

Academic Senate
September 22, 2015

Present: Azevedo, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Chan, Crayton, Dorsey, Eastham, Espinoza, Filling, Garcia, Garone, Gerson, Gonzales, Guichard, Hoover, , Larson, Loza, Manrique, McCulley, Nagel, Odeh Oluwarotimi, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Strangfeld, Provost Strong, Silverman, Sims, Stone, Strahm, Strickland, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wood, and Zhang.

Excused: Advanced Studies, Huang, Miller-Antonio, and Ringstad Young.

Proxies: None.

Guests: The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, Odmund Myhre, Helene Caudill, Mark Grobner, John Tillman, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma Betsy Eudey and Lauren Byerly. .

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
October 6, 2015
2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118

Minutes submitted by:
Chris Nagel, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:06 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 8, 2015 (distributed electronically)

Approved.

4. Introductions

John Sarraille, Odmund Myhre, **Helene Caudill**, Mark Grobner, John Tillman, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma, Betsy Eudey and Lauren Byerly. Today is Ms. Byerly's birthday and the Senate sang "Happy Birthday" to Byerly. Sims was not impressed with the Senate's performance and suggested singing lessons.

5. Announcements

Nagel announced the CFA November 17 event. Nagel announced Academic Freedom Panel Discussion September 24. Nagel was proudly wearing the CFA T-Shirt. Please join them at the Nov. 17th action scheduled at the Chancellor's Office in Long Beach. They are departing the campus between leaving 5 to 7 am to drive to Long Beach to participate in a rally like the one in 2006 when 1500 people shut down the BoT. This is to support the CFA bargaining for faculty, who richly deserve salary increases. Meals will be provided.

The Academic Freedom Forum panel discussion is on Thursday, 2:30-4:30. There will be representatives from all constituencies and they hope to could get 4 to 5 panelists consisting of a full professor, a non-tenure-track faculty member, an administrator, student and staff member. The theme is how academic freedom is experienced here on our campus. One reason to do this is that it is the 100 anniversary of AAUP and Nagel is a member of the national council. They want campuses to do things like this. This theme was chosen to steer away from the typical focus on big, hot button issues. We don't have Steven Salaita-type cases on our campus. (This is in reference to Prof. Steven Salaita, who had an offer of a tenured professor position at UIUC rescinded by the university's board of trustees in response to a

donor's complaint about offensive Twitter remarks he made about the occupation of Palestinian territory by Israel.

Gerson announced artist talk by Dean De Cocker in FDC, along with a reception. Join them on Thursday, September 24th, from 5:30 – 7:00 pm, in FDC 118.

Odeh announced that the Ag Studies Tastes of the Valley fund-raising wine and cheese event is on October 8th from 6-9pm. Announcements with details forthcoming through Postmaster.

Speaker Thompson announced that he and Sims met with President Sheley, and discussed campus safety issues that have recently been raised, and he anticipates information coming from them soon. President Sheley sent a memo regarding Faculty Status, which was circulated to ASNet. Counseling faculty issue president said he would be responding fairly soon. Finally, they asked about the naming of the baseball stadium and field complex; Sheley has taken the Senate resolution under advisement.

6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)

FAC (Sims): Formally moved to CoC the formation of ad hoc committee to review increased IDEA forms to 50% of classes. This was the result of a big change in the CBA to require all classes to administer the IDEA. As a compromise, considering the relative value of using IDEA in all classes, our campus settled on 50%, for a test period. Other discussion items are the b-e items on the discussion agenda in Senate today.

Sarraille corrected this information to explain that the CBA allows the possibility for campus presidents to agree to less than 100% of classes administering IDEA.

FBAC (Peterson): Spent most of their meeting discussing stable financial model for funding of the CSU that came from the Chancellor's office. Compiling what they think are good points and points of concern. Shimek will visit the committee to discuss pay adjustment plan, including cost of living differences between our region and other CSU regions. If time permits, they will discuss budget priorities.

Strangfeld asked whether the pay adjustment plan referred to the equity plan in the CBA. Peterson affirmed that it was.

GC (Garone for Ringstad): Reported that one significant discussion is the ongoing issue of the meaning of graduate education on the campus. Further discussed that there would not be a graduate dean in the immediate future, but there is the possibility of a full time staff person hired to centralize operations. Further discussion of lack of funding for graduate students, e.g., lack of research assistantships, etc. and the problems this causes for building strong graduate programs on the campus. If trying to create a more thriving culture on campus we need reasonable funding for graduate students.

Provost stated that GC had discussed forming a strategic plan, and that there was consensus to do so.

Speaker Thompson interjected that support for TAs came under the umbrella of faculty status as well, or should.

SWAS (Filling): Student success fees prohibition ends in January; at that point campuses can implement them. A sister campus advertised a new LED scoreboard as sponsored by these fees. On RSCA funding, Filling commended the Speaker's diligence for getting the memo out.

On background checks, this campus has been less silly than some regarding this and he thanked VP Shimek for that; however, we might still want to have this tweaked. They are still soliciting comments on the sustainable financial models draft report. They could use thoughtful suggestions to contribute to discussions. Likewise comments on the ethnic studies draft report are to be submitted by the end of the month.

Strahm mentioned the Chico and San Bernardino shared governance issues. Chico appears headed toward a status similar to our experience under Shirvani. Staff at San Bernardino are approaching faculty because the faculty have tenure, and asking them for help.

Filling stated that as the designated faculty member who has to sit through BoT meetings (to wit, as Chair of the statewide senate—ed.), he hopes faculty will come to the November 17 meeting to divert him from the usual banalities. Regarding the salary issues, the CSU has hired yet another consulting firm to do yet another survey of compensation issues, which led to conclusion that faculty should be content since our compensation is near national average. Filling pointed out that cost of living in California is more expensive.

UEPC (Stone): Still looking at the two-pass registration. Looking at advancement of ethnic studies draft. Composing statement of concerns about Community Colleges' baccalaureate degrees. Looking at course time modules. Under the category of old business now new again, UEPC are reviewing new course consultation and possibly looking at course modules.

7. Information Item

a. Baccalaureate Goals and Outcomes

Speaker Thompson presented the plan for proceeding on these issues: following the information item on this agenda, it will return as discussion item, and then, probably, as a resolution.

The goals were developed by the assessment committee, along with input from open fora. Five succinct goals were composed, and these are presented here along with the rationale for these goals.

California State University, Stanislaus

Baccalaureate Learning Goals

1. Demonstrate expertise in a scholarly discipline and understand the discipline in relation to other disciplines and the historical context.
2. Develop the intellectual skills and competencies necessary to participate effectively in society and the world.
3. Develop broad knowledge of biological and physical sciences, humanities and creative arts, and social sciences.
4. Develop the abilities to integrate knowledge, make informed ethical decisions, and accept civic responsibility.
5. Demonstrate personal responsibility and civic engagement with respect and appreciation for diverse local and global peoples, cultures, environments, and resources.

UEPC:rl 8/27/15

Approved by UEPC 9/10/2015

Rationale:

These Baccalaureate Learning Goals represent the skills and competencies, knowledge, and abilities that CSU, Stanislaus commits to developing in its students through General Education, the major, and co-curricular programs. The first goal represents discipline specific learning goals. This statement is broad to encompass the learning goals of our many diverse majors and minors.

Goals 2-4 incorporate the General Education Goals and Outcomes that were the result of a thoughtful, multi-year, collaborative effort between the General Education Subcommittee of the University Educational Policy Committee (UEPC), the Faculty Coordinator of General Education, the Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Coordinator of the Assessment of Student Learning, and UEPC. Goals 2-4 were approved by the Senate (17/AS/14/UEPC GE Goals and Outcomes) on 2/10/15 and they were approved by President Joseph F. Sheley on 3/26/15.

The final goal is a statement of learning goals that is specific to our campus. We live in an economically and educationally challenged region. Many of our students have never ventured outside of the Central Valley. Goal 5 was inspired by our Mission Statement:

MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The faculty, staff, administrators, and students of California State University, Stanislaus are committed to creating a learning environment which encourages all members of the campus community to expand their intellectual, creative and social horizons. We challenge one another to realize our potential, to appreciate and contribute to the enrichment of our diverse community, and to develop a passion for lifelong learning.

To facilitate this mission, we promote academic excellence in the teaching and scholarly activities of our faculty, encourage personalized student learning, foster interactions and partnerships with surrounding communities, and provide opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, and artistic enrichment of the region

We recognize that the Goals and Outcomes of any educational program are continuously being evaluated and revised. The determination of Baccalaureate Goals and Outcomes is part of an iterative process designed to assure that students are acquiring the knowledge, skills, and abilities we believe to be critical to a broad liberal education. As individual programs are mapped to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals and Outcomes, assessment strategies are developed, and evidence of student learning analyzed, we may desire to modify our Goals and Outcomes to better reflect our academic programs. We also will revisit these Goals and Outcomes on a regular basis as we respond to changes.

8. Discussion Items

a. Minor Changes to CIPSP-Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan Recommendations Faculty Status (See electronic version with tracked changes)

Provost again presented the change made on p. 4 of the CIPSP memo, to refer to the goal of Enhancing Partnership without specifying Turlock. In previous draft, this was noted, but is now removed to avoid any misperception and hard feelings by leadership in City of Turlock.

Speaker Thompson reminded senators of the draft response that was distributed to ASNet. SEC decided it made more sense to respond in this way than by way of a resolution.

Nagel noted that the draft response, under Goal 3, needed to be clarified to say what kind of “balance.”

Speaker stated the memo will be looked at once more by SEC before being sent to CIPSP as our input.

b. 13/AS/11/FAC/SEC Power Disparity Resolution & System wide Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence and Stalking against Employees and Third Parties and System wide Procedure for Addressing Such Complaints by Employees and Third Parties (EO 1096 Revised June 23, 2015)

Sims recounted that FAC was asked several years ago to develop policy about “personal relationships” between members of different constituencies. FAC consulted the Chancellor’s Office and legal counsel, and received little input. FAC developed a policy that is now current. The most important element was to protect the less powerful person involved in such a relationship. Recently, EO 1096 imposed policy that requires a change, to incorporate those changes into our policy. The EO lays out policies and procedures for responding to violations.

Speaker Thompson added that President Sheley said something about this in his last encyclical, about the need for consolidation of policies. This is part of a series of such policies, which will include various others, up to and including unmanned aircraft. These have gone through the senate, as they should.

Silverman asked for clarification of how EO 1096 and campus policy will affect one another.

Sims replied that our options appear to be either that the EO language replaces the current policy, or we need to incorporate the new EO into current policy. It appears to Sims that EO 1096 makes the local policy redundant.

Speaker noted that, as change in policy, this will return as a resolution.

Garcia addressed what he termed the “proliferation of policy”: The book *Normal Life* by Dean Spade discusses the pursuit of policy being misguided, and capable of doing more harm to the people they are intended to protect. He encouraged the senate to consider this in light of the way policies have sometimes not addressed the issues we’re actually concerned about.

Speaker responded that we do want these to come through the senate, though in the present case this is simply system policy, and so this concern is *à propos*.

Silverman commented that there is a disparity between the content of the policy and the title. The title is “Power Disparity Policy,” but the policy does not address all sorts of power disparity relationships.

Sims responded that the current policy is not really the issue, the issue is how to incorporate EO 1096. The language in current policy will change.

Shimek offered his support for Garcia’s comment and also recommended the book *Normal Life*. If we could find a way to live with practices without policies, that could be very good.

c. Workplace Behavior (Memo dated 6/29/15 from VP Dennis Shimek)

Speaker Thompson stated that the memorandum is not itself policy, but a summary of work that had been done over a year or more.

Tuedio encouraged senators to discuss the memo with department faculty, because it is critical for dealing with situations and restore good will among faculty and staff.

Silverman asked for clarification that the item under discussion was the memo from Shimek. He had some questions. The purpose of the memo is not to make policy, but a statement from administration. What does *statement* mean?

Speaker replied that it does not carry the force of policy.

Silverman suggested that in that case this does not mean anything.

Speaker attempted to explain by analogy to a sense of the senate resolution: it is not a policy recommendation, but it has power and carries some force. The author exerts some force through the memo.

Silverman asked if the author could explain what *statement* means.

Shimek replied that the memo was intended to report on the work of a task force created by Chancellor White. The Chancellor charged a committee to review the items identified in the statement that the Chancellor could disseminate throughout the university. The intention is to bring to the attention of faculty, staff, and administrators certain ways of thinking about and talking about behavior and relationships in the workplace. Shimek stated he is fairly confident that there will be a further report and maybe a policy statement. Many things in the document also refer to existing policies, for instance, harassment, retaliation, etc. Shimek looked forward to meeting with FAC to discuss this.

Silverman stated that he has studied the term *harassment* extensively, because he has been harassed. There are multiple meanings of *harassment*, so the question is which meaning is intended in the memo. What exactly is the meaning of the word *harassment* in this memo.

Sims responded that a good starting place is EO 1096, which takes great pains to define the term.

Silverman asked if the author of the memo could explain the meaning of *harassment* as used in the memo.

Shimek replied that Sims made the appropriate comment: the definition of *harassment* is what is stated in EO 1096. That is what guides administration. Tuedio referred to p 24 of EO 1096.

J. Complaint means a report of a violation of this policy or a written communication that complies with Article III. C. 2 alleging Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking, against the CSU, an Employee, a Student, or a Third Party.

Silverman stated that if you open a dictionary, you find two definitions of *harassment*. One is repeated attacks on someone intended to upset and disturb. Second is defined by the US federal government as series of attacks intended to upset, but on the basis of religion, race, national origin, etc. Which of these two is the intended meaning?

Speaker responded that the answer has been given, that the relevant definition is stated in the policy document from the CO. That is the definition referred to.

Garcia returned to his initial comment, and hoped that Shimek is incorrect that this will return as policy. If we are concerned about this, it will not be policy that makes respect happen, it will be the commitments of people. We are disrespectful to one another on the campus every day, and policy will not change that.

Sims reported that last spring a complaint was brought to FAC, with a request to review policy. FAC decided that the policy was descriptive rather than prescriptive, and that this was appropriate. FAC agreed in principle with Garcia's remark. Indeed we have a problem with interaction, but micromanaging interactions would not solve anything.

Shimek again endorsed Garcia's remarks. It takes discussion and engagement to take action that's appropriate in the environment in which we work. It will come down to relationships and how we treat each other. All too often he hears someone say that they did not intend or mean something. The reality is that the impact of one's conduct that matters.

Petrosky stated that he appreciated the comprehensiveness of the June memo, but wondered how interpretation plays a role. If he had made statements in a public forum critical of the foundation board, would that violate this?

Speaker noted that this is actually related to 8.d. The Statement on Professional Ethics 6/AS/94/FAC.

d. Statement on Professional Ethics 6/AS/94/FAC

Sims replied that in his view the issue would be when someone is claiming to speak for the institution. If someone made a strong statement, and an auditor assumed that the statement was on behalf of the institution, this would be in a gray area regarding academic freedom.

Speaker noted the Salaita case at UIUC, and wondered if his Tweets would be considered to meet those criteria.

Silverman asked if he wanted to make a statement about the university in public and would put on the top this note "This opinion does not represent the opinion of the university", then would he be within the academic freedom guidelines?

Sims responded yes it would be within the guidelines of academic freedom.

Wood asked if it would be within academic freedom to criticize the work of a colleague, perhaps publicly, for instance questioning their professionalism, or would that be harassment or disrespect?

Speaker stated he struggled with the word *disrespect* because if he does not respect someone, he feels he should have the right to say so, despite the impact it could have.

Wood noted that between these two there appears to be a contradiction: on the one hand we are told to be respectful, but on the other hand it is stated that we have academic freedom.

Speaker remarked that one of the reasons to bring this statement into the discussion is that this is an AAUP statement endorsed by the senate, so it does have some force in community. Is there a reason to reinforce the statement?

Nagel added that the document from AAUP needs to be read as whole. In the Statement of Professional Ethics, the first principal and the third principle inform this discussion, but can't give you a straight answer. There is not a straight answer. According to the AAUP statement, academic freedom entails having a certain responsibility in how one seeks and states the truth. This can look like a contradiction, or it could look like a balance of aims that can be in tension with each other. The statement as a whole indicates that.

The Statement

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

Sims stated that there is no clear answer to Wood's question, but thought that there was a difference between saying my colleague's opinion is stupid, and my colleague is stupid. One is criticism, the other is personal attack, which often gets confused.

Silverman stated that he knows the AAUP view of professional ethics. He questioned the meaning of the word *harassment* in the 3rd principle.

Peterson noted that this document is from AAUP, and suggested that the rest of the paragraph in question elaborates on the idea. If you wanted to go beyond that, it would make sense to contact AAUP to ask.

Silverman stated that this is attached to a resolution.

Sims replied that this statement is incorporated into policy. Harassment is to some extent in the eye of the perceiver, and thus there is ambiguity. When emotions run high, some people find this uncomfortable. When someone says to you "your behavior feels like harassment to me" you need to stop. When that happens, that person can go to a third party to report that this is happening, to allow for a response that helps members of the university respect each other and improve relationships. Fixating on the definition of the word misses the point of the policy.

Speaker said that the definition is both in the context in which it is stated and the context of the situations.

Silverman stated that he is concerned about someone in a position of power writing a memo saying, for instance, that I do a lousy job. This is not about someone not saying good morning, or using a four-letter word. I have informed HR about his situation but have not been satisfied with the response.

Strahm stated that she does not believe the senate is the proper venue for litigating personal concerns, and hoped to move to next item.

Speaker replied he did not take anything stated to be out of order.

e. Background Check Policy (Memo dated 8/3/15 from VP Dennis Shimek) & System wide HR 2015-08 Background Check Policy effective 8/3/15

Speaker Thompson called on Shimek to begin discussion.

Shimek reiterated what he had stated in prior senate meeting, that the background check policy has arisen over many years. Background checks on some campuses began with staff. CO reviewed and looked for model policy that would reflect needs of an academic community. Systemwide academic senate reviewed it, as did unions and counsel. Upon publication, many found items in the policy that were unclear or, if pursued, would lead to unanticipated consequences. On our campus the administration has taken a cautious approach, attempting to get more clarity on the policy. Only new faculty would be covered by the policy. Identifying that a candidate for faculty appointment is who that person says he or she it is important. For staff, background checks are usual before hiring. For faculty, in the case of an immediate, crucial need, the university can make immediate appointments, but the offers include the proviso that background checks are pending.

To the question of whether workers compensation background checks would apply, the answer is no. To the question of credit checks: only in the case of major institutional responsibility for financial matters. To the question of the sex registry, the case of an employee that has significant responsibility to work with minors. If a conviction or other issue comes up in a check, admin has responsibility to determine whether this information would give reason not to extend the appointment offer.

Speaker asked, for a new faculty member, what is checked? Shimek stated: employment history, education, and criminal record. Shimek clarified that the checks go back 7 years.

Wood asked about the issue of “safest possible environment” for minor children. His understanding was that this was a primary motive for the policy. But it also addresses financial issues. So is it to protect minors, or is it to protect the university from financial threats?

Shimek replied that it is to protect the university and university community.

Wood asked a second question, about UEE employment, which he understands to be on a course-by-course basis. If currently employed by the university, would the background checks apply to UEE?

Shimek stated that the only time the policy would apply to current faculty is when that faculty member takes on a new position that would ordinarily require a check.

Petrosky asked who bears the cost, and if new Foundation Board members are subject to the check.

Shimek said the employing authority bears the cost. Departments can make the claim that they are unable to pay the cost of the background check. Shimek stated he believes that it includes volunteers, but will verify this.

Strahm had a few questions. If we don't have money to pay raises for faculty, how do we have money to pay for this? Strahm remarked on the phrase "number and circumstances of offenses." This refers to situations in which someone may be denied a position. Suppose someone in social sciences, heavily involved in activism, has been arrested repeatedly. The CO memo as written states that administration on campus can decide how to apply the criterion of "number and circumstances of offenses." What will be the specific policy? For instance, if someone is arrested 10 times, is this the limit?

Shimek replied that the administration will look on a case by case basis, in conjunction with college deans, and is not unilateral. Consultation leads to the decision.

Strahm p. 15 notes convictions that would preclude hiring. On one hand they don't seem unreasonable, but if the people in question have been convicted, and completed their sentences, and come out the other side, and apply for a position, this claims a right to discriminate against those people, based on the conviction. Could this leave the university open to a lawsuit for discriminating against someone?

Shimek repeated that the decisions are made on a case by case basis. Applicants have the opportunity to respond, and could possibly convince the administration to approve the appointment.

Provost proposed a distinction to address Wood's question. If a faculty member teaches in UEE for the first time, the currency of employment on "state side" would apply to extension work.

Shimek said that this is his understanding.

Sarraille inserted the question, whether this was Shimek's interpretation, or whether the policy actually states this. Shimek replied that it is an interpretation, and suggested that such interpretations should be documented.

Peterson stated that in the past, we have checked on references, etc. How much does a criminal background check cost?

Shimek replied the CO contracted with a third party for education and employment verification, and police department scans the criminal check. Cost is approximately \$85-95 for each candidate.

Petratos wondered if the background checks apply to promotions. Shimek said they absolutely do not.

Strangfeld asked, if someone is a lecturer on a one-year contract, and is re-hired, is that person a "new hire" under the policy?

Shimek responded that in regard to lecturers who are currently working, the gap between appointments is not, for these purposes, considered a new appointment. There are a number of interpretation questions that many have raised, and what he is presented is the administration's current interpretation, but it is possible that the CO will be told to interpret the policy differently.

Strangfeld further pursued the issue, asking if the background check would be a one-time thing. Would the background checks apply to the potential conduct of a current employee, following hiring?

Shimek replied that it was a one-time check, except in the case that new work would involve duties related to concerns about minors or finance. Other matters would come to the attention of the university via another route.

Sims noted that the music department has a summer program for high school students. Do faculty and students who work in that program have to go through the background check, and will the university pay for the checks?

Shimek said they would have to go through the checks, and paying for the background checks would begin at the department level.

Larson asked if students are subject to background checks if their work involves sensitive groups or matters. Further, students often volunteer in a number of different areas, through athletics, music, etc. would there be more than one background check or just one?

Shimek stated that under the policy, there would be one. That coordination needs to be worked out.

Gerson was curious whether this would apply for one day appointments, for instance, on Science Day, when students are required to attend and work with minors.

Shimek said that this would not apply, but students would sign a volunteer form. This is part of the interpretation that they have asked for from the CO. When minors come to campus for such a program, he hopes that there are parents there or some faculty.

Odeh asked how long a background check is valid.

Shimek opined that if initially an employee goes through the check, but then two or three years later adds a sensitive assignment, a new check would be needed. In general, the check must be within one year of the assignment.

Wood asked if a minor happens to be a student, if that would constitute an assignment involving minors.

Shimek said we consider that as part of the student mix we have, so there is no problem. The check does not apply.

McCulley asked how long the background checks take to process. Shimek stated that it can take less than a week, but it has in complex cases taken several weeks.

Garcia pointed out, for the sake of a larger discussion, that the policy assumes we have a criminal justice system, but in fact our society has a criminal punishment system. It discriminates against people of color, particularly women of color, and the poor. The policy would help to guarantee through these ways that the employees would be white.

Strahm noted that statewide senate is discussing the issue.

9. Open Forum

None.

10. Adjournment

4: 01