

**Attendance:** Abel Mills, Barbone, Butler Byrd, Csomay (proxy for Ornatowski) Fuller, Hernandez, Kamper, Love, Marx, Moore, Ozturk, Rhodes, Schellenberg, Sharma, Vasquez, Weston, Wills.

**Reported Guests:** Atterton, Bohonak, de la Torre, Krick (ITS-Senate), Kuang, Laurie, Mintz, Molina Rodriguez, Oduro, Saldana (Senate Analyst), Sanchez, Tatum, Walls, Wheeler (Parliamentarian).

## **1. Call to Order, Land Acknowledgement, and Principles of Shared Governance:**

**Secretary Fuller** notes that quorum was reached with at least 14 members present.

**Chair Butler Byrd** welcomes attendees and shares that this meeting was called because critical updates are available relating to the alleged sexual assault of a young woman off campus by SDSU football players. This issue is a critical emergent issue in terms of our responsibility to ensure a welcoming and safe environment here at SDSU. The meeting will provide an opportunity for the SEC to provide input on this issue. In addition, A.S. President Shawki Moore and Senator-at-Large Stephen Schellenberg also requested to add the GSHIP program pause to the agenda. The tensions between the College of Graduate Studies and Student Affairs and Campus Diversity are palpable around this issue and there has been an overall negative impact for students that we need to explore. **Chair Butler Byrd** notes she initially placed items on the agenda in the order in which they were received, and has since revised the order of speakers and topics in order to allow for a more effective meeting.

**Chair Butler Byrd** provides instructions to attendees regarding meeting rules/procedures (e.g., attendance, using chat, Zoom-bombing), and reads the policies that govern the Senate and SEC bodies.

Meeting called to order by **Chair Butler Byrd** at 2:15pm.

### **Land Acknowledgement**

We stand upon a land that carries the footsteps of millennia of Kumeyaay people. They are a people whose traditional lifeways intertwine with a worldview of earth and sky in a community of living beings. This land is part of a relationship that has nourished, healed, protected and embraced the Kumeyaay people to the present day. It is part of a world view founded in the harmony of the cycles of the sky and balance in the forces of life. For the Kumeyaay, red and black represent the balance of those forces that provide for harmony within our bodies as well as the world around us.

As students, faculty, staff and alumni of San Diego State University we acknowledge this legacy from the Kumeyaay. We promote this balance in life as we pursue our goals of knowledge and understanding. We find inspiration in the Kumeyaay spirit to open our minds and hearts. It is the legacy of the red and black. It is the land of the Kumeyaay.

Eyay e'Hunn My heart is good.

Michael Miskwish – Kumeyaay

The Land Acknowledgement was read by **Chair Butler Byrd**.

### **Principles of Shared Governance:**

Trust is recognized as a fundamental ingredient that is essential for effective shared governance. Without trust, the practices of partnership, inclusion, open communication, ownership, and accountability are likely to break down. SDSU community members have identified three key principles for shared governance at SDSU that all rely on the fundamental ingredient of TRUST: Respect, Communication, Responsibility.

The Principles of Shared Governance was read by **Chair Butler Byrd**.

## **2. Approval of Agenda (Fuller)**

Motion (**Schellenberg/Abel Mills**) to separate the GSHIP and GA/TA Workload Reports in the agenda so we can discuss them separately, and because there is still a question if the university can speak to the GA/TA Workload Issue. This motion was objected to by **Moore**. The motion carries (12 yes | 2 no | 0 abstentions).

**Chair Butler Byrd** asks **Secretary Fuller** to include all speakers in the original item to be listed under both of the separated items.

Motion (**Fuller**) to approve agenda carries without further objection.

**Chair Butler Byrd** notes that while the items have been separated, we recognize that there is a relationship between the two items.

## **3. Criminal Sexual Assault Investigation and Title IX Reports**

### **3.1. President's Report (de la Torre)**

- Gail Mendez, Title IX Director
- Josh Mays, AVP Public Safety and Community Empowerment

**President de la Torre** thanks everyone for coming during a time we are not typically in session. She states that the alleged sexual assault of a young woman by SDSU football players in October 2021 and events surrounding the incident have been challenging and disturbing for our community. Like all of us, she is brokenhearted. She states that this type of behavior is horrific and absolutely unacceptable, and the university continues to seek the facts about who was involved so that they are held fully accountable. This is what they have wanted since learning about the incident and this remains the priority.

She shares critical facts: Firstly, their foremost concern is for the victim, as what she has described in media accounts is monstrous. As a woman, as a mother, as a university president, as a human, her heart breaks for anyone who suffers this of assault, which is why the university has complied with SDPD's requests regarding this investigation. To that end, we were recently informed by SDPD that we can now pursue our own investigation and processes without jeopardizing their criminal investigation. SDPD also confirmed for us, for the first time, the name of the victim, since the victim had requested confidentiality in October [of 2021]. SDPD has not yet confirmed any charges or suspects in the alleged incident, but the university is moving fast to collect pertinent information in relation to the University's potential disciplinary action, or other pertinent action. Secondly, there has been some misinformation in some media reporting that she needs to correct: 1) accusations that university has done nothing in support of the victim and 2) that a relative of the victim shared information about the case with UPD in October of 2021 and suggestions that many of us at the university have long had detailed information about the victim and the case. This is simply not true.

She trusts the criminal justice process and strongly believes the university made the most prudent and responsible decision in not interfering in the SDPD investigation. She also states that we would be guilty of the worst kind of negligence if we had taken any action, no matter how well intended or desired by members of our community. Immediately upon speaking with the relative of the victim on October 19, 2021, UPD called SDPD as this was an off-campus incident with a non-SDSU student at a private residence. SDPD confirmed that they had already opened a criminal investigation. SDPD requested that SDSU not intervene in their active investigation and informed us that the victim had requested confidentiality. Under CA law, penal code 293, her name could only be shared with law enforcement and prosecutors. Only recently has the victim given her permission to share her name with SDSU, and now we are clear to proceed with our own process.

Since July 2022, the university has reached out to the victim. The university wants full accountability for anyone committing sexual misconduct no matter who they are.

SDSU's response is how responsible universities behave in situations like this, despite being criticized in the media. Now that we have we have initiated our own process, and we are

awaiting the closure of SDPD's investigation and decisions by the district attorney, there is information I cannot share with you given the legal restrictions.

She invites **Josh Mays** and **Jessica Rentto** to share more information.

**Mays** will address three primary concerns and give an update.

*1) Why did UPD decline to take a police report when the victim's family reported the alleged assault to them in October 2021? 2) Why didn't SDSU initiate an investigation after they became aware of the crime in October of 2021? 3) What information did the victim's relative share with SDSU and UPD, and what information was provided to the Title IX Coordinator?*

On July 22, 2022, SDPD contacted SDSU to say we can now move forward with our investigation without compromising their investigation. When this happened, we asked for the name and contact information of the victim. It is the University's understanding that SDPD asked the victim for her consent to provide this information to SDSU, and she agreed. We have since reached out to the victim directly, but confidentiality prevents administration from sharing further details.

The reason we needed her consent to contact her is important. She asserted her legal right to anonymity when she reported the crime to SDPD in October 2021. Given this, and the ongoing active SDPD investigation, UPD was legally restricted from sharing her name and contact information provided by the victim's relatives to SDSU administrators.

SDPD requested UPD and SDSU's Title IX Office to not take any action, which is understandable during a pending criminal investigation, and they did not share much information with anyone outside of law enforcement, including SDSU administrators.

Last year, we asked SDPD to provide the victim with a letter that included the contact information for our Title IX Coordinator, and her options to pursue a complaint with SDSU, but the victim did not respond. This happened within the month of learning about the incident. The victim chose to pursue the criminal complaint through SDPD and not through the university, which was well within her rights. It is understandable that the victim desired to pursue criminal accountability and to protect her anonymity. The university process does not involve anyone being prosecuted or going to jail. The most severe sanction the university can enforce is expulsion from the university. We are now moving forward with our own independent process now that SDPD has informed us that doing so will not compromise their criminal investigation.

**Rentto** covered Title IX (federal law) and CSU Policy, and how they relate to this case. Based on the information we currently have about this case (victim is not a student at SDSU, location of alleged crime was off campus), it is not clear that Title IX applies in this situation. That does not

mean that our University policies do not apply. In moving forward, we will gather known and confirmed details and use the lenses of University and CSU policies violations as they apply to the conduct of our students (e.g. discrimination, harrassment, sexual misconduct, violence) beyond the confines of Title IX. Confidentiality rights of both the claimant and respondent must be maintained based on policy and what is best for the integrity of SDSU's investigation. The university will not be able to speak about the details of our investigation. Finally, SDSU has no control over the pace or outcome of the SDPD investigation, nor any potential criminal proceedings. It is also not prudent for the University to take action against or punish anyone before confirmation of evidence, charges and due process. This may feel overwhelming or frustrating, but the University is committed to a prudent course to ensure that nothing jeopardizes justice in this matter. Handling this matter with care ensures that if violations are found we will be able to sustain consequences for those involved.

**Csomy** asks why there was no report or written record filed at all in this case? Mays says that it has less to do with the preferences of the reporting party in terms of where to file the case and more to do with jurisdiction. UPD, as state police, have authority in the entire State of California, but that is not the same as jurisdiction. The jurisdiction (where one can investigate a crime, or respond to calls for service) for UPD is university property only. The City of San Diego police department has jurisdiction over this alleged incident since it occurred within San Diego and not on campus property.

**Barbone** states he is confused about why this meeting was called (as opposed to the Senate directly, or in a townhall) as there is no action to take, and the Senate is not yet in session. What is the purpose of the SEC hosting this meeting? **President de la Torre** states the administration did send communication to the entire campus, but they wanted to communicate directly with the Senate and SEC in addition to community based sharing. **Chair Butler Byrd** states that we are mindful that these types of issues that impact our community can be decisive and we need to maintain open and consistent communication so that the facts can be transparent and share that information within our constituencies. **Secretary Fuller** notes that while these are reports and not action items, the SEC may choose to take action or make a statement based on the reports given.

**Kamper** asks (because he wants to be able to answer questions from community members): If we assume the parent came to SDSU to share the that the alleged incident occurred because they believed the alleged perpetrator(s) were SDSU students, why that did not trigger our own Title IX investigation concurrently?

**Rentto** clarifies that in relation to Title IX, under the Trump administration, there were changes to minimize its scope and reach. Currently, because it occurred off campus and because the victim is a non-student and because it was not a university event or program, it is not covered under Title IX. The sexual misconduct policies of the University are a but broader and may apply. We need to understand the established facts of this case before we can determine if

violations occurred and if there is a broader nexus to campus. In terms of why the family member came to UPD, she clarifies that the victim's relative came to report the incident with UPD after the criminal complaint had already been filed with SDPD. In initial conversations with SDPD, they shared that the alleged incident occurred in a house off-campus occupied by SDSU students, but the suspects were not identified.

**Mays** adds that he didn't have conversations with the father. Not speaking about this case in particular, he shared that people tend to reach out and report when they are interested in the issue gaining traction appropriately. Mays gives the example of an SDSU employee filing with La Mesa PD about domestic violence but also wanting SDSU / UPD to know, because they are an employee there and there's a restraining order against the person that harms them. There's a variety of reasons why people might also involve UPD. He reiterates that he didn't speak to the father, and he doesn't know why he shared that information, but it's not uncommon – it's not necessarily odd to UPD. The biggest thing was that it was reported as an investigation that was already underway in terms of a report being filed with the appropriate jurisdiction and agency on record.

**Rentto** reiterates that when the father or relative came in, a call was immediately made to SDPD and they immediately said to not do anything with this case. They did not want UPD involved, or the SDSU administration involved at that time. So, it was from the get go that we were given a directive from SDPD to stand down.

**Chair Butler Byrd:** We've been waiting now for nine months to get the okay to do the Title IX investigation. Why did it seem like it took the young woman going into the media in order to mobilize the San Diego police department to give us consent to do that?

**Mays:** There's been huge criticism surrounding the timeline of the investigation, more specifically, that SDPD, and the University, has let everyone involved down by taking too long (not prioritizing it). These cases are complex and can take many months, up to years, to investigate. As the first step, law enforcement must build their case (examine evidence, interview victims and potential witnesses). They have to establish that a crime actually occurred, and that they can prove that it occurred, before moving forward. Typically, in these cases, when investigators interview one witness it leads to three other witnesses, each with related data on cell phones, and those search warrants usually take months to secure. Once you get that evidence, the investigators must sift through and examine all of that new evidence and information. It's very typical that one lead, or interview, or phone call, or piece of information leads to many others. So, I know that in the very beginning, SDPD mobilized many resources, including assets and resources from the district attorney's office. The district attorney assigned investigators to support the issue and the lead deputy district attorney of the sex crimes unit was specifically assigned as an advisor in this case to SDPD's investigation team. It is likely, without having all the details, that it is more just a matter of the course of the

investigation. The timeline does not concern me – it tells me that there's multiple things that they have to sort through.

**De la Torre:** Thanks the SEC again, and reiterates that this is an incredibly complex case. SDPD has provided tremendous resources and has been very diligent, so we are very mindful of how we act in supporting this investigation, and we have been doing so from day one. She understands the community's frustration, and the frustration for all individuals involved, but states we need to understand that to serve justice, we have to have some degree of patience concerning and knowledge of the process and the requirements for evidence for this type of crime. Again thanking attendees, she states she will keep the Senate informed and the campus informed moving forward.

#### **4. GSHIP Report**

4.1. Shawki Moore, Associated Students President

4.2. Stephen Schellenberg, Senator At-Large

4.3. Provost Hector Ochoa & Dean Tracy Love

***Note:** 4.2 occurred after 4.3, based on the natural flow of conversations and the order with which questions were posed by attendees.*

**Schellenberg:** If we're still in a collective bargaining situation, and members of SEC are not free to speak in this conversation, I think it's very asymmetric and really antithetical to our shared governance principles if we're going to start this conversation without folks being allowed to engage in a discussion.

**Kamper:** I want to point out that labor law understands the larger asymmetry here and labor law says that management can't talk about it, but that doesn't mean individual employees can't talk about it because they already deal with an incredibly asymmetrical relationship with management. It seems silly to presume some sort of balance greater than what the law presumes and decides, and so the idea that we can't hear students' complaints in this context – It doesn't matter to me that they (or their issues) can't be responded to.

**Wheeler:** Were Senator-at-large Schellenberg to wish to delay consideration of this information or delay receiving it, he can move to postpone it to a certain time, or postpone indefinitely. That would require a vote, and the body can decide if he decides to make that motion. So that's just to show that the parliamentary rules aren't meant to squash people's interests. There are ways to move forward with Schellenberg's request. Notes that this debate is in regards to a report on today's agenda, which was approved. It may have been appropriate to address this when the agenda was adopted, I think.

**Moore:** Point of Clarification – the topic is the GSHIP health insurance and has nothing to do with any labor law or negotiations that the university is in. I think this motion is pointless and an unnecessary delay. **Chair Butler Byrd** notes that there are some comments in the chat but she cannot respond to them. **Secretary Fuller** notes that Senators are using the chat to make motions and clarifies that Senators cannot make emotion in the chat.

[long pause]

**Chair Butler Byrd:** In the absence of a formal motion, an attempt to proceed with the approved agenda topic is made. **Csomy:** Expressed her belief that we need to respect Schellenberg’s request to delay the discussion on this topic. **Secretary Fuller:** Point of Clarification – no motion was made by Senator schellenberg. **Moore:** Point of Clarification – since his report has nothing to do with the labor negotiations that the university is in, how can another Senator make a motion based on that point? **Schellenberg** asks to clarify which topic we are on. **Chair Butler Byrd** clarifies that it is the GSHIP graduate student health insurance topic.

Motion (**Schellenberg/Csomy**) to indefinitely postpone discussion until all parties are free to speak that are members of SEC.

**Chair Butler Byrd** opens up discussion of the motion to postpone the report indefinitely.

**Moore:** I find the motion hypocritical since Senator Schellenberg himself requested to be on the agenda to discuss this topic. There is a clear distinction, as previously stated, and Senator Schellenberg himself has acknowledged, between the GSHIP health insurance report and the TA/GA Works and Benefits report and whatever negotiation the University is in. I don't understand any reason why any member of SEC or the university would not be able to speak about the GSHIP health insurance.

**Kamper:** If I understand correctly, the basis of this motion is that somehow we are not engaging in shared governance if we hear from one party, but don't hear from another party. And to me that presumes a kind of level of equal knowledge and equal access that is naive, and that we never have. We don't come to these meetings with all the same level of power. The President comes to our meeting with a lot more power than any of us has. That doesn't mean for it to be shared governance, we all have to have the equal level of power and equal level of “say.” The idea of shared governance is letting voices be heard, so students want to be heard on this, they should be heard, and that is sharing governance. The administration has all kinds of opportunities and other venues to make their policy and assert their policy and other opportunities to talk to us if they want to, so I don't see how this is violating a notion of shared governance.

**Secretary Fuller:** Part of the reason that we have a quorum is so we can ensure there's enough people here to discuss the issue or to receive a report. We have a quorum for this meeting. Therefore, I believe this meeting is a valid place to accept the report.

**Schellenberg:** Just to respond to Senator Moore, I think you want to speak about the GSHIP – Is that correct? [Moore nods yes] Okay, so the agenda item we're on as I understand it, and what my motion is regarding, is the TA/GA Workload & Benefits report. We split these items in the agenda. The topic we're on is the GA/TA support package, and the motion I made is to table this because while I understand that there could be power differentials in SEC and in Senate, I feel it's the University Senate where all the voices need to be heard. So my motion is in play. We can discuss it, but I would like to call the question unless someone else wants to do that.

**Moore** objects to calling the question.

**Secretary Fuller:** Point of Clarification – clarifies we are discussing the GSHIP Health Insurance report and not the TA/GA Workload & Benefits report. **Chair Butler Byrd** confirms that the report that is up for discussion is the GSHIP and not on the TA/GA Workload report. **Secretary Fuller** reiterates notes that Chair Butler Byrd has already clarified this twice before, including when Senator Schellenberg asked, so there seems to be some confusion.

**Schellenberg:** If we're on the GSHIP topic, I'm happy to have that conversation move forward because there is no collective bargaining issue currently in play with that. I pull back my motion to table this discussion. There was some confusion, I think, in the order of how this was split.

**Chair Butler Byrd:** I want to ask everybody to listen and be open hearted because I think folks are not hearing each other, so thank you. Chair Butler Byrd recognizes President Moore and the scheduled report continues without further objection.

**Moore:** The GSHIP health insurance fee was the largest SDSU fee in history, and it was going to be put on students' bills with no communication a week before classes start. Here's a historical timeline:

- 2020/2021 - Back when Christian Holt was A.S. President, during COVID, he began having conversations about GSHIP, starting with Graduate Studies (with the predecessor to current Dean Love). Holt told Graduate Studies and University administration that this policy should not be put in place, and there was no discussion around the GSHIP fee at all. Later, Holt was also told that there would be a deferment of the policy for at least one more year so the University could collect data.
- 2021/2022 - One month into Ashley Tejada's term as A.S. President, the University decided to introduce the program as a policy instead of deferring it a year, as they had said to Holt. Once the policy was introduced, even though we didn't agree with the timeline or the policy, associated students agreed to support getting the word out to students about this policy. For the entire year Christian Holt, Ashley Tejada and Darren

Wilson, the Graduate Student President) were told that this would be a policy, and never once were they told it would be a fee. There was no conversation around GSHIP, the health insurance, becoming a fee. A policy for a student means that if the student does not have health insurance, they would be allowed an option through the University to get enrolled in health insurance. An opt-out fee, which is how GSHIP was ultimately presented by the University, means that GSHIP fees go onto every student's bill as a default.

- AY 21/22: A.S. leadership first learned that this was going to be a fee in May of 2022, during the transition meeting with me, Dean Love, Associate Dean Bohonak, and Ashley Tejada. Though A.S. was told multiple times that this was not going to be a fee at all, and this was going to stay a policy, once we realized that this would be a fee, we had multiple concerns and requested a CFAC meeting be convened:
  - Low Usage of Existing GSHIP: The rate of GSHIP Policy usage was around 4% of graduate students. That's around 250 graduate students who utilized the policy last year out of ~4500 graduate students. Making this an opt-out fee would put it on 100% of students' bills, so all students would have to pay and participate in GSHIP, unless they were aware and opted-out.
  - Lack of Timely Communication: The fast implementation is problematic. Finding out the switch from policy to fee in May meant that we only had the summer to communicate with students as it was going to be put on students' bills for the fall. That provided roughly less than three months for communication during summer when graduate students are mostly out of school and otherwise occupied – there was a concern a lot of them would not have been able to receive that communication.
  - Lack of Process/Shared Governance: CFAC, the Campus Fee Advisory Committee, where all fees changes go to for review, was already in recess for the year. CFAC, which by policy requires a student majority, was largely made up of graduating students who were well into their summer activities. There was no real possibility for an effective review process for this fee in general. There had been no shared governance on this issue because there was no discussion with students around this policy becoming a fee.
- May 2022 (cont'd): We were able to call a CFAC meeting, and in that meeting, Graduate Studies was the sponsor that drafted the GSHIP fee. Graduate Studies shared that there would be a robust communication plan put into place before the fee was implemented. In the CFAC meeting minutes from the May 2022 meeting, you can see A.S. shared all of our points that I just outlined in great detail, and at the bottom it also states that all the students voted in opposition to this fee. Category IV fees, which are opt-out fees, do not have to go to CFAC to be approved, and do not require any vote at all to be passed, so there was no actual vote, only a consensus of how students felt in the meetings. If there had been a CFAC vote on the issue, it would have failed because no student was in alignment with this fee being put into place. The fee was approved by the President at that time and we were told again there would be extensive communication around this fee to graduate students through multiple modalities.

- July 2022: Associated Students was told that the university was moving forward with the implementation of the GSHIP fee (\$2900), and that it was slated to be added to graduate students' bills for this academic year. A week before the first bill was to be sent to students (\$1300, the initial payment for GSHIP), no communication to students had been made. For perspective, the fee is more than half of most graduate students' tuition.

As Associated Students, given power by the CSU as the voice of students, we cannot sit back and be okay with a \$2900 fee, the largest fee in SDSU history, being placed on students' bills, with less than a week's notice. A.S. has an issue with the proposed communication plan which was for three months notice and discussion, and now, this fee would be implemented in a week. It was, quite literally, impossible for effective communication to go out to all graduate students that this new fee was going to be on their bill. This type of disorganized, last minute communication would likely result in our minority graduate students looking at this fee and just paying it, not knowing that they're paying the largest fee in SDSU history. So we could not, in good conscience, be okay with this happening.

Associated Students had a conversation with the Interim Chief of Staff, and we were able to successfully advocate, with all of these points, that the new fee not be allowed to proceed. However, we also asked that the model for student access to health insurance via SDSU to remain as a policy (for no change to happen from last year). Associated Students did not ask for the complete repeal of graduate student access to health insurance at SDSU. We wanted the students that already had to use the policy last year, as well as students that had hoped to use it this year, would still be able to access health insurance.

Unfortunately, we got the news that the university decided to defer the program for the entire year, and that this would mean that students who intended to access insurance through SDSU would not be able to do so. When we heard the decision we were very excited for the vast majority of students, who will not have to see this on their bill as a fee. But we also felt bad for the students that now have to find another way to gain access to health insurance. Associated Students was assured by Libby Skiles that there would be one-on-one communication with the students that had intended to use the health insurance from SDSU, and that each would be aided to find a comparable plan via Covered California. There was also some mention that some sort of funding might be available to assist some of those graduate students looking to access health insurance.

**Moore** yields his time to **Skiles**.

**Skiles:** We have reached out to over 250 graduate students with one-on-one communication (supported by ECRT, Wellbeing & Health Promotion and Insurance Enrollment Specialists) to help them find plans that meet individual needs.

**Moore:** We have been told that it is a mandate from the State of California that all students must have health care. While we understand that perspective, I would like to state that we are the only university in the CSU system currently trying to enact a plan of health coverage like this. As shared governance is a tenet of this university, there should be a large amount of shared governance in making a decision to change a policy into a fee.

There was no communication to students about a new fee. This type of behavior calls to mind the March 1, 2022 Senate meeting where the Senate discussed, and even passed a resolution, advocating for more shared governance – in this instance, around the John Coltrane music collection. It was made clear in that discussion that the University community wants to see shared governance implemented more robustly at this university.

The two biggest issues that we have here are a lack of shared governance and the largest fee in SDSU history being implemented for all SDSU graduate students with no student communication plan.

**Moore** yields his time to Lark Winner.

**Lark Winner** asks that **Peter Uhl** be allowed to speak to this issue. **Weston** yields his time to **Uhl**.

**Uhl:** I've been a TA for the math department for the last four years. I'm also a PhD student in the computational science program, and the financial Secretary for UAW 4123. I've been instructed by my department to pursue GSHIP as an alternative source of healthcare, given that the university proposes to end my current healthcare, and that of my wife's, in the coming months. After hours on a Friday night a few weeks ago, SDSU sent a message to all graduate students that the GSHIP policy was being put on pause for AY 22-23. This leaves not just Teaching Associates with less than .5 time appointments, but all graduate students, suddenly without access to health insurance. Once again, SDSU administrators made a unilateral change affecting thousands of people with no regard for the impact, and with little information on why, or what the next steps would be. This pause is in direct contradiction with what the administration proposed in regards to TA compensation packages, just a few days earlier. And again, for the last three months, GSHIP has consistently been where administrators have been directing Teaching Associates to go for new health insurance.

**Abel Mills:** I think that I'm experiencing a lot of confusion because in the previous meeting what we've heard about was how the GA/TA plans unfairly penalize a small percentage of graduate students, and that we should have, in fact, reached out to all graduate students across the university. We heard from them and they were going through true inconveniences. What I'm hearing today is kind of an opposite story, that this is only going to affect a small percentage of graduate students, and what I didn't get to hear are the testimonials from those students who

are losing their insurance, or may have a few weeks where they don't have insurance. What is the story here, and is the ultimate message we're trying to convey.

**Moore:** As the University has stated, GSHIP and the loss of TA/GA benefits for graduate students with work appointments are not connected. I don't know how true that is, but I will say that, in terms of GSHIP, it has nothing to do with the previous Senate meeting, because this is about the fee that would have been put on all graduate students bills, not just TAs and GAs. The issue I am raising impacts all graduate students, who would have been hit with a \$2900 fee for optional health insurance that about only 4% of them choose to use.

**Abel Mills:** I was confused because the previous speaker, Mr. Uhl, just said that as a TA, he was pushed to GSHIP, which was then canceled – I thought he was bridging the two topics. I wanted to make sure that we're keeping them distinct. On one hand we're saying only four percent of people are being penalized when we discuss the GA/TA Workload Issue, but that small percentage is still an issue. Here, it seems like it's okay that only 4% of graduate students want GSHIP, and now it's acceptable that this small percentage is penalized. I'm hearing this disconnect in our messaging and I just am trying to wrap my head around what our messaging ultimately is – is there a percentage where we say it's okay?

**Moore:** Fundamentally, I think that what Peter [Uhl] was saying is that it makes sense. Even though the university is saying that they're not connected, it makes sense that we're going to pass GSHIP and then right after GSHIP is passed, TA/GA benefits are cut and they're directing students to GSHIP – that the two issues have a connection seems to be the point Peter was trying to make. Like I said, the University has said otherwise, but it seems like there may be a connection there. To your point, what we are saying is if a \$2900 fee is put on 100% of students' bills when only 4% of students took advantage of GSHIP, the insurance company (by making it a requirement for it to be an auto-enrollment system) thinks that the percentage of usage in that insurance may not rise significantly, especially if there's not a robust communication plan, and there was not the robust communication plan that was promised. This is especially negative since some students pay their tuition at the beginning of the semester, and they have no idea they just paid into GSHIP (even though they might have insurance), and now they are paying for something they don't need. That is our biggest problem with his fee – the absence of a robust communication plan.

**Moore** yields his time to **Ashley Tejada**, last year's A.S. President.

**Tejada:** I'm the Graduate Student Association President. I'm here in the capacity of representing graduate students, specifically. I know that the question at hand is why it's acceptable in the case of GSHIP that a small number of people have their insurance being taken away, but for GA/TA the change in workload, the issue doesn't matter to the same capacity. I think the difference between the two issues (GSHIP and GA/TA Benefits) is that when it comes to GA/TA Workload, the issue is related to benefits (coming into student pockets), while the

GSHIP is a huge fee paid (coming out of student pockets). In one sense, I understand that [Abel-Mills] is confused about the message we are sending, but at the same time, I see the two issues as completely opposite. This is the graduate student perspective. I do also want to say that, as far as the students that can afford the \$1300, or students that were counting on that insurance, I'm not at all speaking against those students. I want to have empathy for every graduate student in this situation, but I must also speak to the damage the GSHIP fee will cause. I'm all for GSHIP as a policy. GSHIP as a fee would be detrimental to the progress of graduate students as a whole.

**Moore:** Ashley, in addition to the clarification, our advocacy has always been to keep the GSHIP as a policy, and not make it an opt-out fee; we have never advocated to get with the program entirely.

**Fuller:** When we say GSHIP as a policy, does that mean that it used to be an opt-in fee, like it provided students an avenue to insurance if they opted into that avenue? Is that what GSHIP as a policy means?

**Moore:** Opt-in fees exist, but GSHIP as a policy is not a fee at all. They are entirely different, and that is why we focus on this distinction between it being talked about as a policy and a fee. The dollar amount is so large, and as a policy students can choose if they want to pay for it – it's just like a service that they can use. As an opt-out fee, it will go charged to all students, regardless if they need it or not. If they do not show proof of insurance with the opt-out fee, the \$1300 in the fall will be charged, and then in the spring, another \$1300 will be charged as an opt out fee.

**Secretary Fuller:** Okay, and was there any discussion of making it an opt in fee?

**Moore:** To our knowledge, we were only as aware as our leaders in the past. This was only ever discussed as a policy, not an opt out-fee.

**Secretary Fuller:** My question was more along the lines of was it ever considered, and maybe it wasn't discussed with the students in this way. I guess my question was from the administrative point-of-view: why opt-out and not opt-in, so that it didn't automatically go on every student's bill?

**Chair Butler Byrd** recognizes **Chief of Staff Ana Molina-Rodriguez.**

**Molina-Rodriguez:** I personally spoke to Anthem and opt-in was not an option. In essence, we had two options: proceed with opt-out or pause.

**Chair Butler Byrd** recognizes **Stephen Schelleberg.**

**Schellenberg:** So I appreciate Senator Moore's outline of the process, and I think we both agree. What we have here is the failure to communicate broadly and deeply, and for a long enough time, so that there are no surprises for anyone. So my question is, at this point, who was responsible and accountable for leading the communication plan that did not start arguably until the recent pause of this program, leaving ~300 or so students who would already fulfill their state and federal requirements for insurance through the Anthem program provided through the GSHIP? Why did this decision happen at the last possible moment? Why was there no communication plan much earlier, exactly as Senator Moore stated? Why wasn't this conversation held while people were here during the spring, so that if there were concerns, they could be raised when everyone is here? To me, this appears like a manufactured crisis. Unintentional, perhaps, but certainly avoidable. So, my question to Senator Moore is, if you know, who was supposed to be leading the communication plan for this to faculty, staff and students? The first mention of it for faculty was two weeks ago on a Friday, when the GSHIP was paused, which effectively canceled insurance already secured for over ~300 graduate students.

**Moore:** This process may have been underway longer than when students were introduced to it in May. One of our biggest concerns is why were students not involved in the discussion leading up to the switch from a policy to an opt-out fee? If shared governance is a tenant of this university, it needs to be upheld, and that involves students having a say in the decision making process. It creates a better result, no matter if students agree or disagree with the final product, when students are in the conversations from the beginning. Shared governance is not coming up with a policy or procedure, and then at the end, introducing it to students – that is not shared governance. If you go back and look at the agenda and minutes from the CFAC meeting, it says the item was submitted by the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, and that the College of Graduate Studies will work on a comprehensive communication plan with Associated Students, but that did not happen. So, it seems to me that graduate studies was in charge of this communication plan as written in the proposal at CFAC.

**Schellenberg:** So, as A.S. President speaks for students, what do you want to happen this month, and what do you want to have happen over the next academic year? The question still stands as to who was responsible, as my understanding is that the GSHIP issue shifted out of the College of Graduate Studies sometime in the spring. But I'm curious, what does Associated Students want to have happen this month, and this academic year?

**Moore:** I think that you may be correct about the shift, but like I said, in CFAC, the College of Graduate Studies was the presenter. They've said that they were expecting to communicate. I think it's a little unfair to ask us to say what we want now. What we want is to have been involved from the beginning – to be involved in the conversation around this being changed from a policy to a fee. I think we want a comprehensive plan regarding how GSHIP changes from a policy to a fee that includes robust community education via different modalities. To ensure that all graduate students' questions and concerns are answered and addressed, and that the student voice would be prevalent within the creation of what comes next. I think it

needs longer than three months to work out and communicate – it needs to stretch over a significant amount of time. We need to feel confident that all graduate students know about what is happening, and are empowered to make informed decisions.

**Moore** yields his time to **Tejada**.

**Tejada:** In the meantime, the university needs to support the communication about Covered California, Medicare and Medicaid (all of these options) given that a lot of times students are eligible for these services. Because those options are not connected to SDSU, and the cost won't appear on their bill where they pay their tuition fees, it's not as accessible or understood. Health Services and Libby Skiles need to continue to work with students to get into Covered California. In recent years, I have continuously asked for data related to student needs, and I have never seen significant data. Data that might show why one option over another – that's one thing that I would love to see as Graduate Student Association President next year. More importantly, where is this data made available that links to GSHIP specifically. Where is the original data from when this policy or insurance plan surfaced, where did the data come from showing that students need GSHIP? As a graduate student, I think it's much more reasonable to be offered actual health services before it is to be paying such a large fee on your bill, but like I said before, I think, access is important and that policy is different, but the fee itself, I think it's just difficult for students.

**Chair Butler Byrd** recognizes **Eniko Csomay**.

**Csomay:** I have three points to make: 1) I want to thank A.S. President Moore and Ashley, the previous A.S. President, for their voice in this because it's heard loud and clear. It's cumbersome and troublesome, so thank you for bringing all this up; 2) Why could this not be an opt-in program? Why was it paused? I still don't quite understand what the rationale was to pause the whole GSHIP in the first place; and 3) Isn't there a very specific process as to how a fee needs to be introduced – a student fee, especially for this large amount? Doesn't it have to go through all kinds of steps in the process, so it can't just be introduced, like that, as a fee?

**Moore:** The reason why we advocated for action against the fee was because, like I said, this was going to go out within a week without previous communication or warning for graduate students at all. Most graduate students, other than the ones that intended to use the GSHIP, had no idea the fee was coming, not even the students that were intending to use the GSHIP policy from last year. No one knew there was going to be a fee placed on their bill. So, that is why A.S. advocated for GSHIP to remain as a policy. We did not want that to go on students bills without communication because we know that it would have led to some students paying it unnecessarily.

**Csomay:** So the other questions were: Why could it not be an opt-in program? Why does it have to be either a pause or an opt out program? Isn't there a very strict procedure on how a fee is created/used?

**Moore:** There are multiple categories for fees (types of fees). All fees go to the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC), which I currently sit on, and I sat on last year. I would like to make a distinction: Category II and Category IV fees are the usual fees that come through the system, and must come to CFAC. Category II fees are mandatory fees, meaning they must be paid by every student, and to make a Category II fee happen there has to be a referendum, which must involve the entire student body, or alternative consultation. For example, the sustainability and technology fee proposed last semester went through an alternative consultation process. Then the data from that alternative consultation process went to CFAC and it was voted down because the data clearly showed that students did not want this fee. This GSHIP insurance was introduced as a Category IV fee, meaning there is the potential for a student to be able to opt-out of the fee. A Category IV fee goes to CFAC as information only, and can be passed by the President without CFAC or student approval, and that is what happened here, with the GSHIP insurance.

**Abel Mills** yields her time to **Andrew Bohonak**.

**Bohonak:** I can speak to some of the operational details from last year. This was started by the previous graduate Dean Ed Balston and I wasn't part of the initial negotiations or discussions, but operationally, I was one of the small number of people to deliver it last year. Lots of universities have opt-out insurance plans. It is not common in the CSU system, but it's common. My daughter just got accepted at a UC school where she's going to start in the fall as a freshman. She had to take a picture of her insurance card into the system for that particular UC campus so that she would be exempt from their default health insurance plan.

Generally, the way insurance works is that there's a risk pool, and the risk pool is not everyone who is sick and opts-in. It's everyone, period, and that's how insurance works. It was difficult to negotiate the initial year, because at the time, there was not a mechanism to provide adequate communication during the first year, except as an opt-in. It was not set up as an opt-out fee. So, for that first year, communications went out encouraging all graduate students who were domestic students and eligible to be part of this GSHIP program to provide waivers that they have health insurance, or if they chose to purchase the particular insurance plan that was offered, at what I think most people would agree would be a reasonable price for an individual plan. Was it expensive? Yes. Health insurance is expensive, but the price for the first year was reasonable. Since it was not an opt-out process, the only sort of enforcement mechanism was if students did not take any action in the fall, we put a hold on their spring account. This really dragged out the administration of it, and took an extraordinary number of person-hours to constantly contact students to follow-up and deal with all the registration holds at the end of term.

In the end, I can personally say I feel confident no one was forced to buy an insurance plan that they didn't need. Lots of students got insurance that they needed, and that insurance was better than what they would have been able to get outside of SDSU, and it was less expensive. Lots of students also went through Covered California or MediCal. It was a big problem in terms of person-hours to manage it in that way. The opt-in feature was not renewed, and this is what Anna was alluding to. We could not get an insurance carrier to renew because the enrollment rate was too low, and it ran very differently than every other university that does this. Even at SDSU, international students all have the same insurance carrier that offers an opt-out plan. It's been running for 10,15, 20 years. It runs successfully. All the international students have this type of plan and they just move through it without problems. We could not continue with an opt-in plan; we had to move to the opt-out option, otherwise we couldn't offer any insurance at all for the coming year. This is why the decision was made, part way through the year, to move in that direction.

I have not been part of any recent discussions over the summer about where we are with the company that puts us all together. I can't comment on the likelihood, for this coming year, that we would be able, with hard negotiation, to move back into an opt-in plan, or whether after a one year pause and better communication, we could get to opt-in, or that is completely off the table. These are questions definitely best answered by Anna or Libby Skiles, but that's how we got to this point. And the other thing I can say just for historical context, is that Dean Balston didn't just come up with this idea on his own. This came after years of graduate students saying they wanted an option for a reasonably priced individual insurance plan. Some of them make too much money for MediCal, and they have asked for insurance options for years, and that's how we got to the point. Again, it was initially put together by Dean Balston.

**Provost Ochoa:** As we shared on Friday, July 29th, the University has paused GSHIP for this upcoming year. We've heard from students today that it's important for further engagement to provide more education on the changes to the program, so that important questions are answered carefully, and with as much information as possible to better meet students' needs.

It is my understanding that we believe we made a good faith effort to communicate these changes related to SHIP by meeting with the Graduate Student Association, A.S. Leadership, Graduate Council, CFAC and others since fall 2020, and communicating this information to incoming graduate students their admissions letters. Additionally, we coordinated our efforts to put GSHIP information on our websites and in our emails to our students. As it got closer to the start of the year, the administration heard feedback that we could have done more. Given the concerns that were raised, it was important enough to take time to address those concerns as diligently as we possibly could. It is understood that the decision to pause GSHIP has caused a lot of frustration and questions. SDSU intends to address all those questions so that every student, faculty member and staff member are well informed about our next steps in 2022. I think it's really important to hear Tracy Love-Geffen and Libby Skiles talk about the update of what we're trying to do because students come first, and there's been concerns raised about what we are doing for our students.

**Skiles:** I would just add that a majority of our graduate students already have health insurance for the coming year. For those who do not, whether or not that is because they were considering GSHIP (side note: GSHIP is often convoluted with the insurance requirement and the Anthem Student Advantage Plan), or were just looking for insurance in general, we're working to ensure that they all find health care coverage.

**Love-Geffen:** We need to make sure that we are taking care of the commitments that we have made when Anthem was an available option. The University is going to provide an allowance to students who were guaranteed coverage through Anthem. Eligible students for this program involve those in the University Graduate Fellowship Program, the Division of Research and Innovation and College of Graduate Studies Research Fellowship Program, graduate students supported through SDSU Research Foundation grants (such as training grants and fellowships where the grant provided an allowance for health insurance and the principal investigator (PI) had planned to purchase Anthem insurance coverage for their students). This does not apply to those graduate students hired through the SDSU Research Foundation as an employee. This also includes doctoral students who are new or continuing who had been promised Anthem health insurance coverage as part of their admissions packet.

SDSU is providing an allowance of \$400 a month for a health plan. There are limited cases where students have special circumstances, and Libby has been working with them (and BFA has been working to find additional funding through emergency funds or scholarships to aid in coverage costs). For students who were not guaranteed Anthem, but had expressed an interest in joining or continuing with that plan, Student Health Services is working with Covered California and other entities to connect those students with health insurance options. We're already working with Covered California right now to allow some backdating of insurance coverage to August 1 for some eligible students so that there's no harmful break in their plan.

**Skiles:** In the last week, we've engaged in a high level conversation since the notice went out. We have been providing a great deal of individualized support given that we recognize each student's circumstances are unique to them, and we want to give them agency and care. We will continue to do that to ensure that their health care needs are met, both through health coverage, as well as through the resources that are able to be offered on campus such as Student Health Services and Counseling and Psychological Services.

**VP Wood:** I would like to talk about what things look like moving forward because I think that might be most productive. We're going to work closely with our student leaders and devise a robust communication plan for the reinstatement of GSHIP for fall of 2023. We're also going to collaborate with Academic Affairs and Business and Financial Affairs to secure a revised health care plan that's going to be offered to our students. We will also work closely with Financial Aid and Scholarships to ensure a smooth process for how the insurance requirement is coordinated with student financial aid. As part of our communication, we're going to report on progress to

CFAC. Student Health Services is going to be leading the implementation of the health care insurance requirement, and part of our commitment is to make sure that students can be informed about their health care decisions because they have all the necessary information to address their unique needs.

**Secretary Fuller:** Point of Clarification. Senator Schellenberg was on the agenda to give his own report. I know he was speaking in response to other people earlier, but he was on the agenda to give his own report ahead of these speakers.

**Chair Butler Byrd:** We will come back to Senator Schellenberg shortly.

**Moore:** [directed to the Provost] You referenced that both Graduate Student Association and Graduate Council were consulted about changes to GSHIP, and I just wanted to clarify if this consultation was around a policy or a fee.

**Provost Ochoa:** I was not at those meetings. [asks Tracy Love-Geffen to address the question]

**Love:** There is representation of the Graduate Student Association on the Graduate Council; we have two representatives. At a number of those meetings, we discussed the status of GSHIP and Anthem enrollment, as well as compliance with the requirement for proof of health insurance for graduate students. We discussed how that had been working throughout the fall semester. We discussed the fact that there needed to be changes in enforcement of the requirement of health insurance. While the terms “policy” and “fee” weren’t used, we talked about changing the way that students were able to pay for the insurance if they chose that insurance (not the way in which the waivers occurred, which the majority of students were doing anyway). We heard from students that when there was direct pay to the insurance company, students had to pay for the entire semester upfront, and that put a hardship on them. We were able to help those who were put under some serious pressure because they wanted the insurance but could not afford an entire semester at once. We also heard from students that they really needed a way in which to use financial aid that they received to pay for insurance, and they wanted options. In talking with Student Account Services, we discovered there is a way for them to have installment plans. So, these things were discussed at a number of different Graduate Council meetings. To your direct question, I never said the words “change of policy to fee,” but I actually don't think that's an accurate representation of what was happening.

**Moore** yields his time to **Tejada**.

**Tejada:** I want to request that the letters that were sent to incoming graduate students, as the Provost mentioned, which promise them an insurance option, are attached in the minutes or sent out to members of SEC. Throughout my conversations regarding GSHIP, I was never informed that letters guaranteeing an insurance option went out to students. Considering the

contract was not signed, to my understanding, to renew GSHIP for the following year, I think that's alarming if insurance was offered to students with no contract even signed at that point in time. Associate Dean Bohonak had mentioned that for years Dean Balston was asked by students for insurance options, and I've asked for any actual data now for two years, that shows these requests or needs demonstrated. Was this need present five years ago? Is it still a need now for current students? I think understanding and documenting student needs is just essential, especially as we move into the communication plan for 2023. As the current GSA President, I want to make sure that these testimonials of students during those years, and which framed our "now" are accounted for so there's nothing lost in translation. In terms of last year, when I was A.S. President, I did have a seat on the Graduate Council for a bit, and while I wasn't able to attend all meetings, I had frequent one-on-ones with the College of Graduate Studies, and the idea of a new fee was never mentioned. I assure you, if it was presented as a fee rather than an update to existing GSHIP policy, and I think everyone in this space knows I'm very big on immediate advocacy and not waiting, this conversation would have come up months ago if A.S., GSA, or any of our student leaders, were informed of a new fee at any time before this summer, when students literally had to scatter with their advocacy because it was such a last minute communication that wasn't shared with me as A.S. President at any time during spring 2022. It sounds like there was development of this idea during spring 22 when this request was submitted by Graduate Studies to CFAC without consultation. From an A.S. standpoint it is important that advocacy remains at our forefront.

**Abel Mills:** I want to speak as a graduate advisor. I'm not sure when communication around the changes with GSHIP moved from Graduate Studies to Student Affairs and Campus Diversity. Regarding GSHIP, but also going back a few months about the new student orientation mandatory fees, which are also opt-out – I didn't hear about any of that ahead of time. I was told when the students were told (they received emails), and I have complained about not being informed ahead of time, and have received no recourse/response. Additionally, my students were asked to go to an orientation that conflicts with other times they're required to be on campus, and I wasn't made aware of that either. No other graduate advisor that I've been in contact with has any communication in advance either, so there's a major missing link. All the people that have been listed as participating in this, people who spend their summers communicating with graduate students, are sometimes the last to find out. For the new student orientation, I found out after the graduate students came to me and said: What's this orientation that conflicts with things you have scheduled for us? I would like people to understand that graduate advisors should be at the top of that communication list, not below the students, on all of these points. GSHIP is one very critical issue, but overall, this pattern of poor communication is embarrassing and it looks very unprofessional for us as an institution.

**Schellenberg:** I appreciate Vice President Wood's focus on looking forward, but I think the way we learn how to make better mistakes tomorrow is by looking backwards. I have put in the chat a link to a document of discussion questions [link available below] that I think we need to ponder. The focus there for me is on students that were set, compliant and covered. Everything we've been talking about, reaching out to those students and helping those students now in

crisis, was completely avoidable if there had been a better communication plan earlier on all fronts. A number of the issues that Senator Moore brought up would have surfaced during the academic year. The responsibility for this program, as I understand it, needs to be clarified because a communication plan developed by one unit, if that unit/person is no longer responsible for the program, the person and program that owns that unit is now responsible for the communication implementation. Pausing it two or three weeks before school starts creates chaos and confusion. The questions I pose are really for everyone involved. There is a petition with over 300 signatures, mainly from graduate students that are very, very upset [link to petition available below]. I'm just expressing the frustration and concern that we should make better mistakes tomorrow. Communication is key and to send a critical communication out on a Friday at 5:15pm, just from the optics, should never be done.

**Fuller** yields her time to **Tejada**.

**Tejada:** In looking at these questions as far as health insurance goes, there's nothing at all mentioned about a fee. It only mentions the need for health insurance and the needs of students who want access to health insurance. I want to make sure that the absence of fee language remains at the forefront of our perception. There may be a difference in graduate students preferences or opinions with full disclosure: supporting access to health insurance and supporting access to health insurance that requires an expensive opt-out fee for all graduate students are two very different concepts..

**Schellenberg:** I agree with you. People may not like how the fee went through or the path this process took, but it was an established pathway. You could disagree with what it should have been, or what it shouldn't have been, in terms of being late, or what was decided in terms of implementation. However, having no communication about that implementation and not implementing it (leading to a cancellation of the coverage for students already enrolled) seems like unforced error across the board for us as a campus.

**Tejada:** In terms of "established pathway," this was brought to CFAC as a fee after CFAC had concluded for the year. Perhaps it was originally introduced before that, in the late spring I think. I believe using the term "established" is kind of strong, given that there was never full consultation before the CFAC submission regarding whether or not this should be a fee or not.

**Schellenberg:** My document really focuses on the impact of previously covered students, given how this was basically paused/canceled at the very last minute, and the stress and chaos that ensued. I also want to mention this became known to graduate advisors and chairs at the same time students became aware, and it was never made known to our JDP partners. There was no consultation with our JDP program partners, so that doesn't exactly make us look good.

**Note:** Two requests were made to add documents into the minutes as attachments:

- **Appendix A: Moore** shared the CFAC May 2022 meeting agenda and minutes.

- **Schellenberg** requested his documents also be included in the minutes: 1) Discussion questions regarding the GSHIP "Pause": <https://docs.google.com/document/d/11cKklv0lv0MCl-iucQAoTIVHsHi-o7J2HU6HdjYjZb8/edit?usp=sharing> – and 2) a petition @ GSHIP currently making its way around the community: <https://form.jotform.com/222137243659154>
- **Tejada** requested the SDSU Letter to Graduate Students that explained the GSHIP be included in the minutes. Two requests were made to the Provost's Office for a copy of the communications that went out to students. No response was ever received.

## 5. GA and TA Workloads and Benefits Report

- Shawki Moore, Associated Students President
- UAW President Lark Winner
- Peter Uhl
- Briana Tatum
- Ellen Kuang
- Stephen Schellenberg, Senator At-Large
- Provost Hector Ochoa
- Dean Tracy Love

Motion (**Fuller/Schellenberg**) to postpone Item 5 until the August 23, 2022 SEC meeting.

**Kamper:** Point of Clarification. Is there an assurance this item will not be tabled prior to the next meeting? Meaning, if we push the item to 8/23/22, it cannot be tabled indefinitely unless we vote to table it then?

**Secretary Fuller:** The item will be on the next SEC agenda.

Objection by **Moore. Butler Byrd** clarifies objection is out of order. After clarifying that the motion to postpone indefinitely is not part of the motion, the motion carries (9 yes | 4 no).

## 6. Adjourn.

Motion (**Schellenberg/Fuller**) to adjourn the meeting at 4:15pm.