Chair Comments

The Chair stated his support for the following specific statements contained in the recently released draft document, “Principles Against Intolerance”: “The University therefore strives to foster an environment in which all are included, all are given an equal opportunity to learn and explore, in which differences as well as commonalities are celebrated, and in which dissenting viewpoints are not only tolerated but encouraged. Acts of hatred and other intolerant conduct, as well as acts of discrimination that demean our differences, are antithetical to the values of the University and serve to undermine its purpose” and; “Nevertheless, mutual respect and civility within debate and dialogue advance the mission of the University, advance each of us as learners and teachers, and advance a democratic society.” To date, in Chair’s opinion, actions taken by administration and faculty have been consistent with these two principles.

The Chair made a on the behalf of the Academic Senate commitment to students that the Academic Senate will review existing courses approved for GE Domestic Diversity (DD) credit. He reached this decision because of known concerns raised by the GE Committee that some GE certified courses may not be currently delivered as intended as well as concerns raised by the UC Davis African Diaspora Community about how domestic diversity is being implemented in our GE curriculum. The Academic Senate review will ensure that current delivery meets the DD criteria, that proposals to add DD component to existing courses are considered, and that a review of such courses will be completed so a final review can be conducted by COCI during Fall Quarter.

The Chair received two letters from faculty—one from faculty in Chicana/o Studies and one from faculty in African American and African Studies. In addition to the several points made in these correspondences (see attached), the Chair expressed that when incidents of racism occur in our community, the students often express their concerns to, and seek guidance from, faculty mentors and staff members. He reiterated the point that issues raised by the faculty are important and present an opportunity for all faculty to engage in discussions that ensure a learning community inclusive of all.

The Chair discussed how Chancellor Katehi served on the board of Wiley & Sons from 2011 to 2014 and how she resigned from the DeVry Education Group Board of Directors, a position to which she was recently appointed. On March 4, the Chancellor met with the faculty of the Executive Council to discuss these matters and explain her motivations to serve on these boards. The information in the communication from the Chancellor to the Council of Vice Chancellors and Deans—released later—is consistent with what the Executive Council heard on March 4. The Executive Council also wanted assurance that the Chancellor acted in accordance with current UC policy. As is required practice, when a Chancellor anticipates future outside professional activities, a pre-approval request is filed. The Chancellor’s service on the Wiley board was annually approved by UCOP. On January 29th, 2016, the Chancellor filed a request
with UCOP for possible service on the DeVry board. The Chancellor admitted she made an error in judgment by prematurely accepting a position on the DeVry Education Group Board of Directors prior to UCOP approval. As soon as she realized her request has not been reviewed, she resigned. The Executive Council has requested and obtained supporting documents relating to pre-approval filings by the Chancellor. Copies are available in the Academic Senate office.

On the matter of senior administrators holding board positions, the Chair pointed out that under current UC policy, senior administrators are allowed to hold outside board positions with prior approval. Just as the Academic Senate disagrees with the Administration on several matters, on this matter many faculty will disagree with the Chancellor’s choices to serve on boards. The UC Davis Chancellor is not the only Chancellor serving on external boards. For example, it was very recently announced that the UCSD Chancellor will be serving on the board of a Canadian company in the area of high-tech surveillance.

Since March 11, 8 to 12 students at any given time have continuously occupied the fifth floor of Mrak. The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs met with the protestors on March 11. The meeting was unsuccessful as she was subjected to hate speech from the protesting students. The protestors have released a public announcement saying that they want the Chancellor to resign, and include the following reasons:

- Failing to appropriately address anti-Blackness and Islamophobia on campus
- Blocking the proposal to divest from companies that perpetuate the Israeli occupation of Palestine
- Increasing police presence on campus, as well as, the militarization of their weapons and equipment
- Ignoring hate crimes
- Personally blocking the request for foot sinks in the SCC, and furthering Islamophobic behavior and policy on campus
- Allowing for the pepper spraying of student protestors during the Occupy movement on campus in 2011.

The Chancellor offered to meet with protestors to discuss the issues (privatization/corporatization, Black Lives Matter/hate crimes, etc.), but the protestors were not interested. The Chair referred to his March 9th correspondence to Department Representatives of the Representative Assembly (see attached), and the letters he received from the faculty in Chicana/o Studies and African American and African Studies. He reiterated the point that issues raised by the faculty are important and present an opportunity for all faculty to engage in discussions that ensure a learning community inclusive of all.

The Academic Senate learned on Tuesday, March 15th the details of a proposal from the Regents Work Group on the Principles of Intolerance Report Prior that will be presented to the Regent the following week. The Chair consulted with Committee Chairs, and concerns were raised by the Chairs of CAFR, AA&D, Graduate Council, and the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate. The matter will be discussed in Academic Council in a meeting later in the day. (On 3/19/2015 Chair sent communication to Representative Assembly – see attached. Position of Academic Council meeting – also attached).
GE – Domestic Diversity Course Review Project – See whiteboard posting for project plan. The Domestic Diversity project was presented by the GE committee Chair. The Senate will soon be sending out a survey to all instructors who teach GE courses with the Domestic Diversity literacy. A Senate Faculty workgroup will be appointed during the summer to review course proposals for existing UCD courses that currently do not have the Domestic Diversity GE literacy attached to it.

Search Waivers
The issue will be brought back in the future.

COCI: Policy on Online and Hybrid Courses – See whiteboard posting.
The Chair of COCI presented a brief background on the committee activity regarding online and hybrid courses. They are currently working with CERJ to revise the committee’s online and hybrid courses policy. COCI voted in favor of removing the restriction of take home exams for online and hybrid courses.

COCI: Policy on “Overflow” Course Delivery – See whiteboard posting.
The Chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) presented COCI’s overflow policy (Policy on Equitable Delivery of Instruction in a Course), which no longer permits courses that do not guarantee the same modes of delivery, such as students having to attend online or simulcast versions of a course due to lack of lecture space. This practice was not able to be effectively enforced so this will no longer be an allowable solution to the over-enrollment problem, other solutions will need to be considered.

Provost Hexter Update – (comments below)
- Four Year Degree Initiative
- Enrollment Management
- “Professor of Teaching ____” – See whiteboard posting.

The Chair asked the Provost what the response will be to the correspondences from two letters from faculty in Chicana/o Studies and African American and African Studies. Provost indicated there will be a mini-retreat in April with faculty from the African Diaspora to discuss these issues and receive input from the faculty on how best to move forward. The CAP Chair indicates she would like prior CAP members to possibly be involved in mentoring the Deans and Department Chairs on what should be added/ included in the Dossier for CAP review.

The Chair pointed out that mandates from the State and Office of the President to add more students on top of the self-assessed 2020 goals are creating a crisis in space. He asked the Provost how additional student enrollment on the campus will be handled. Provost indicate that the campus is working to identify all teaching spaces – to utilize more of the existing spaces for instructional use. Renovation of classrooms will take 1-5 years. Classes are being held in the Mondavi Center, there will be a classroom in the Shrem Museum as well as one in the Pitzer Center (to be completed in 2018). The solution is a combination of utilization of current space,
renovation of current space, and addition/ expansion of space. The question was asked who determines how many TAs are allowed to go into a course? Provost feels this should be decided / done on the Department / College / School level. The Chair remarked that TA to class size ratio is unfavorable in some large classes (e.g. 1 TA to 200-400 students /course). There is a concern of the quality in the student experience. He promotes that every program should consider what the ideal student experience should be. He also reiterated to the Provost that Academic Senate and the faculty would like to be more involved in enrollment management and participate in the Enrollment Planning Task Force. The Academic Senate wants to have a faculty representative on the Enrollment Planning Task Force. Provost indicate support of the idea. Provost would like the faculty and faculty representative to understand the pressures and give/take of the enrollment issues Executive Council members emphasized that there needs to be input from the Senate more frequently on issues of enrollment management and participation at the outset.

The Provost proposal for “Professor of Teaching” was discussed next. The Provost explained that the proposed title is meant to replace the “Lecturer with security of employment” title, and meant to more accurately describe what these individuals do. Question was asked in faculty in these positions will be hiried at the aggressive rate in which they were in 2013? Provost answered no, they will gradually build to the “ideal” number which will be be approximately, in his opinion, 4% of ladder faculty. The question was asked how did / didn’t these hires contribute to the diversity on campus? The point was made that what occurred the previous year, is seen as a missed opportunity to increase the diversity of faculty on campus. Provost agreed to look in to this issue. The Academic Federation Chair expressed the view that the proposal is seen as a back hand to those existing lecturers as they are not considered AS members. AF Chair sees this as a very divisive proposal. Unit 18 lecturers are already doing the work as outlined by the “Professor of Teaching” title. The Academic Federation Executive Council will be taking the topic up at their meeting the next day.
March 21, 2016

THE REGENTS WORKING GROUP ON PRINCIPLES AGAINST INTOLERANCE


Dear Colleagues:

The Academic Council of the Academic Senate met on March 17 to consider the Final Report of the Regents Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance in Regents Item E-1 and asked me to convey its concerns to the Regents Working Group. Additional details can be found in the attached report from the UC Systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF), that also met on March 17, and in a letter from the Divisional Senate leaders, also attached.

The Academic Council appreciates the efforts of the Working Group to draft a statement on intolerance and appreciates several notable attributes of the statement. For example, the statement recognizes freedom of expression and freedom of inquiry as bedrock values of a public University and pledges that the University will defend them. The statement strongly affirms the first amendment protections for freedom of speech and affirms the right to engage in even impassioned dialogue on issues and to debate those issues on the merits of the speakers’ views. The policy also clearly states that actions that attempt to deprive others of their freedom of speech or actions that threaten, intimidate, cause injury or damage property are not protected. The clear separation of protected speech from unprotected acts is a fundamental and extremely important distinction that the Academic Senate greatly appreciates.

The Academic Senate did find several areas of significant concern, however. Most importantly, the Academic Senate objects to the inclusion of “Anti-Zionism” in the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Contextual Statement. Zionism is a nationalist and political movement with specific and well-documented historical roots. Explication, analysis, and critique of that movement, both in all its current and historical manifestations, are legitimate subjects of academic teaching, research and scholarly debate. We fear that an overly broad interpretation of “Anti-Zionism” may have a chilling effect on reasonable and appropriate discourse on this political, social, and historical phenomenon. Thus the condemnation of “Anti-Zionism” in total raises valid concerns for protected speech and academic freedom.
The Academic Council therefore cautions that the retention of “Anti-Zionism” in the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Contextual Statement could lead to needless and expensive litigation, embarrassing to the University, to sort out the difference between intolerance on the one hand, and protected debate and study of Zionism and its alternatives on the other. The Academic Council therefore strongly recommends that “anti-Zionism” be removed from the first sentence of the Second Paragraph of the Contextual Statement.

UCAF also raised similar concerns but suggested a different approach. UCAF suggests that the wording be changed to make a distinction between criticisms of “Zionism” that “are simply statements of disagreement over politics and policy” and others which are “also assertions of prejudice and intolerance toward Jewish people and culture.” UCAF therefore recommends the following change in the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Contextual Statement as follows:

Suggested replacement phrasing (in bold):

“Anti-Semitism, anti-Semitic forms of anti-Zionism, and other forms of unlawful discrimination have no place at the University of California.”

The change still may not remove all concerns about how the condemnation of “anti-Zionism” might infringe upon free speech and academic freedom (e.g. how different forms of “anti-Zionism” might be differentiated), but the amendment does make the language of the condemnation consistent with the previous paragraph.

Also, as the Working Group was cautioned, the Divisional Senate leaders and the Academic Council do not support the language, “Anti-Semitism and other forms of Intolerance…” in Section c. of the Policy Statement. As the letter from the Divisional Senate leaders notes, “a statement of Principles against intolerance should not privilege some forms of [unlawful] discrimination over others.” A Davis faculty member summarized this viewpoint below, and the viewpoint was endorsed by other Jewish faculty members:

“Speaking as a Jew who abhors any thought of anti-Semitism, I believe that elevating anti-Semitism in any way in a document like this will actually be counterproductive, insofar as it reinforces the perception that those in charge of the university take [unlawful] discrimination against some groups more seriously than [unlawful] discrimination against others.”

The Academic Council therefore endorses the recommendation of the Divisional Senate leaders that this section be changed as follows:

“Unlawful discrimination has no place in the University. The Regents call on University leaders to challenge actively any form of unlawful discrimination.”

Finally, the Divisional Senate leaders note that the statement of the mission of the University is incorrect.
I regret the short amount of time before the Regents Meeting to bring the concerns of the broader faculty to your attention. On the other hand, the full faculty have had only a few days to review the item since its public posting.

Thank you for your assistance, and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

J. Daniel Hare, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: President Napolitano
    Chief of Staff Grossman
    Academic Council
    Executive Director Baxter

Enclosures
March 17, 2016

DAN HARE, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE AND MEMBER, REGENTS WORKING GROUP ON PRINCIPLES AGAINST INTOLERANCE

RE: Brief emendation to the Contextual Statement of the FINAL REPORT OF THE REGENTS WORKING GROUP ON PRINCIPLES AGAINST INTOLERANCE

Dear Dan,

At today's UCAF meeting, the committee discussed the Final Report at length. We also noted many of the comments that have arisen since the Final Report was made public, particularly concerns regarding how the concepts of Zionism and anti-Zionism are used in the document. The committee noted that the first sentence of the second paragraph of the “contextual statement,” which has been the focus of most of the public condemnation the “Final Report” has received, appears to contradict the preceding sentence, which makes a distinction between criticisms of “Zionism” that “are simply statements of disagreement over politics and policy” and others which are “also assertions of prejudice and intolerance toward Jewish people and culture.”

The committee determined that a very brief emendation to the sentence in question might mitigate some of these concerns, and remove this troubling contradiction. We urge that you convey this proposed clarification to those in a position to determine its inclusion.

Current phrasing:
"Anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism and other forms of discrimination have no place at the University of California."

Suggested replacement phrasing (in bold):
"Anti-Semitism, anti-semitic forms of anti-Zionism, and other forms of discrimination have no place at the University of California."

Sincerely,
Kathleen Montgomery, Chair
UCAF
Statement regarding Regents’ Policy: Principles against Intolerance, to be presented for adoption at the March 23, 2016 Regents’ meeting

We, the undersigned, are strongly in support of development of principles regarding intolerance. The nature of political and public discourse today and the directions in which it appears to be evolving make it imperative that the University of California be an institution of tolerance.

We have a number of concerns, however, regarding the content of the proposed Principles of Intolerance (the “Principles”) occurring specifically on pages 8, 9, and 10 of the Final Report of the Regents Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance and its revision to the mission of UC. Other issues regarding specific wording and well-recognized concerns within the Academic Senate over process have been omitted from this document for brevity.

1. The Principles Identify only one specific form of discrimination (anti-Semitism).

The specific motivation for the working group and earlier Regents efforts, as described in the Contextual Statement, arose largely from concerns regarding incidents of anti-Semitism. Regardless of this context, a statement of Principles against Intolerance should not privilege some forms of discrimination over others.

At the end of item c, page 8, the Principles state,

Anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination have no place in the University. The Regents call on University leaders actively to challenge anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination when and wherever they emerge within the University community.

We, the undersigned, propose that item c, page 8, instead concludes as follows,

Unlawful discrimination has no place in the University. The Regents call on University leaders to challenge actively any form of unlawful discrimination.

In the same vein of not privileging one form of discrimination over another, we also offer the following statement received from a chair of one of our committees, and which is supported by other faculty signers of Jewish origin who also related to the quote:

“Speaking as a Jew who abhors any thought of anti-Semitism, I believe that elevating anti-Semitism in any way in a document like this will actually be counterproductive, insofar as it reinforces the perception that those in charge of the university take discrimination against some groups more seriously than discrimination against others.”
2. As written, the Principles restate the official mission of the University of California. Item a, page 8, of the Principles states that “The mission of the University is to promote discovery and create and disseminate knowledge, to expand opportunities for all, and to educate a civil populace and the next generation of leaders.” The official mission of the University of California is

"The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge. That obligation, more specifically, includes undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central pervasive mission of discovering and advancing knowledge."
— Mission statement from the University of California Academic Plan, 1974-1978
http://www.ucop.edu/uc-mission/index.html

The difference between the two mission statements is the addition of the phrase and concept “to educate a civil populace.” This addition seems potentially quite significant and, we believe the language requires some thought. The current mission was adopted in the 1970s after a process of extensive consultation undertaken by the Regents. The consultation included (the University Academic Plan states) “hundreds of individuals—faculty members, students, Chancellors, deans and other administrative staff—from the {as it then was} nine campuses of the University of California.” This mission has long been reflected in the UC’s institutions and customs. If the Regent’s new mission is similarly to have force, it must find such expression as well. However, not having been subjected to the same tests and discussions as the mission of the 1970s, and it is impossible to predict how it will manifest in the UC’s daily work.

**If the University’s core mission is to be redefined, it should be done so through an extensively consultative process and in a document expressly and separately devoted to that purpose.**

We believe there would be little difficulty in quoting the University’s confirmed official mission directly, with additional language the Regents believe essential to the established mission. That is, that all members of the UC community observe the norms of discourse that have been long established, if not codified and that the additional language attempts to specify some of the important defining limits to those norms.

Divisional Chairs of the Academic Senate:

UCD: André Knoesen, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering
UCSB: Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Professor in Sociology
UCLA: Leo Estrada, Associate Professor of Urban Planning
UCB: Robert Powell, Professor of Political Science
UCI: Alan Terriciano, Professor of Dance
UCR: Jose Wudka, Professor, Department of Physics & Astronomy,
UCM: Cristian Ricci, Professor of Iberian Studies and North African Studies
UCSC: Don Brenneis, Professor of Anthropology
UCSD: Robert E. Continetti, Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry
UCSF: Ruth Greenblatt, Professor of Clinical Pharmacy, Medicine, Epidemiology and Biostatistics
Dear Colleagues

I have been asked to provide additional context regarding the statement that I distributed late Friday.

**The Context**

The Regents decided to establish a Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance. This working group produced a recommendation “that the Committee on Educational Policy recommend that the Regents adopt the Report of the Regents Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance, including the policy statement on Principles Against Intolerance.”

On Tuesday, March 15 at 8:45 am, the Academic Council, along with the general public, got access to two items:

i) Adoption of the Report of the Regents Work Group on Principles of Intolerance
   [http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/mar16/e1.pdf](http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/mar16/e1.pdf)

ii) F1: Recommendation for a New Retirement Program

**The Issue**

We are dealing with an unusual situation in terms of the consultation process with the Academic Senate. A typical sequence of events, even for the case of an important policy consideration, would be that the Academic Senate would be given an opportunity to comment before the matter goes to the Regents for a final decision. This did not happen in this case. The Academic Senate received its first access to the Report when the agenda of the Regents and the supporting material was posted to the Regents’ public website four days ago.

On the day the information was released, I contacted the Davis Chairs of Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AAD), and Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibilities (CAFR). I alerted them that there was a recommendation "that the Regents adopt the Report of the Regents Working Group on Principles Against Intolerance, including the policy statement on Principles Against Intolerance." I specifically requested their assistance in examining what was being proposed by the Regents’ Committee on Educational Policy. I also alerted Executive Council (UC Davis), which was already scheduled to meet on Thursday, from 1-3 pm. An Academic Council (UC-wide) meeting was called for Thursday, March 17, 3-5 pm. I also subsequently found out a meeting was called for the systemwide Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF).

**Campus Consultation**

Christopher S. Elmendorf (CAFR Chair) and Brian Osserman (AAD Chair) were able to quickly consult their committees. By Thursday morning, I was alerted to two issues:
• Concern #1: Chris reported that within CAFR there were concerns about the wording used in the Contextual Statement of the report (pages 1-7), and
• Concern #2: Brian and other chairs reported concerns about the wording used in the Principles Against Intolerance (pages 8-10). Also related to this concern, a CAFR member pointed out the issue related to the revision of the mission of the UC.

Because I anticipated that UCAF would address the concerns with the wording in the Contextual Statement, I focused my attention on the second concern. I prioritized the second concern because once the Regents make a decision, any eventual campus implementation will be the Principles Against Intolerance. At the Thursday meeting of the Executive Council, I informed the group that Rachael and I, as individuals, were going to strongly endorse the concept of developing principles against intolerance and that we were also going to take a principled stand against specific wording in the Principles Against Intolerance, which could be remedied with more inclusive language.

The document that you were forwarded reflects the members of the Executive Council who elected to join Rachael and me as co-signatories to the letter. During all Executive Council discussions, I made it clear that I was not asking for a vote and that if individuals wanted to support the statement they could do so.

**UC-Wide Consultation**
At the Academic Council meeting that same afternoon, both Concerns #1 and #2 were discussed. Academic Council was informed that UCAF will subsequently communicate their opinion related to Concern #1 to Academic Council. I am not in a position to share UCAF position at this time, yet is does reflect the opinion expressed by Chris Elmendorf, our CAFR chair, that “In my opinion, the biggest problem BY FAR in the combined Report-and-Principles document is the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Report, which states: "Anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism and other forms of discrimination have no place at the University of California." Anti-Zionism DOES have a place at the U.C.—it is a political view ... political views have to be allowed to be expressed and discussed.” Knowing about UCAF position, in the Academic Council meeting I stated my opinion regarding Concern #2 related to wording described above. The other Divisional Chairs immediately voiced support.

The Divisional Chairs were of the strong opinion that we, in our capacities as Academic Senate Chairs, while making it clear that we have not been able to consult our division committees, must go on record with our concerns specifically related to the Principles Against Intolerance. In large part, because we already know from our faculty that there are significant concerns. Since an initial draft document stating our position had already been prepared, after the meeting, I circulated early drafts to Executive Council and gave the other Divisional Chairs a copy. During the Executive Council discussions, I also made it clear that I was not asking for a vote and that if individuals wanted to support the statement they could do so.
The Divisional Chairs have at least two choices in how we can respond to the Regents item in the spirit of shared governance. First, even though we were not asked to comment on behalf of our divisions in the traditional consultative process (i.e. it takes roughly 6 weeks to receive comments from all of the parties), as Divisional Chairs, we can provide comments to the Academic Council Chair. The Academic Council Chair (Dan Hare) is an ad hoc non-voting member to the Regents. In relaying the information to Dan, the hope is that the information will be provided to the Regents. We are cognizant that our comments are likely to have little effect at the meeting of the Regents. The Divisional Chairs are simply going on record with our views via the Academic Council Chair. Our second, less favorable choice, is that the Divisional Chairs can withhold information that is already known regarding the faculty concerns. Keep in mind also, once the Regents’ decision finalize their position, that would likely result in a formal consultation process with the Academic Senate.

As things continue to unfold in this specific case, the Academic Council (of which all Divisional Chairs are members along with Chairs of systemwide committees) will be transmit both UCAF’s position related to the Preamble (i.e. Concern #1) and the Divisional Chairs’ position regarding Concern #2, along with Academic Council’s own opinion on both issues. That communication will happen by Monday morning.

Members of the Representative Assembly
Where does all this leave you, as members of our Representative Assembly? First, I wanted to alert you that I, along with individual members of Executive Council, are going on record with our concerns. That is, we are concerned about, 1) wording that privileges one form of unlawful discrimination, and 2) the possible implications related to the rewording of the UC missions. This is the most important thing to know.

Again, I emphasize that I am not asking Executive Council for a vote. Individuals members of the Executive Council have been allowed to request that they be added as individual signatories (i.e. no vote is taken that is reported as the majority opinion). Second, if any of you want to sign the statement at this time, I want to provide you with the opportunity to do so. But before signing, it is important to understand that the situation is highly uncertain and changing rapidly and there may be other future avenues for you to express your concerns. Once the Regents make a decision, I would expect that there will be avenues for the Academic Senate to address specific issues, ideally though a standard shared governance consultation process.

Attached Statement with Revisions
After receiving substantial feedback, the Divisional chairs have decided to make a change in our statement relative to the version I circulated at 6:41 last night (Friday). Paragraph (b) (page 8) of the Principles provides a description of unlawful discrimination, which is “University policy prohibits discrimination based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender, gender expression, gender identity, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), ancestry, marital status, age, sexual orientation, citizenship, service in the uniformed services, or the intersection of any of these factors”.

In the statement from the Chairs and those that sign from our Executive Council, we propose that item c, page 8, instead concludes as follows: “Unlawful discrimination has no place in the University. The Regents call on University leaders to challenge actively any form of unlawful discrimination.” (in case you are puzzled by “unlawful discrimination” – it is a legal point. For example, in a legal sense we lawfully discriminate between which applicants are admitted and which are not, and lawfully discriminates between which students pass our classes and which fail).

I am also attaching the latest, and most likely final version, of the statement by the Divisional Chairs.

Have a great weekend. My apologies for not being clearer in my first communication.

Andre Knoesen