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR).

Questions:

Q: I'm on the Committee on Committees (CC) and as I was reading the Executive Committee minutes there was a statement that it is difficult to fill these seats, so I'm wondering why there are so many limitations as to who can join the Senate? Who should I talk to about this since I am new, or should it just be discussed in the CC?

A: Chair McKee responded that the Senate is considering all of its membership and requirements, particularly for the BAFPR. Yes, some of these things are very restrictive.

A: AVC Kataoka responded that regarding the International students, we have clarified that there is no university policy restricting International students. As far as the requirements of the committee regarding membership, I think it is best if we discuss this in CC.

#### **C. Executive Committee Action Items: None**

#### **VI. New Business:**

Senator Frazier presented a motion to suspend the standing rules to allow "New Business" to be moved up to the next item in the agenda. The motion was seconded by Senator Mathur. The Senate voted and the Frazier motion passed (44-0-0).

#### **Election of the Chair of C&R for Spring 2023:**

There was only one candidate for Chair of C&R for Spring 2023, Senator Hiu-Yung Wong. Chair McKee called for nominations from the floor. There were no nominations from the floor. Senator Hiu-Yung Wong presented his statement of interest. The Senate voted and Senator Hiu-Yung Wong was elected Chair of the C&R Committee for Spring 2023 (41-0-3).

**VII. Unfinished Business:** None

**VIII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**

**A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):**

Senator French presented ***AS 1839, Amendment D to University Policy F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty (Final Reading)***. **The Senate voted and AS 1839 passed as written (41-0-3).**

**B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

Senator Haverfield presented ***AS 1836, Amendment A to University Policy S16-17, Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process (Final Reading)***. Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add “letter” before “graded” on lines 111 and 146. **The Senate voted and AS 1836 passed as amended (42-0-2).**

**C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

Senator Hart presented ***AS 1832, Senate Management Resolution, Update to the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (Final Reading)***.

**Questions:**

Q: I'd like to know if you and the O&G Committee consulted with the Senate Administrator and others that work behind the scenes on the feasibility of these meetings and what was the outcome?

A: Yes, O&G invited the Senate Administrator, the Senate Chair, Senate Vice Chair, and the AVC to come to a meeting and answer questions from O&G. In a subsequent O&G meeting O&G analyzed that data using a qualitative approach and thought best how to integrate that feedback into the Senate Management Resolution (SM) and how to address it in the remarks I made today. We feel we can still run a hybrid meeting just using Engr. 285/287. The key thing this resolution does is give our Senators a voice.

Q: I am wearing two hats today. As incoming Senate Chair, I do have a question regarding feasibility. While Senator Hart has presented some evidence about the feasibility of the meetings, I believe there is still a difference of opinion about the feasibility, some of which was expressed on the Senate listserv before this meeting. I believe the only way to determine the feasibility is by actually having a hybrid meeting. My



question is since we do not know at this time whether SJSU has the ability to offer a space large enough and equipped for a hybrid meeting, and I will advocate for the Senate to be provided such a room, nevertheless, as the first Senate Chair that will confront this issue, I would not want to be in violation of the bylaws. Let me present a scenario: if the Senators in May vote on a modality and then in September I am not able to offer that modality, that places me in a position of potentially violating the bylaws. I'm asking for advice from the body as to how do I act in that situation? I do have an amendment when we get to debate. Would the committee be open to my proposing an amendment that might be a potential solution to this dilemma?

A: That is one of strengths of ranked choice voting. If the first option does not succeed then go to the 2<sup>nd</sup> option and then the 3<sup>rd</sup>. I think that the body could expect every effort would be made to honor the vote. However, if for a legitimate reason that vote couldn't be honored, then that would be acceptable.

Q: My question has to do with the workload impact that has been spoken about back and forth on the listserv and how this would be addressed. Is it not possible for other positions within the Senate to support a hybrid modality? I don't think we are saying the existing positions should have to work triply as hard. As someone who has hosted hybrid events that is just not feasible. However, I think there is a way to address the workload issue through other means that we have.

A: I agree with you. I think we already have precedent for sharing workload in committee meetings. As you know, I am chair of O&G, but other committee members do the minutes. On I&SA, as I understand is a very large committee, those members divide up that work in an even more robust way. I think the question you pose about dividing the workload in meetings is something we already do and I think that we need to continue if we had hybrid meetings. It would be unreasonable to expect one, two, or even three people to run a hybrid meeting. We would need to develop a process.

Q: If this fails, who decides modality in future meetings?

A: If this fails, we stick with the standing rules as written which say Senate and Executive Committee meetings will be in person. For policy committee meetings, the standing rules say that there may be exceptions. It places the responsibility for the arranging the exception on the person requesting the exception.

Q: I have two questions for you. The first is when were we told we can't use the Student Union? I know that non-student organizations have used the Student Union for hybrid meetings. The second question is will this measure change the situation if, heaven forbid, we have another viral emergency and need to go online and take emergency measures?

A: To answer the first questions, the Senate was never told we could not use the Student Union. We were reminded in the Executive Committee that the Student Union is first and foremost for students and student-run activity. We were told the Student Union is not there for the Senate to use routinely for hybrid meetings. It is to be used primarily for the students. As far as preventing us from going completely online if another viral situation occurs, this resolution does not prevent us from doing so. In the event of another viral wave there are other precedents that would take priority such as if we were told to shelter-in-place again. We would defer always to the higher authorities.

Q: Thank you and O&G for your work. I have two questions. You said the Senate Administrator and others that work behind the scenes gave you feedback. Would it be possible for us to hear that feedback and how it was incorporated into the resolution? My second question is that I believe students and staff are required to attend in person in general, so if that is the case then faculty would have a choice of attending in person, but they would not. Has the committee considered this?

A: When O&G was visited by the Senate Chair, Vice Chair, AVC, and Senate Administrator some of the key concerns are as follows. First, locating a room for the meeting if the voting on modality takes place in May. That is late in the game for booking a room. There is no guarantee we can book an adequate room that late for fall. Another issue was the budget. The Senate has a very limited budget and it would be inadequate to purchase any special equipment, and/or to hire additional support personnel. It was after that visit that O&G collected the data included with the resolution on small and large hybrid meetings on pages 5-15. We can run a hybrid meeting in Engr. 285/287. The key thing this does for all Senators is give all Senators a choice and voice.

Q: I want to emphasize one thing quickly. I do have a question for you. With regard to the finances involved, in your meetings with people that control the purse strings, what solid financial and personnel commitments were you able to secure in terms of equipment and personnel for hybrid meetings that would ensure high quality hybrid meetings possibly in perpetuity?

A: [Chair Hart] No financial and personnel commitments have come to me in the Executive Committee to date. However, our Interim President, President Perez has been vocally very supportive, but the general strategy I've heard unofficially and officially in leadership has been if we give you all this technology both in terms of technology and funding, maybe you will use it and maybe you won't, so rather than our doing this, demonstrate to us that you need this, show us you are going to use it, and make a case for it. If you do this, then we will be willing to support you. I think it is a question of us making a decision and communicating that to our leadership with justification. If we vote on this and it passes to go to

hybrid meetings, I personally feel confident that it will be supported. Then again, in all fairness, no one has put that in writing and agreed to the support. I do think we need to take that approach rather than wait until the funding is given.

C: Thank you. I did mean to ask one additional question. I believe the Student Union costs money to rent is that not correct?

A: That is correct.

Q: Do you know when and why the current standing rules were written, and if so why they tried to force people to participate in person?

A: Thank you for this question. I'll have to defer to our more senior Senators to tell us how why the Senate Standing rules were written that way. I can only speculate that this was simply our way of doing things, or our tradition prior to the pandemic. Do other Senators have more historic knowledge of the origins?

A: Senator Peter said he would address this during debate.

Q; Thank you for this resolution and the rigorous debate that I have not seen since before the pandemic. My question has to do with the questions I asked about the first reading in October of 2022. Part of this was answered in terms of what you learned from the Senate Administrator, Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and AVC. Can you clarify how what you learned from the conversation with the Senate Administrator, Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and AVC were incorporated into this final reading resolution beyond noting that there may be an impact on the workload? You pointed out the necessity for shared collaboration and decision making and now you have the opportunity to do so.

A: Part of the concern was the vote and the late booking of rooms. There is really no guarantee that we can book an adequate room for Senate meetings or other meetings. Another question was in regard to the budget. The Senate budget is \$24,000 and this is including a student salary and catering for meetings. The feedback was that this would not cover buying new technology, which would not allow us to buy equipment to run the meetings in hybrid format and allow for hiring additional support personnel. It was after this visit that O&G collected the data on small and large hybrid meetings that is included in this SM Resolution. What we learned is that a hybrid meeting can be run even if we can't afford to buy cameras or book a sufficient room in the Student Union or elsewhere. We can still run a hybrid meeting given only a portion of Senators show up in person. These were very valid concerns from the Senate Administrator.

Q: I wonder if the committee would consider leaving the modality up to the policy committees for their meetings, but maintaining the current modality for the Senate and Executive Committee meetings? Is this something O&G would consider?

A: O&G would prefer that you consider the resolution as it is written.

Q: Thank you for your presentation and at one point you describe everyone coming to the podium to speak and it all being recorded and everything is wonderful. I don't know I might be the last AVC that did that job for in person Senate meetings. Have you considered that the AVC is the person that shares all the documents on the screen and makes all the amendments while the meeting is going on. Can you address how that laptop is also simultaneously on the podium for everyone's use?

A: Yes, the short answer is they are not the same laptop. The laptop I addressed in my remarks was the laptop reserved for speakers. As you all know from Zoom meetings, you can't have a bunch of microphones turned on. We would have only one laptop turned on. The AVC would have to be on another laptop as well as the Vice Chair and the Senate Administrator. Everyone would have to be on mute except for the laptop at the podium used by the Senate Chair and all speakers.

C: Thank you for clarifying that for me.

Q: [Senator Sullivan-Green from College of Engineering] Senator Hart have you consulted with Dean Sheryl Ehrman or IT from Engineering about the capabilities of Engr 285/287? I know that you indicated that Engr. 285/287 has been used for hybrid meetings, but if you talk to the people that have used that room for hybrid meetings, you will find there are some challenges with using it, so even if the equipment is there it might not function the way that we optimistically hope it will.

A: We have not consulted with the leadership in the College of Engineering, but I did have the opportunity to speak at length and discuss this with the Center for Faculty Development (CFD) and Dr. Deanna Fassett who has experience running hybrid meetings in Engr 285/287. Dr. Fassett did mention that the projector at one time just stopped working. Ironically, it was the fact that they were connected via Zoom that allowed their hybrid meeting to continue, because the presenter and all the people in the room on Zoom were able to continue the meeting and see the presentation. I absolutely acknowledge that maybe there are issues with technology in this room. However, the experience with CFD goes to show that even despite that with just WIFI and laptops, you can still run a good hybrid meeting.

C: I highly encourage you to consult with the people that use those rooms constantly.

C: [Chair McKee] We have been in question mode for quite some time and it is now 4:50 pm. and we need to move forward. Therefore, we are going to move into debate.

**Debate:**

Senator Rodan presented a motion to table this resolution until our next meeting in February 2023. There is a lot of debate to cover and I don't think we can do it justice in the 10 minutes we have left.

Senator Peter commented that the motion should be to postpone to a time certain.

Senator Rodan amended his motion to postpone to a time certain of the first Spring 2023 Senate meeting. Chair McKee asked Senator Peter to explain why it should not be "tabled." Senator Peter explained that when you table a motion, it stays tabled until you vote on the resolution. When you postpone it to a time certain you then guarantee that it will be considered at that specific time.

Chair McKee commented that a motion for postponing is a way of not killing the motion but continuing on with it. Senator Rodan commented that he did want to postpone the resolution until the first Spring meeting in February 2023. Senator Peter explained that it would come back as "Unfinished Business" and would precede any other Senate business. Senator Sasikumar asked if the list of speakers for debate should be carried forward to the Spring 2023 meeting, or should a new list be started at that meeting. Senator Peter commented that there was no rule on this but suggested that it seemed appropriate to continue with the current list. Senator Hart asked a question from the chat as to whether if we postpone to the Spring 2023, how do we proceed at that meeting. Chair McKee said we would be in person in Spring 2023 and it would come as "Unfinished Business." Senator Curry asked if this would mean that the modality for Spring 2023 of returning to in-person meetings would hold even if the resolution were approved at the February 2023 Senate meeting until Fall 2023? Chair McKee said yes, Spring 2023 would be in person. Chair McKee commented that she travels 1 ½ hours to campus and that she is prepared to do this for the five meetings in Spring and whenever needed. Senator Mathur called the question on debate. Chair McKee asked for unanimous consent to call the question. There was no dissent. The question was called. **The Senate voted on the Rodan motion and the motion to postpone until the first Spring 2023 meeting in February 2023 passed (41-2-1).**

**D. University Library Board (ULB):** No report.

**E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):** No report.

**IX. New Business:** None

**X. State of the University Announcements:**

- A. Statewide Academic Senators:** No report.
  - B. Provost:** No report.
  - C. Associated Students President (AS):** No report.
  - D. Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):** No report.
  - E. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):** No report.
  - F. Chief Diversity Officer:** No report.
  - G. CSU Faculty Trustee:** No report.
- XI. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.