

**Complete transcript for the  
Equal Opportunity and Diversity Advisory Committee (EODAC)  
meeting held on October 11, 2022**

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

0:00:12

ANDREA THORSON: Before we get started, I did send out an email earlier this morning with the links if you prefer these [motioning to printed copies] to the electronics, um make sure that everyone has what they like. Some like pencil; I like pen and paper. Um, so those are here for you too. The charges over there on the table um there should be the the one that's current and active the 2019 version and then there's the newer charge and that's the one that we're discussing today that was brought to EODAC last year was is on your website as a draft. Um, the other piece is the agenda, is on the EODAC website if that's easier for you but if you want a paper copy it's over there. And, oh, the racial climate task force document that is on the website and is over there.

ANDREA THORSON: unintelligible mumbling before official start of meeting]

0:01:48

ANDREA THORSON: We were just discussing that some of us don't know everybody at the table, so maybe it would be okay if we just went around for a quick. Some people may not be current voting members that are here because they want to stay in the loop so with your a voting member go ahead and note that and your affiliate what your name is and what your affiliation is at a faculty classified or admin, great. Can we start over there?

0:02:10

MARIA ELIZONDO: Starting with me? My name is Maria Elizondo. I work at in the Delano campus for rural initiatives, and I am a voting member.

0:02:19

LORENA VILLANUEVA: Hello my name is Lorena I'm with the rising Scholars Program and I'm a classified.

0:02:26

UNKNOWN: Are you a voting member?

LORENA VILLANUEVA: I'm a voting member.

0:02:28

DIANA ALCALA: Diana Alcala I am the program manager for the rising Scholars Program and I am a voting member.

0:02:34

MATTHEW GARRETT: Matthew Garrett, ah, professor of history and I'm a voting member.

0:02:38

CATHERINE JONES: Catherine Jones, professor of Occupational Safety and Risk Management, voting member.

0:02:43

ANGELA WILLIAMS: Angela Williams, Ed advisor and Outreach in Early College, and a voting member.

0:02:49

HARLAN HUNTER: uh, Harlan Hunter, criminal justice Professor, voting member.

0:02:54

TIFFANY SAGBOHAN: Tiffany.

0:02:56

JENNIFER ACHAN: Jennifer Achan, um, executive director of finances, and I'm a voting member.

0:03:02

TIFFANY SAGBOHAN: Tiffany Sagbohan, um, program manager for Public Safety and public safety training and I am a voting member.

0:03:10

PAULA PARKS: Paula Parks, ah, English Department, I'm an alternate.

0:03:14

ANTHONY VASQUEZ: Anthony Vasquez, um, from [unintelligible] Student Government Association, and Public Relations Director.

UNKNOWN: [unintelligible - likely Vazsquez asking if he is a voting member]

0:03:22

ANTHONY VASQUEZ: voting member

0:03:27

LILY PIMINTEL: Lily Pimentel, faculty in child development and I am an alternate here as a proxy for a voting member Teresa.

0:03:50

ANDREA THORSON: uh, my name is Andrea Thorson. I am faculty co-chair.

0:03:54

VIKKI COFFEE: Hi I'm Vikki Coffee, I am classified co-chair.

0:03:57

RICHARD MCCROW: I'm Richard McCrow. I am the administrative co-chair.

0:03:59

DOMINICA DOMINGUEZ: Good Morning my name is Dominica Dominguez. I am an ed advisor.

0:04:05

JOE SALDIVAR: Joe Saldivar, biology instructor. Ah, voting member.

0:04:10

LEO OCAMPO: Leo Ocampo, manager over the BC Southwest Campus. Ah, voting member.

0:04:15

REGGIE BOLTON: uh, Reggie Bolton, Dean of Instruction and Athletics, uh, voting member.

0:04:19

JENNIFER JETT: Jennifer Jett, dean of instruction, and what other thing we need,

0:04:19

UNKNOWN: if you are a voting member

0:04:21

JENNIFER JETT: ah, voting member.

A THORSON: [unintelligible] clarify.

0:04:23

DEBRA THORSON: Debra Osorio Thorson, I represent the Communication Department and I am a voting member.

ANDREA THORSON: Adjunct faculty

0:04:34

DEBRA THORSON: Adjunct faculty, voting member.

0:04:35

XIMENA DA SILVA: Ximena, uh, da Silva, I'm am, uh, a professor of chemistry, voting number for physical science.

0:04:43

GILBERT AYUK: Gilbert Ayuk, physics instructor science [unintelligible]

AUDIENCE: laughter.

0:04:52

ANDREA THORSON: Thank you. Thank you everybody. So the first thing we want to do is to take notice that our president is here today. Um, we also have our senate president that is going to be here so I'd like to let's get started with us some words of wisdom.

0:05:15

ZAV DADABHOY: I know yeah it's it's fascinating that we just built this building and now we're getting into rooms that we already to crammed in. We need something more, something like Measure J.2 or something, and stuff. Um, thank you all for being over here today it is critical to see the number of people who are interested in this committee is important uh shared governance or participating governance group that works to advise me um team in terms of the direction of DEI work that we need to take on in our College. There is always going to be some people who have different perspectives about diversity; that is the reality of the world we live in and I'm not here to persuade either take one perspective over another that is not my role. I'm here to tell you what we do in California community colleges and from the perspective of the California community colleges have the 116 colleges around our state the state Chancellor's office gives us the guidance in terms of our DEI work and I would hope that each of you takes a critical look at the work that the state Chancellor's Office has been doing over the last three or four years. Many of their vision for Success goals are embedded in diversity work and the way that they define diversity is a shared model that they are trying to get everybody across the state to buy into. Now, you can say I don't believe in that and that's fine. I'm looking for what the collective view is for this committee because I think that's what's important about any governance process. The definition of disadvantaged students—disproportionately impacted community members—those are definitions that are built based upon statistics and based upon data and facts and I would hope that when you're considering all of those different elements you take data into into consideration because that's what this is all about right? Um, the other thing that I have to tell you just from my perspective my own personal way of operating: I think it's okay for us to disagree I think it's healthy for us to disagree. Paula and I sometimes disagree. Jennifer and I sometimes disagree but we always disagree agreeably and that to me is really important and I hope that in the work that you do you try to lift one another up because the alternative is beating one another

down. Nobody wins in that. I mean, I think all of you have to buy into that that perspective because these are difficult conversations to have and putting any one person down or two people down or groups of people doesn't behoove us. The question is how can we work together to inlift [sic] our most disadvantaged student populations and our communities. So, those are my two pieces of advice. I hope that you engage in the study by by incorporating those in your work. I'm not here to be a hall monitor by [unintelligible] to encourage everybody and to get out of here so I've done my piece, I think, unless anyone has a another request from me I'm going to say "bye" and see you all later. Good luck.

[Applaud]

0:09:26.280

GARRETT: Andrea, I noticed during the introductions 18 people identified as voting members and then Dave walked in making 19 but only 15 are on the charge. I just want to make sure we were, we knew, who really are the voting members and got it figured out before we vote on anything.

0:09:41

A. THORSON: while I double checked the names and the check boxes if you want to review the documents on the website or the documents in front of you, [unintelligible], um, and then

0:09:50

DAVID NEVILLE: Is there a copy of that?

0:09:52



A. THORSON: Right over here.

NEVILLE: Perfect.

0:09:55

JONES: I think identifying the voting members is, like, not a minor thing because I have one committee charge where there's 18 people on it; one committee charged where there's 28 people on it; and the new draft charged with 33 people on it,

0:10:13

A. THORSON: so, so, the charge you were, it's on the agenda. We're gonna get to that.

JONES: Yeah.

A. THORSON: Which one is the old version, and it's also in the email, which one's the old version and the one we're functioning with it's also on a website default and there for months so they're all the old, the current one that we're actively using, if you want to bring up my email for ease of use or if you want to bring up the website for ease of use or if you want to look at it maybe it gets too much because they're all black and white um and then the new charge is the one that's that's also in the email and then it's also on the website as under the last meeting the new draft so if you want to take a look at that and actually what I could probably, I could probably suspend the agenda and just let Paula do her presentation while I do this work.

0:11:05

A. THORSON: Okay. Let's utilize time because I know we don't have a ton of it. I know some of you have to leave ten minutes early and what not. So I'm gonna do with what [unintelligible] the task. I'm on the e-board so I've already heard this presentation and

seen this document so what I can do is I can double check the voting situation and the membership while that presentation is going on. Paula, whenever you're ready.

0:11:29

PARKS: Okay.

0:11:30

[Unintelligible committee whispering and soft chatter as Parks prepares - somebody asked for more chairs]

0:12:39

PARKS: Yes, I'm glad to see students here. It underscores Zav's point about us outgrowing our room already as well as what we're about. We are about students. We are about student success, so they should be involved. They should know how our school works, how we function, and what we deem important. So, I'm proposing a racial climate task force based on the survey from the National Association of Collegiate campus climate and I'm gonna go over first the timeline of it being presented, and then go over it, and then go over the proposed task force. So, it was presented —the results—to e-board on February 9th by Craig Hayward and Sooyeon Kim. It was at e-board on February 16th uh February 23rd the task force was recommended. It was in Senate March 2nd in terms of what can you do better. Also, March 16th it was at Senate. It was on the e-board agenda from March 23rd but it was postponed. It was also on the April 6th e-board but it put was postponed. It was discussed April 27th in e-board — the task force — and there was a draft and feedback was given. Nick included it in his president's report May 4th and then it was on the first e-board agenda August 31st but it was postponed due to all the students time issues. It was discussed at the September 14th e-board meeting and suggestions were made and then it was at the September 28th e-board and the recommendation at that point was that this go to EODAC. So, looking at the survey itself there were some things that made me happy. All student groups felt no matter what race felt that they mattered or strongly mattered with professors of color and they experienced more concern from professors of color and that shows that what whatever we're doing in

terms of hiring faculty of color all student groups are pleased. What bothered me was the racial stress that our students are feeling. So looking at the report if we look at feelings of loneliness not belonging or isolation, 42 percent of students of color felt that, versus 26 of white students. Decline in academic performance as a result of racial stress — how it impacted their personal well-being — students of color 31 percent, white students 18 percent. So since we are about student success and we see that our students are suffering due to the racial stress that they are feeling, that bothers me. Race-based physical aggression: black students 14 percent, white students two percent. Race-based verbal attack: black students 20 percent, two or more races 17 percent, white students seven percent. So our students of color are having two different experiences on this campus

0:16:33

DA SILVA: Paula, could I, could I ask a question? Is that allowed?

0:16:36

A. THORSON: No, let her finish her proposal first, if that's okay.

Paula, let us know when you're ready for questions

0:16:42

PARKS: Okay, being viewed as less able: black students 12 percent, Latinx six percent. Microaggressions: nine percent students of color, thirteen percent two or more races. Experiencing jokes: our students are more likely to experience that, more likely to have to speak for the entire race, our students are more likely to experience that and since we are about student success since we care about our students and I feel that those things need to be looked into further. The recommendations were to establish a campus climate committee. They recommended more dialogue, more discussion among students and the whole community. This task force is larger than any group that we have. It would include counseling, as recommended in the recommendations, professional development, student activities, HR and the community because students of color are more likely to feel aggression off of campus. The task force itself, and you all have a copy of that, it's been

through several drafts. The goal would first be to look at the climate survey, gather more information from students and from other surveys that we've done, and create a more cohesive welcoming community for students, and to create healthy collegial dialogue across the campus, increased cultural awareness and appreciation, create an emotionally and physically safe environment for students. So this is about students. This is about caring about their success, caring about their experiences; they're about the students that you see in this room and caring about their success. What's interesting is that CSUB did a similar survey and had similar concerns and they're forming a task force because when you get results that concern you and your priority is students you look into it you look into it and you do something about it because we're here for our students. I'll take any questions.

0:19:29

DA SILVA: um, you know some of the things that were brought out and the survey that was presented the Senate and back in EODAC, um, it, we're using data but the the data that we're using is from questions and I don't feel that those questions have been answered appropriately. One is whether this is a representative sample of our student population. This survey was administered during covid. These students were not on campus and we had a very low response rate: it was 1300 approximately out of our 33,000 or so uh uh student body. A specific question where, um, it was one question, and there were several actually, but some of us question is the way that these questions are written is they're leading students to to answer a certain way to collect that that data like. If I look at that at that survey as a scientist I could not possibly have done a better job at designing a survey to get the results that I'm looking for as opposed to the actual real data. For example, the question that's asked "do you feel that your," uh "professor of color versus your white professor," just by asking questions as white versus of color we're already making something about race that might not be about race. So, the the question that I still have about the survey is, you know, are we going to get the question answered about how is this considered a representative sample for all the students and finally I'd just like to just essentially as long as it gives us off my chest why are we using a morality argument? Like, this, okay, we're bringing students we we're all here because we care about our students, desperately so. To bring in students and say, "we care about the students and students have to be represented," it's like well, we have student voices and every single Committee in this college so, is that not appropriate? So then should we change those instead because then it's a morality cudgel, and I I'm sorry; why are we doing this to each other? Like, because now anybody who opposes this, can get said

“well you don't care about student success. No, we question the solutions of the problems, we question even the problems that you're saying that we have, anyway.

0:21:52

A. THORSON: There are some hands up.

0:21:53

PARKS: So, I can respond to that. So, when Craig [Hayward] came to to the board, he said it was a typical response rate. The students who responded there were 1442 students which he called, quote unquote, “a good size.” The race distribution was close to what we have and he said that full-time faculty were over-represented; everything else was representative.

0:22:22

D. THORSON: My question is this has been done throughout the state right at different colleges these questions right?

0:22:29

PARKS: 40 plus colleges.

0:22:31

D. THORSON: Okay, so are your questions any different than theirs, uh, to find out this information?

PARKS: What do you mean “are my questions”?

D. THORSON: I mean are we using basically the same questioning throughout the state?

0:22:44

PARKS: Yes, it’s the exact same exact same thing.

0:22:47

D. THORSON: Yeah, so, so, that, that takes away your [motioning to Da Silva] argument. We're saying that we want to have a representation, just not of this campus but it's of the state campuses, it's because it's being sent out everywhere. So, in that, when you look at the representative sample, our sample is basically, if I understood you correctly, can you please correct me if I'm wrong, is that we are basically in line with other institutions in the state and that as a whole colleges need to work on this.

0:23:18

PARKS: Yes, he [Craig Hayward] called it a “typical response rate.” quote unquote.

0:23:19

D. THORSON: All right, thank you.

0:23:25.800,0:23:28.509

A. THORSON: Okay, I think you had your hand up first, Catherine [Jones].

0:23:28

JONES: Just because everybody else in the state used the same survey doesn't make the questions right. I just got, so, saying that that proved Ximena [Da Silva] wrong was, that was not true, because her point was correct

[D. Thorson speaking over/interrupting Jones]

0:23:43

D. THORSON: Well, I didn't, I. People who made the questions were a committee that tried to make it as equitable as possible on the question level

[Unknown/Elizondo Interrupting D. Thorson]

UNKNOWN (ELIZONDO?): Throughout the State of California.

D. THORSON: Throughout the State of California

[Unknown/Elizondo? Interrupting D. Thorson]

UNKNOWN (ELIZONDO?): Community Colleges.

0:23:51

D. THORSON: So, I mean these aren't just people that we randomly say "Hey, make up some damn questions." These are people who have, uh, you know, some kind of

scholarly background in this area, so I mean, to fight the questions, I don't, I think it's a waste of time. I think the whole thing here is we need to look at what the problem is and go forward. Um, minutia holds back committees you need to get to the solution not fight the process, for crying out loud.

0:24:21

JONES: So my actual problem. . .

[Da Silva interrupting Jones]

DA SILVA: we need to know the actual problem before we can come up with a solution.

0:24:24

A THORSON: Catherine [Jones] did respond to you, so you responded, but let's let her finish.

0:24:29

JONES: So, in the academic senate discussions last year, and in the in these discussions last year, there was a lot that was brought up about the validity of the questions and the data and the sample size and the self-selecting nature of all of that. Um, my greatest concern with the task force is that it's doing the work that this committee's supposed to be doing and so why have 15 more people do work that's supposed to be done by this group and under — regardless of which version of the charge you're looking at— it's still fundamentally the the work of this group this group.

0:25:16



PARKS: I can respond to that. This is larger than this group. It involves counseling, per the recommendations, counseling, professional developments, student activities, HR, and the larger community. Part of all of your charges include, lets see, ah, bullet point, collaborating with local community committees and task forces. So part of what you're charged to do is work with other task force. This is a task force that is larger than this group. It includes more. It wouldn't be appropriate for counseling to do it because it involves it's bigger than that. It's bigger than professional development. It's bigger than student activities. It's better than HR. It's bigger than EODAC. It's bigger than a community group. It includes all of those.

0:26:03

D. THORSON: I apologize Reggie, I skipped you.

0:26:09

BOLTON: Um, I think we're, everybody's state'n the obvious point here. We're not doing the work. You're right, that committee's don't do the work of the of this committee. The problem is with this committee is we spend too much time dissecting data, challenging processes, challenging procedures, and we're not doing the work. So I, I applaud Paula for trying to start a committee — a group that will actually do the work — because at this point we're spending so much time, process, charge, who's got voting rights, and and the data is the data, and as a scientist you guys make a lot of decisions based off data. And so, to make the statement that these questions are leading when we just she just established that there's 40 other colleges doing the same thing the data is the data and you can pull it from any data source you want the same data says the same thing whether it's at this college or any other college in the state. Students are still suffering. Students of color are suffered. Students overall are suffering. So if we go'n spend all our time like we did last year on this committee challenging the data, challenging the charge, challenging processes because everybody's trying to maneuver to get their agenda across, the students are suffering. So, I agree with you. It is not wrong to bring students in here because we're sitting in this room making decisions what's in the interests for these students. They need to have a voice. They really do and I think sometimes we're not even hearing the students. That data says the students have a voice so let's listen to the data what the

students say and do something about it and help them be successful because at the end of the day the people in this room the that are working it's not about our success it's about their success so we could spend and this is exactly where we went last year on this committee we're back to that we're going to challenge the data challenge all these things. Let's just do the work people. Students are suffering and let's help them be successful and it's all students. Don't get me wrong. I'm not saying just the students of color because anything we put in a place will help benefit every single student on this campus because right now it ain't even about color; we're challenging mindset.

0:28:24

A. THORSON: Matt [Garrett], you're next.

0:28:30

GARRETT: Um, well, I'm concerned about repeated appeals to popularity as evidence of truth I know you [indicating to A. Thorson] teach that in your class that that's bad logic. Um, I'm also concerned about appeal to authority that I hear arguing that that's where truth is coming from. Um, what we do need to answer that question of if the questions and what the group that made them. That's a valid question. We should, and I remember, we heard this at some point: who developed this questionnaire? And I can't remember was the USC Equity organization or or, but, but, who organized the questions and do they have a biased interest? Because that is a valid question, and if it was a bias partisan group well that might explain some of the concerns now. Um, so I think that's a valid exploration also, um, because it was taken at a hot spot in a little strange window of time that's very unusual I do think it would be appropriate to do another survey to see if what sort of data we get because, um, Craig [Hayward] said this in his presentation, that it's really just a little shot of a glance a quick shot of what we saw, and so you know it's been another year or so I think it'd be a great time to do another survey people are back on campus. Let's see what students think now, what sort of environment they're in, so I'd love to see more data. Um, also, my concern about the survey is less about the data and more about the recommendations it makes. There is a huge gap between the data it observes and the recommendations it makes, and the data doesn't support a lot of those recommendations. For example, one of the recommendations was a safe space, I recall. Well, there's a lot of data that suggests that the safe space places actually create more con- comf- problems; more animosity; that some students are resentful if they exist.

Some stu- there's there's a very good argument that that's going to take us in the opposite direction. So, I'd love to see evidence that connects the observed data with the actual solutions that are recommended because I see a huge gap between them. Um, and then another issue is we keep hearing that this this committee isn't large enough to meet the needs of this proposed task force. Well, the only reason the proposed task force is so large is because it's being proposed as so large. There's nothing written anywhere that says that the proposed task force needs to be this massive. Why couldn't the proposed task force be five six seven eight people out of EODAC who all represent different constituencies who do the work and that's what subcommittees usually work. Usually, a committee makes a subcommittee to move forward so to create some outside external thing seems a little bit odd and unusual um and it's really farming out a lot of work that we should be doing.

0:30:49

A. THORSON: I think that Diana [Alcala] had her hand up. You hand your hand up earlier. I think you're next.

0:30:54

ALCALA: You know, I think that if you look back going all the way back to Ximena, how she had indicated that 1300 of our students had voted on this survey and, um, this survey was taken during covid, um, and she said that, she implied that, that wasn't enough students answering the question on the survey or participating in the survey but you sit here and you have to think about 33,000 students and only 1300 answered the questions for the survey. That doesn't count 33,000 students is inmate scholar program which is now the Rising Scholars. They don't get an email with the survey to their BC account because they don't have access to that. You also have high school students that are participating in our dual enrollment they don't get to vote. However, the students that did get to vote and voted through a statewide survey that was proposed to 40 other colleges their vote and their survey has to count for what it is that they're feeling on campus. We can't undermine just because not enough of our students voted. Our students voted and they told us what they are experiencing and what they are going through when they are in classrooms on this campus. We need to take that into consideration. I agree with Dr Parks. I agree wholeheartedly that there needs to be a task force that takes this into consideration and that we move forward and we stop wasting time. I've only been on this

committee for about five months and every single month that we met last spring was a waste of time because again we kept going in circles everybody keeps questioning. People are saying "we don't, you're not giving me enough time to speak." You've been, you've had the floor for 40 minutes. How have you not had enough time to speak and get your point out? We get it. You question every single thing that comes to the table and you don't want to move forward. We're being unproductive and the only people who are hurting here are our students.

0:33:16

A. THORSON: I apologize I didn't realize the co-chairs had their hands on for a while because they were, and so I am so sorry. Rich [McCrow], first and then Vicki [Coffee].

0:33:25

MCCROW: I think, uh, uh, I'm listening to the arguments about data and I, I heard the same arguments when they presented the data. Um, I think, um, that the purpose of what Paula is bringing forward on the task force, and correct me if I'm wrong, but this really is coming from Academic Senate to see if we agree that you should have a task force. Um, I think that, um, just given the discussion whether it's the validity of the data, or not, those kinds of things that raises that consciousness to a task force. The other, the other thing that I want to talk about is, ah, the comment that work is at this committee. Um, all DEI work and anti-racism work is not at this committee; it's across campuses and when an entity says we need a task force to look at this I think that we should fully support that, and it would be my recommend-, in fact, I, I would look for a motion to support Paula and her effort to. . .

[interrupted by Coffee]

0:34:25

COFFEE: I second the motion.

A. THORSON: [unintelligible] to vote for the task force?

COFFEE: Yes, Yes, we've already, yes, I move to vote. I second the motion.

D. THORSON: I second.

0:34:28

A THORSON: Okay, and then Vikki, you still [want to speak]?

UNKNOWN: no

A. THORSON: Okay. Okay so we have a motion in a second to vote. Um, I need the voting members I went through it three times but um according to what I've got here for, so, again we have a lot of people that are here as um a proxy or an alternate. So, for classified individuals I've got Maria and Angela and Dominica and Vicky. That's what I double checked on everything as voting members if someone disagrees please articulate it now.

0:35:09

GARRETT: Vikki, you said, Vicky Coffee, but as a chair, okay, I'm sorry

A. THORSON: she votes.

GARRETT: Right, but isn't that separate from, I forget. Is there only three classified plus the chairs

A THORSON: There's only three classified plus the chair.

GARRETT: Great. Okay, I withdraw, sorry.

0:35:25

A. THORSON: Um, okay, for administrative co-chair we've got Rich [McCrow] and then we've got Reggie [Bolton] and Jennifer Achan as voting members. So the other individuals, we appreciate you to be here the classified an admin that are here. You don't have a vote today but you'll always have a voice. Uh,

GARRETT: Could you repeat those names?

0:35:41

A. THORSON: Reggie [Bolton] and Jennifer A[chan], and then we got from adjunct faculty Deborah Thorson your alternate is not here. I am the co-chair for faculty. I've got Ximena [da Silva] down for her area and her proxy, her alternative [Gilbert Ayuk] is here, so he won't be voting today. Matt Garrett: your alternate, um, I don't think your alternate's here, um but you get your vote today. Harlan Hunter your vote today. Catherine Jones your vote today. Joe Saldivar. Teresa [McAllister], oh, Lily [Pimentel] is, um, the alternate for Teresa and is the proxy today for Teresa. Murad [Zikri]? Oh, that's right; I'm his proxy. Okay, and then David Neville who had to drive quite a bit, who has some cute dogs that he trains; you have your vote today. So it's one two three four [mumbling counting] Yeah, yes, so all my math adds up. If anyone disagrees, now's the time not later to create some sort of trauma drama that I do not need. Okay, so everyone's name I said you're a voting member please everyone else, again, we appreciate you being here but please don't vote at this time and then as we go what I'm probably just gonna do because I do know that there's, even I don't know some of the people in this room even though I have been here over 16 years I will just call your name unless people feel very uncomfortable with that, just vote, so the motion on the table is vote to approve Paula's task force.

0:37:26

SALDIVAR: May I have a clarification? Is this the first time that EODAC had been presented with basically the the tasks of the task force?

0:37:34

A. THORSON: EODAC was brought the information last year I thought? yes

GARRETT: No

0:37:39

A. THORSON: but it's changed slightly based on like being stuck in eboard for six months she went and changed according to what they wanted

UNKNOWN (possibly McCrow?): Correct.

A. THORSON: so yes this is the first time here.

0:37:50

SALDIVAR: So then, um, then I, ah, I, I don't know if this is the time. If this is the first time presented as this, I would support that this be a first reading and then a vote at the next meeting.

0:38:04

A.THORSON: I completely hear you. Uh, at e-board, however, a vote was taken that not only did we need to look at this and make a finding but I had to bring that finding of support the lack thereof to the next kind of meeting which is also why I didn't want to make changes and make things because I was told that this is what we we have to look at it we've got to have a perspective to bring them moving forward at the next meeting. So, the other thing I will say is that second readings are nice to have I think generally the work is is really nice to have that way however there are some things that are rather urgent just like we did in senate, we did a budget vote last time with the first read. This is not a Brown Act committee that also just to clarify that for everyone I did make sure I double checked with legal and everybody this is not a Brown Act committee so we don't have the obligation for it but it's certainly an option. Does that clarify for everyone?

GARRETT: Does Joe withdraw?

0:39:00

A. THORSON: So, I'm gonna start with classified, oh and you have their student you are proxy, uh your name,

VASQUEZ: Anthony [Vazquez]

A. THORSON: Yeah, okay, Anthony I'm going to start with you. Do you vote to approve?

0:39:16

VASQUEZ: I vote to approve.

A. THORSON: uh, Maria [Elizondo]

ELIZONDO: approved.



A. THORSON: Angela [Wilson]

WILSON: I vote to approve.

A. THORSON: Dominica [Dominguez]

DOMINGUEZ: I vote to approve.

0:39:26

A. THORSON: Vicky [Coffee] COFFEE: approve.

0:39:30

A. THORSON: David [Neville]

NEVILLE: Can I ask a question?

A. THORSON: Not Now.

[MUMBLING DISCONTNENT]

0:39:39

NEVILLE: I'm just conflicted a little bit on this yes, ah, I'm going to abstain on this.

0:39:49

A. THORSON; vote to approve, from Murod [Zikri]. Teresa [McAllister] is Lily [Pementel]

PEMENTEL: Oh wow, what a day to be a proxy. Um, I too feel some although I I applaud the charge

[interrupted]

A. THORSON: Which is a vote. We can't have comments, I'm sorry.

PEMENTEL: I, I have to abstain

0:40:11

A. THORSON: Joe Saldivar.

SALDIVAR: No.

0:40:15

A. THORSON: Catherine Jones.

JONES: no.

A. THORSON: Harlan Hunter.

HUNTER: approved.

A. THORSON: Matthew Garrett.

GARRETT: no

0:40:24

A. THORSON: Ximena [da Silva].

DA SILVA: no.

0:40:27

A. THORSON: uh, adjunct faculty Deborah Thorson.

D. THORSON: approve.

0:40:34

A. THORSON: and my vote is a yes. Uh, going to um our admin Reggie Bolton

BOLTON: Approve.

0:40:43

A. THORSON: Jennifer Achan Achan.

ACHAN: [unintelligible]

0:40:47

A. THORSON: And Rich McCrow.

MCCROW: Approve.

0:40:49

[silent pause to count votes]

0:41:30

A. THORSON: So, I checked it three times, not that I can't still screw up. It is twelve yeases, two abstains, four no's, and the motion passes. All right we are specifically running out of time, um, let's move to the charge because that is something that is floating out here as well. Um, so as everyone knows, voting on the charge in the first meeting is requirement

GARRETT: I don't...

A. THORSON: not a voting on it, but hearing it out, having a conversation um is the first thing that you really have to do on these kinds of committees so you have to hear out with the charge that's current if there's charge if there's any charge to be presented.

[Paula Parks and students begin to leave committee]

A. THORSON: Thank you Paula for coming.

PARKS?: Thank you.

0:42:18

UNKNOWN: thank you students for coming.

STUDENT: thank you for having us.

STUDENT JORDYN DAVIS: have a great rest of your day

0:42:20

A. THORSON: So, the documents that we're printed in black and white, I can see now why that may have been missed. They're hard to tell the difference, so if you have a device and that's easier to distinguish the color I did send an email someone noted that it was kind of hard to find so I tried to clarify it I made the electronic notes for you so there's the 2019 version which was last approved by college Council. I'm going to tell you right now I'm not interested in the backstory of why things didn't get approved last year. We cannot change whatever happened last year on all perspective sides. We have—  
- this is the active charge for this committee at this time. We voted based on that charge and then we are going to move forward and consider an alteration. I just realized that Nick [Strobel] is here and Nick did not get to be here during the public comments so Nick you want to give your your comment.

0:43:10

STROBEL: Yeah, okay, thank you.

A. THORSON: We have suspended, it is not a Brown Act committee, I'm gonna suspend it for a minute to let him speak because he does have class

0:43:20

STROBEL: Yeah, I apologize for not getting here you know at 10:30. I had planetarium field trips. It's like waiting for my son to get there. Um, I'm um academic Senate President so uh sort of speaking uh from that but also from a personal perspective and I'm here to just talk about the the EODAC charge, um, and particularly the the committee membership proposal that has increasing the classified staff representation to equal the faculty representation. Um, before getting to that though I, I hope that when you're looking at the faculty ah, representation if you could please make it by pathway um that's what the Senate has done you know, already, it would be nice if you put that in there but personally, okay, just me then you know I support the proposal to have the number of classified staff equal to the faculty number. Um, the classified staff that I've worked with on various committees, um, I've served here my 26 years at the BC have all provided valuable insights and have felt free to speak their mind and they have shared their opinions. Um, also the classified staff at BC have received training and critical thinking through their own college education, ah, many of them from our own faculty here at BC. If a reasoned argument can be made for a particular action then I believe that the classified staff would come to the same conclusions as any reasonable faculty member would. Um, the argument that I've heard against making the classified representation equal to the the faculty representation has focused on the desire to ensure faculty power to override any classified objection and that argument assumes that the classified staff would be intimidated by administration to vote a certain way, you know they're supervisors. Um, that belief does strike me as a bit elitist and it's not congruent with a committee that has equal opportunity in its name. Um, a proposed action should be decided upon through a reasoned argument and not through numerical domination. Um, furthermore, EODAC is a recommending body. It can it can contr, it can propose policy or procedure changes as can any committee but Education Code does assign responsibilities of minimum qualifications and equivalency processes faculty hiring faculty evaluation and tenure review administrative retreat rights and faculty service areas to the academic senate. Now for some of those areas there's also the collective bargaining um agent, you know, our faculty Union Who's involved in negotiating those things. So, policies and procedures in these areas they have to be approved by the academic Senate which is why there is a regular reporting out to the Academic Senate

noted in the proposed charge, as well as in the Senate bylaws. We've got that you know as well. The, so, that, I think you know if there was something that maybe that the faculty felt a little bit hesitant about, well, okay again, it's a recommending body it's going to go to the Academic Senate it's also going to College Council for final actual you know approval of things. Um, now the proposed charge, so this is the one that, um, was proposed at in April that we have that I guess in our thing here uh that's proposed in April, it does have a line stating advisor to the college president which um I think has led some to believe that EODAC will be able to sidestep Academic Senate and go straight to the president on matters that impact there is given to the Senate in education code and also board policy. Um, now based on my discussions with the previous uh faculty chair I believe the advisor to the college president line and that proposed charge comes from the dash arrow, uh, that was in the decision-making documents decision-making process graphic. Now that dashed arrow carries the same weight as all the other dashed arrows between all the other bubbles on up to the the college president, including all students, all employees, and community members. Um, I, I would recommend that you either delete that line or we can add it to every single committee, um, task force, work group, student club, CTE advisory group, employee group and advocacy group in the community. Um, hopefully you know, any college president would understand the precedence given to the senate by Education Code and board policy you know on those particular areas. Um, so, I, I see that advisor two line is being sort of an unnecessary distraction; call it like a red herring. Um and finally I do also recommend that you add in your in in the membership box a statement that the quorum does not include vacant positions. We have that in a number of other ones sometimes that can mean that you know if you didn't have enough representatives then, it's like, okay, well you you can never, quote "get to in a quorum," but if you have vacant positions they shouldn't count against you so you can get the work done so I'd encourage you to put that in there. Um, and once you finally get the the charge you know settled in here it goes to the Academic Senatetto College Council for final you know official approval, and, um, and if you were to increase the classified representation and then the other groups as well that would that would take effect, you know, that semester you don't have to wait until the entire next year to get it done. So, that, I just wanted to share those comments with you I'm going to then head back to my uh, planetarium field trip so.

0:49:43

A. THORSON: Thank you before you leave could you hang out for one minute so I make sure I, I'm capturing what you're saying?

0:49:48

STROBEL: Okay.

A. THORSON: So he's fundamentally making three recommendations and I'll summarize them here so if someone wants to make a recommendation to amend the the charge, like, the charge that we're considering today for those and then we can consider those that would be okay if not that's okay too. So, recommendation one, remove the rhetoric that says advisor two and then sends the president. The recommendation number two was, um, add some sort of asterisk somewhere in the charge that says that you don't, quorum doesn't have to include, shouldn't include vacancies. And then three, to add that the membership of faculty based on pathways.

0:50:31

STROBEL: Yeah, to do that I was also um okay yeah yeah and I was in support of the idea of having a classified representation being equal to, um, to, um, the faculty representation, um, but I guess that's not a formal recommendation.

0:50:52

A. THORSON: thank you I just wanted to make sure I didn't want to mischaracterize. Vikki [Coffee], you were going to say something?

0:50:59

COFFEE: um you know I just wanted to thank Nick and then we could review the charge and decide what business would need to make or not.



A. THORSON: yeah, so if you want to just take a couple more minutes to look at the proposed one again not the 2019 one the proposed one that's listed as a draft that's been in your um EODAC website since last year under the last minute for a while and then I put it in the description of the meeting.

0:51:22.620,0:51:31.080

GARRETT: I was unaware exactly which charge you'd be doing today because I know we've got several that we've looked at and I also produced an alternative charge that I think we should consider and so I'd like to submit that as an alternative option.

0:51:38

A. THORSON: Okay, so what we'll do first is deal with this one and then we can move forward with another so the first thing I would ask is so we're dealing with discharge right now, so we either need a motion to like the things that Nick said, and I can re-articulate that, and say like, we want to consider altering it this way and then we can take a vote to approve or to not approve and then if that's done if someone wants to bring another one forward we can do that but we have to follow.

0:52:03

GARRETT: This would be an amendment just like this one is they're both amendments right?

A. THORSON: You said an entirely new charge

GARRETT: well, so is the one that's proposed it's an entirely in charge.

A. THORSON: But this isn't a new charge.

0:52:15

COFFEE: So, this is not a new charge. So we need to address a little background. So, in the spring, this committee approved this charge everybody who was a voting member approved this charge and that is how we have operated all year long. That being said, as a classified representative I have people in the room who were not able to vote because we keep going back and trying to undermine what has happened in the past. The charge before, we are just trying to work with Academics Sente and say okay this is an academic Senate rule that you look at your charge every year. It's not a classified rule, and it's not a management rule but so that we can just finally address what you feel is responsible to your group, we're saying let's look at the charge at hand that has already been approved and then let's vote on it to move forward. Again, my members can't vote. We keep marginalizing the work that's been done, undermining, and it is counterproductive, um, and so that being said as far as the recommendations from Nick, I am in support of two and three. The committee does have regular communications with the president, so I would like to keep in there advising to the president. So those are the recommendations I would I would be willing to amend or motion to amend to this charge.

A. THORSON: So, we have a motion on the ground do I have so to be clear what she's motioning is to uh mix point number two which is that to insert something which it says that we don't have Quorum does not have to include vacancies that just makes it easier for us to get some things done when it's obvious, especially with the path that is, I don't have to explain, you all get it. Number three was add membership of faculty based on their pathway so that's the motion on the board. Is there a second?

UNKNOWN [multiple voices]: I second.

0:54:33

[quiet chatter]

0:54:39

UNKNOWN: So, EODAC is responsible for advising the president?

A. THORSON: so the motion on the board right now, what we have to go with is motion, which is, right now the one we're voting on is not that one. The one we're voting on right now is to either you agree or you disagree or you want to abstain from adding a language the quorum doesn't include vacant positions and adding that the membership of faculty should be based on pathway. So that's what's on so then right now. We can do another one, but this is the one we have to do right now because this is one that was articulated and seconded.

0:55:11

JONES: okay, so I'm sorry because I'm running as fast as I can keep up. So the one that's the working document that is not the current one you it we're working off the proposed one?

A. THORSON: Yeah, we're working off the proposed one that was voted on last year in EODAC.

JONES: So we're going to change the proposed one to do what Nick said, take off advisor the president add the quorum language and

A. THORSON: the most so the current one that we're working off of today is the one we voted with but the one we're looking at right now to make an amendment to is the proposal that is on the email that was sent to you one that was approved last year by this committee but didn't go through Senate and college Council

COFFEE: but it went to e-board.

A. THORSON: but it went to e-board, and so we're trying to

JONES: We're amending the draft to keep talking about the draft.

0:55:59

MCCROW: No, we're the motion is to accept two of Nick's recommendations

0:56:05

A. THORSON: recommendations

0:56:07.486,0:56:17.415

JONES: right, but accept those recommendations to amend the draft so that we can keep talking about the draft to see if we're going to say yes this is the new one.

0:56:17

A. THORSON, Yes, un-hunh, all right.

0:56:21

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED: because one of those recommendations is already in the proposed draft and you guys are saying it's two but it's there because isn't that we're classified, the faculty, um, is preferred represented from each of the guided uh pathway teams, so isn't that the language already in here so?

A. THORSON: Where are you? Which page?

D. THORSON: Oh that's under membership.

A. THORSON: under membership.

0:56:44

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED: Ya, I think that's the double sided draft. I just got the hard copy.

0:56:50

D. THORSON: The preferred recommendation for [unintelligible - possibly "EODAC"] guided pathways

0:56:57

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED: So, I was confused. [grunt/laugh]

0:57:02

A. THORSON: Oh yeah. Yeah.

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED: So, we only need the one that he recommended right

0:57:09

A. THORSON: Great catch. You're absolutely right, so let's take away his recommendation number two and we stand that is that acceptable?

UNKNOWN: And we're also taking away the recommendation to remove the advisor to the president?

0:57:21

UNKNOWN (COFFEE?): No, that is not her motion.

A. THORSON: So, the motion was those two they're okay with taking off the number two but so now we're just moving on with number three because number two is not necessary. So number three, just to clarify, add member, no, we're getting the number three, not number two, number two is add rhetoric that says that we don't need to include our vacancies in quorums,

[interrupted]

UNKNOWN [possibly D. Thorson]: right

A. THORSON: So, can I, I'm gonna go person by person and we can take a vote if you find something.

DA SILVA: Yeah just just a question for a Vikki [Coffee]: um, what is your rationale for not removing the college President?

[interrupted by A. Thorson]

A. THORSON: No, that's not where we're at. We're on the part where we're voting on this items we have to stick to this we can go to that next so we gotta we gotta stick to this because the motion was made. Okay, so I'm gonna go with, uh, the student which is Anthony [Vazquez]. Do you um approve, negate, or abstain?

VAZQUEZ: I, [unintelligible]

0:58:12

A. THORSON: Maria [Elizondo]

ELIZONDO: approve.

A. THORSON: Angela [Wilson]

WILSON: approve.

A. THORSON: Dominica [Dominguez]

DOMINGUEZ: approve.

A. THORSON: David [Neville]

NEVILLE: abstain.

0:58:26

A. THORSON: Ah, Murad [Zikri]. Thats gonna be approve. So uh Teresa which is Lily [Pementel].

PIMENTEL: ah, no.

0:58:34

A. THORSON: uh Joe [Saldivar].

SALDIVAR: Abstain.

0:58:39

A. THORSON: Catherine Jones

0:58:42

JONES: no.

A. THORSON: Harlan Hunter.

HUNTER: approved.

0:58:48

A. THORSON: Matt Garrett

GARRETT: Which amendment are we on?

A. THORSON: we're doing the one where it adds language that we don't



GARRETT: Quorum. Gotcha.

A. THORSON: have do we we shouldn't of count vacancies against quorum.

GARRETT: abstain.

0:59:05

A. THORSON: Ximena [da Silva]

DA SILVA: Approve.

A. THORSON: Deborah Thorson approved.

D. THORSON: approve.

A. Thorson: Drea [Thorson]. Yes. Reggie [Bolton]?

BOLTON: approve.

0:59:12

A. THORSON: Jennifer Achan?

ACHAN: approve.

A. THORSON: Richard [McCrow]?

MCCROW: Approve.

0:59:19

A. THORSON: Okay, then that passes. We are at time so we can have a motion to vote, or we can have a motion to

GARRETT: Motion to amend.

A. THORSON: motion to extend by 10 minutes.

0:59:29

COFFEE?: I move to extend the meeting by ten minutes.

HUNTER: I'm going to have to excuse myself.

0:59:36

A. THORSON: Do you want to give proxy to anyone or do you want to abstain?

HUNTER: I haven't even decided who my proxy is.

0:59:43

A. THORSON: Well, if you want to think about it while we're doing this that's okay.

HUNTER: Okay, five minutes.

0:59:47

A. THORSON: okay, [laughter] so we have a motion for 10.

HUNTER: I've got business.

A. THORSON: Could we do, is, has anyone seconded?

DA SILVA: second.

A. THORSON: Second is Ximena [Da Silva]. And then can we just do all those in favor say aye?

CHORUS OF "AYE"'s

A. THORSON: Um, all those opposed? All those abstaining?

1:00:07

GARRETT: motion to amend. I'd like to motion amend the alternative um res-, uh charge.

A. THORSON: Oh, okay. Hold on. So we're moving for a ten minute extension. Right now it's 11:32, so that would be 11:42 unless there's another question on the ground, um, the other individual that would like to get this done in the next five.

HUNTER: Question: is there a proxy here that I could use?

1:00:30

A. THORSON: Yeah, you can give your proxy to me or any other faculty member here if you'd like okay.

1:00:37

HUNTER: Okay, you've got it [motioning to Andrea Thorson]

1:00:41

A. THORSON: um okay Matthew [Garrett],

GARRETT: yes, um so I printed off an alternative draft which is more in common with the currently approved draft than the proposed draft that we're looking at so

A. THORSON: you said it's a whole new draft well it's actually closer to the original so it's a whole set of of amendments just like the proposal we're looking at is a whole set of amendments.

A. THORSON: I totally get that. I just have to finish this draft first. We have to have, like, a final, and see if there's anything else that someone wants to amend to this one, and then if not, if you want to vote on it get rid of it

GARRETT: I don't think that's correct procedure.

A. THORSON: We can go with another draft because otherwise we have competing drafts and we have to take care of it one at a time.

1:01:20

JONES: there's definitely stuff on this draft I want to talk about if that's where you're going.

1:01:25

A. THORSON: Yes, that's where we're going. Great, if, so we're dealing with this draft we have that amendment that amendment went through so we will add the the talk about the vacancy, um, if it's vacant not to be used against quorum. By the way, the reason that was there is because that's currently what we're dealing with on a committee. There's a vacancy for one of our pathways. Somebody didn't want that to be keeping anybody from getting work done or not have representation. So, now is there any other recommendations or proposals for the draft that we're talking about? You're first [motioning to Catherine Jones].

1:02:00

JONES: Okay, so, with the new draft in comparing the new to the old um and some other things I see both mission creep and leaving people behind and so that concerns me. I don't have any problem whatsoever with having a racial climate task force. Maybe next year we'll have a gender climate task force. Maybe the year after that we'll have a religious climate task force. To me, that's part of the mission we're leaving behind because the other versions talk about all students, employees; that language is now gone. Um, in my other life BC prior to BC, uh, heavily involved in litigation the two most expensive employment litigation cases I was involved in were religion was number one and disability was right behind it and I don't see accessibility. When you look at the language that comes out from the Department of Labor it's a fat paragraph of all of the

various things that fall into the equal opportunity the EEOC stuff and and now, okay, we've expanded it to be equal opportunity and diversity, great, but we're leaving people behind when we cut out this language and I'm strongly opposed to —I get where it's going I don't oppose the effort—but I'm strongly opposed to the new draft that adds the word anti-racist because that's now what I see is the mission creep is pushing it to be more into, well, really EE, you know, the equal employment and opportunity and all of that stuff is really mostly about race and it's not and I think that's problematic. So, there's my my whole two cents.

1:04:08

A. THORSON: Ximena [da Silva]

1:04:13

DA SILVA: So, I have four proposed amendments. One of them goes in line with Catherine's. One is on that first paragraph uh I propose to change it back. Right now it says, uh, demonstrate a commitment to create diversity Equity inclusion and anti-racism so I propose to change it back to what we had before so it said demonstrate a commitment to greater diversity and inclusion for all students employees and the community at large on the basis that that's just a more inclusive statement. By going the anti-racism route, you know, we're, we're ideologically excluding groups of people because not everybody buys into the anti-racism, uh, rhetoric. Um, so on that note, also take out the, um. So the second one is under scope of um, authority, we have a conflict with EODAC being an advisory committee and then on the scope of authority we're saying that we're going to create develop and put into action practices and policies so that seems to give to give ourselves the the authority to create implement and put into action policies. So, um, I think that the language should be “will concentrate on advising the appropriate bodies on the creation, revision of, implementation,” so we are still an advisory committee. We shouldn't be

A. THORSON: One second, I'm just trying to make sure I capture this.

DA SILVA: Sorry.

[Da Silva & A. Thorson speaking over each other for a moment]

A. THORSON: [I/you/we?] have to articulate this in like a much shorter way. So, you're adjusting the scope to, the first point was adjusting the language back to the first draft

DA SILVA: yes.

A. THORSON: the 2019 draft. Your second point is to adjust the scope specifically tell me what you want removed.

DA SILVA: um, so say we'll we'll concentrate on advising

1:06:06

A. THORSON: So, what do you want removed though?

DA SILVA: No, just just add add the word “advising” because it says that that we're creating right. So I, I want to say advising on the creation of you know and then the emphasis is on the fact that we don't have the power to create, “to create revise and put into action policies,” we only advise. And then, um, and then remove anti-racism for that last statement and just, uh, “diversity equity and inclusion.”

1:06:36

A. THORSON: Remove anti-racism and where specifically?

DA SILVA: From the “scope of authority.”

A. THORSON: Okay.

1:06:44

DA SILVA: um and then finally we need to uh chat about membership, you know, the, it, it's a big problem because nobody wants to disenfranchise anybody but that argument cuts both ways because by doing this membership you're now disenfranchising faculty. Faculty went, on the, on the, on the previous membership we went around 9 to 15.

1:07:08

A. THORSON: Ximena, I'm so sorry, but you're, you're making a motion to make an amendments so I need you to just tell me what you need

1:07:11

DA SILVA: So, I made the amendment to keep the membership as is.

A. THORSON: So your amendment is to keep the 2019

DA SILVA: yes

A. THORSON: membership.

1:07:23

GARRETT: Point of clarification?



A. THORSON: Yes.

GARRETT: In removing anti-racism there was one more she missed that was on, ah, the last bullet of the first

[interrupted by Thorson]

A THORSON: This is her motion.

UNNOWN (possibly Coffee): This is her motion

GARRETT: So I'm asking if she wants to include that she's got all the other ones.

DA SILVA: Yeah, no, I said four so I, I did three, I think that's my fourth one, I, I, I had it down yes all the "communicates with" uh there it is. So that's my fourth one.

A. THORSON: The "communicates with"?

DA SILVA: yes, remove under communicates with.

A. THORSON: So I have you, your first one is replacing the language back in the 2019 version at the very beginning of the, the beginning. The second one is the "scope": add the word "advising" and remove the word "anti-racism." That's still number two. Number three was remove "anti-racism."

DA SILVA: from "communicates with" and number four is keep the membership for

A. THORSON: the 2018 membership. Okay, we have a motion on the floor. Do I have a second?

1:08:11

GARRETT: second

A. THORSON: Okay, so now we can have discussion please keep in mind that we are very close on time if we can make it concise.

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED: okay

A. THORSON: oh go ahead

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN): I have something because I'm a little, I'm, this is my first one, and I'm confused why you wouldn't want the classified staff to be equal to faculty. I'm I'm confused and you're talking about disenfranchising. There employees here and they represent a large part because some of you wouldn't be able to do what you do without your classified so why wouldn't they equally be represented on a committee like this why would you want a disenfranchise them by keeping your numbers larger than theirs? I'm, I, that's what I heard when you said that because you're the faculty number would be larger than the classified number but why 'cause to be honest if you took all your classified out how hurt would you be? I'm just, I'm just.

DA SILVA: I can, I can, I can, I can address that. The college cannot run with any one of its pieces. [interrupted]

SAME UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN): I know.

DA SILVA: So you take out classified, it cannot run. You take out faculty, it cannot run. You take out staff you take out the custodians [interrupted]

SAME UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN): yes

DA SILVA: it cannot run. [interrupted]

SAME UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED(possibly SAGBOHAN): yes

DA SILVA: Right, so, but the argument is and also Nick Strobel brought in also, you know, the the you know there's a reason why we have tenure and that's to protect freedom of ideas so the argument is that classified, uh,

BOLTON: [disapproving whistle]

DA SILVA: you know, you have pressure to vote a certain way because your jobs are on the line so with faculty the tenure is meant to protect us from.

[growing unrest]

1:09:55

SAME UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN): that that's not it that's not equity. [growing chorus of disapproval] That's not equity. That's not what this committee is about and I totally disagree with you on that one because that that

[interruption]

UNKNOWN (possibly D. THORSON): Can we go to vote?

SAME UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN): that comment to me is not cool because that's totally disrespectful

[growing chorus of speakers]

A. THORSON: Angie [Wilson] was the next person that had her hand up.

1:10:15

WILSON: I'm gonna say, as a, as a classified employee who's been on this campus for thirty years working with the college various committees I serve on with other faculty members I was completely insulted by that comment when you said that we don't participate or we can't have a voice

[interruption by Da Silva]

DA SILVA: I didn't say that.

WILSON: that's what I heard.

[multiple outbursts]

WILSON: Hold on. Hold on. But what I'm saying is that classified as a whole we play a large part we're just not custod-- custodians. We work directly with students we help them. We bring them in. We support them. we are on the ground with them and we know where we reflect and what we do [unintelligible] so I heard, what I heard, when you said what I heard, when you said, what you said was that our voices should not be counted. We are equal to all parts, administrative, faculty our voices should be heard,

[outbursts]

DA SILVA: I didn't say that. That is not what I said.

1:11:01

[outbursts of classified women, Jones, possibly D. Thorson]

1:11:01

WILSON: I'm going to say with longevity as well it's very difficult if you look at our contract very difficult to fire us who have been here long term. It's extremely difficult

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN): extremely!

WILSON: extremely! [Wilson laughs loudly]

1:11:19

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN or COFFEE): I resent the fact that you just said that I lack the capability of speaking and thinking myself! That is offensive!

1:11:26

ELIZONDO: When you [speaking to Da Silva] needed help from Garrett over there to get you to your fourth point.

1:11:31

DA SILVA: I did not say that.

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED (possibly SAGBOHAN or COFFEE): That's what you said.  
You said I can bow to intimidation.

DA SILVA: That's not what I said.

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED: That's what you said. You said I can bow to intimidation.  
That is unacceptable

[outbursts continue]

1:11:38

A. THORSON: Okay, the next person is Reggie [Bolton]

1:11:40

BOLTON: So, cause I gatta go help the students

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED WOMEN (possibly SAGBOHAN and COFFEE): mm-hmm  
[sound of agreement]

1:11:45

BOLTON: um but again, here we go

SAME UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED WOMEN (possibly SAGBOHAN and COFFEE):  
mm-hmm [sound of agreement]

BOLTON: and it's, it's, and again, we talk about a committee and we you just made a point that we want to include everybody yeah but that statement just devalued a whole group of people

JONES: I don't think that's what she meant

[ERUPTION OF OUTBURSTS]

1:12:04

BOLTON: I have the floor. And again, it's just like taking out the anti-racism yeah the point that I think people are trying to make is when you take that out it only it's, it's not an issue because you're not affected by it. Just like a woman: you could say that to a woman and say, "hey I've been," harassment. It's not an issue into a woman until she's affected by it

[interruption by Jones]

JONES: I am affected by anti-racism

1:12:32

BOLTON: Wait Wait. So, whether, whether, we're sitting in this room and we're doing it again. Here we go. We're going to spend all our time arguing back and forth over mindset and those students just walked out will continue to suffer.

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED WOMAN (possibly WILSON, COFFEE or SAGBOHAN):  
mm-hmm [sound of agreement]

BOLTON: So, we could do what we can take out what we want we can do whatever we want but this gona keep coming back to the same fact cause you just brought up, uh, people with disabilities. You're right, we should include them.

[INTERRUPTION BY JONES]

JONES: right

BOLTON: They should include women.

[INTERRUPTION]

JONES: right

[GROWING UNREST]

A. THORSON: This is discussion Ximena. Its not your turn.

1:12:58

BOLTON: Hold up what I'm saying

[GROWING CHATTER]

BOLTON: This is my floor

A. THORSON: This is discussion Ximena. Its not your turn. Its his turn to speak.



1:13:03

BOLTON: What I'm saying is if we spend all our time in this room talking about these specifics we'll never get anything done

[interruption by Jones]

JONES: I agree.

BOLTON: And that's what's happening because every time something comes up here comes the specific and again that point just devalued a group of people and that's where anti-racism comes from.

1:13:21

UNKNOWN WOMEN: that's right.

BOLTON: devaluing groups of people

JONES: right

BOLTON: so whether we pull it or not, pull it out, or don't discuss it, we goin' devalue somebody. The point is the mindset his room should be to move this forward to help everybody on campus because anything we propose will help meet the need of the students and the faculty and the staff because that statement was a strong statement to a group of people and that's not okay. And then to make the statement tenure gives us academic freedom

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED WOMEN (possibly SAGBOHAN, WILSON or COFFEE):  
wow.

BOLTON: Gee, I'm a fac— I'm a former faculty member I would never think that I would never think my tenure gives me the ability to devalue another person regardless of race gender color disability on this campus. That's a mindset and that mindset's in this room

[interruption by A. THORSON]

A. THORSON: Reggie

BOLTON: So, we're not voting are we today? Because I

[OUTBURSTS]

UNKNOWN (possibly Coffee): We are voting

BOLTON: 'cause I gatta go.

1:14:08

[OUTBURSTS BY CLASSIFIED WOMEN AND POSSIBLY BOLTON]

D. THORSON: I motion to vote on what her proposal is so we can get going

A. THORSON: okay, there's a motion to vote

[OUTBURSTS]

DA SILVA: Its my motion. Can I amend it?

UNKNOWN CHORUS (including Elizondo): No!

1:14:21

ELIZONDO: Let's move forward. It's 11:47.

[OUTBURSTS]

DA SILVA: But it's my motion.

A. THORSON: I'm so sorry we're over

ELIZONDO?: Way over. We are way over.

1:14:28

[OUTBURSTS BY ELIZONDO AND OTHERS]

A. THORSON: . . . Ximena had her motion so I need to remind

[CONTINUED CHAOS]

GARRETT: cutting discussion short

1:14:34

A. THORSON: cutting it back to the 2019

[INTERRUPTION by GARRETT]

GARRETT: I would like to have part of the discussion.

A THORSON (speaking over a chorus of chatter): I need to remind you all . . .  
replacement back to the 2019

JONES: This should have been the only thing we did today.

1:14:46

A THORSON: . . . the second is the scope, asking and advising, the third,  
recommendation of the amendment was remove the anti-racism language in the area that  
says “communicates with,” ah, that was two, ah, the fourth one was keeping the 2019  
membership in tact. All those I'm gonna do it one at a time, cause I don't want the drama

[INTERRUPTION BY JONES]

1:14:54

JONES: Say it again say it again so I know what I'm voting on.

A. THORSON: Okay, so her first one was the first sentence in the the draft changing it  
back to the 2019 version. Her second proposal is that the scope, um, in there, add the  
word advising and remove anything about anti-racism. The third piece remove anti-

racism for the area that says communicates to. Her fourth is keep 2019 membership - to reject therefore the membership is proposed in this draft for the 2022. That is a proposal that is on, on, right now so if you vote to approve you vote to approve all of it if you vote no you vote to negate all of it if you vote to abstain you're saying you do not want a voice on this one. Alright? So I'm gonna go person by person because I don't think this

[INTERRUPTION BY PIMENTEL]

PEMENTEL: It's not possible to revise her motion?

[outbursts/interruption by D. Thorson]

D. THORSON: No.

[outbursts continue]

JONES: Somebody can't can't make another motion to, before we vote, so that we never vote?

DA SILVA: Its my motion. Why can't change my motion?

[OUTBURSTS BY CLASSIFIED WOMEN/interruption by D. Thorson]

D. THORSON: No, you can't

1:15:50

A. THORSON: We are at.

[CHAOS CONTINUES]

ELIZONDO?: We are way out of time and we need to move forward!

A. THORSON: So you [Ximena da Silva] put a motion forward. It was accepted and

[INTERRUPTION BY DA SILVA]

1:15:57

DA SILVA: I want to change something to make it easier.

CHORUS OF CLASSIFIED WOMEN AND POSSIBLY D. THORSON SHOUTING:  
No! No! No! No!

[OUTBURSTS OF CLASSIFIED WOMEN and possibly D.  
THORSON/INTERRUPTION BY JONES]

1:16:03

JONES: But you're doing the same thing that your accusing.

[INTERRUPTION]

A THORSON: I'm not

JONES (continuing): Who cares about time I'll sit here till three o'clock this afternoon to

[OUTBURSTS OF CLASSIFIED WOMEN AND POSSIBLY D. THORSON  
POSSIBLY BOLTON]

JONES: to get this done!

A. THORSON: We can still do that after we finish this vote we can vote again to extend time but I can't do another amendment or a vote to extend time in the middle of a motion that's already been had or the discussion that's been had and we're overtime!

[INTERRUPTION BY JONES]

JONES: I'll bet my retirement the amendment is going to make everybody happy!

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED: I bet it won't!

UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED WOMAN (possibly SAGBOHAN OR WILSON OR  
COFFEE): I Bet it won't.

OTHER UNKNOWN CLASSIFIED WOMAN (possibly SAGBOHAN OR WILSON  
OR COFFEE): I bet it won't.

A. THORSON: Okay, this is the amendment

COFFEE: whoever abstains, whoever, okay, let's go.

A. THORSON: Maria [Elizondo]

ELIZONDO: for a person who's been working in student services for 20 years

[OUTBURSTS OF CLASSIFIED]

1:16:44

ELIZONDO: we are going to, [interruption] no, [interruption] we are going to,

[INTERRUPTION]

A. THORSON: so, your voting

[INTERRUPTION]

ELIZONDO: no

[INTERRUPTION]

A. THORSON: what she says

[INTERRUPTION]

ELIZONDO: I'm voting no because yes no

1:16:53



A. THORSON: Okay, yes, Angela [Wilson]

WILSON: No.

1:16:57

A.THORSON: Dominica. Vicky [Coffee].

COFFEE: no

1:17:00

A. THORSON: David [Neville]

NEVILLE: yes.

A. THORSON: Murad. No. Theresa, which is Lily [PEMENTEL]

PEMENTEL:

1:17:13

A. THORSON: I can come back. Joe Saldivar?

SALDIVAR: I abstain.

1:17:17

A. THORSON: Catherine Jones.

JONES: Abstain.

A. THORSON: Harlin Hunter. I'm a yes.

1:17:29

A. THORSON: Matt Garrett

GARRETT: yes

A. THORSON: Ximena [Da Silva]

DA SILVA: Abstain.

1:17:36

A. THORSON: Deborah Thorson

D. THORSON: no

1:17:41

A. THORSON: Drea's a no. Reggie [Bolton]?

BOLTON: no

A. THORSON: Jennifer Achan?

ACHAN: no

UNKNOWN: sorry

A. THORSON: Okay, Richard [McCrow]

MCCROW: no

A. THORSON: so that motion does not pass if someone wants to put another map uh

1:17:53

[COFFEE and JONES SPEAK OVER EACHOTHER]

JONES: I move the exact same thing Ximena said except the committee configuration

A. THORSON: this, so she had, first,

COFFEE: I move we accept

A. THORSON: first off, if we want to keep

[INTERRUPTION BY ELIZONDO?]

ELIZONDO?: I second.

A. THORSON (continuing): because time right now. I'm so sorry, I would need the motion to extend the time, that's part of the problem

1:18:07

JONES: Motion to extend.

UNKNOWN WOMAN: I gatta go.

UNKNOWN WOMAN: I gatta go too.

BOLTON: we got meetings. I mean, we gatta go to meetings.

1:18:11

D. THORSON: I make a motion we adjourn

BOLTON: thank you

UNKNOWN WOMAN: Yes!

BOLTON: Can we come back to this?

[OUTBURSTS]

1:18:16

JONES: It should be the only thing we do. It should have been the only thing we did today.

[OUTBURSTS - Bolton and others]

1:18:21

A. THORSON: I had to bring what I had to bring today I had no I had to do that that was put on me from eboard from our Senate eboard that was not choice based from me so

JONES: We were almost freak'n there. Almost there.

1:18:35

A. THORSON: Do we want to extend the time? All those in favor of another 20 minutes? Say "aye."

AYEs

A. THORSON: All those saying no.

NOs

A. THORSON: all those abstaining. The no's have it.

1:19:02

Note: Multiple “outbursts” are noted in the transcript, particularly nearing the end of the meeting, as well as interruptions from unknown individuals. None of those notions should be mistaken to include the entire committee. In most cases those voices seemed to include Angela Wilson, Maria Elizondo, Diana Alcala, Debra Thorson, and/or Tiffany Sagbhohan.

END OF TRANSCRIPT