

# Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee Formation

## Result for Faculty on EODAC

by Nick Strobel (select title for video of these comments)

At the April 19 Senate meeting, many who voted against the DEI Committee formation assumed that the faculty would be removed from EODAC and voted accordingly to keep EODAC a fully participatory governance. There were some voting in favor of the DEI Committee who assumed that faculty would remain on EODAC while others who voted in favor of the DEI Committee assumed that faculty would be removed from EODAC and the DEI Committee would operate separately in parallel with EODAC.

There's also the fact that the referendum did not get the majority of the membership needed, so the approved EODAC charge with all the faculty membership and tasks is still officially approved. With as much overlap or duplication of the tasks as we see, how would the work of the faculty on EODAC mesh with the work on the DEI Committee? If the duplicated tasks were removed from EODAC, then how would the classified staff, administration, and students have voice and vote in the application of those tasks to their own groups? If faculty remain on EODAC and the duplicated tasks are kept in EODAC but in a form that applies only to classified staff, administration, and students, would the EODAC faculty be voting on those tasks? Wouldn't a clearer decision-making process be that if the faculty have the DEI Committee, then the faculty are removed from EODAC as originally intended?

Using the historical record of the Senate meeting recordings and the public and written comments of those responding to the ["Effects of DEI on EODAC" document](#) would make one reasonably conclude that the faculty will be removed from EODAC starting in Fall 2023.

### February 15, 2023 Senate meeting

Here is what Steven Holmes said about the faculty removal from EODAC from [recording of the February 15 Senate meeting](#).

At timepoint 00:59:05 Holmes says "[DEI Comm] is also an alternative to the EODAC. As a body, you have a right to suspend your membership in EODAC... It's an alternative plan."

[ By "suspend your membership" , Holmes is referring to Article VIII, Section 13 of the Senate By-Laws. In Spring and Fall 2022, Holmes had talked with President Strobel several times about invoking Article VIII, Section 13 and removing the faculty from EODAC. At the Feb 15, 2023 Senate meeting, Holmes handed out the [2019/20 EODAC charge with all the tasks he said were 10+1 in red font](#). Those are bullets #3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 => i.e., almost all of the EODAC tasks. The DEI Committee would decide the faculty components of those bullets.]

At 01:18:51 into the Feb 15 recording, our student rep asked what was the point of the DEI Committee—was it meant to replace EODAC? Steven’s response, “It is an alternative to EODAC, yes. Made of faculty with input from students, administration. If we want to add input from staff, that would be great.”

At 01:37:21 into the Feb 15 recording: Holmes said that DEI “would look solely at 10+1 as it applies to diversity, equity, inclusion. It would communicate with an existing EODAC that would continue probably to meet based off of classified and administration... We would focus solely on what falls within our 10+1 which based on what I saw at other schools, based on what EODAC started doing.”

At 01:37:54 of Feb 15 recording, Holmes said “I would suggest that we DON’T carry a representative on EODAC, that we have our own committee; that we just communicate with them with regard to things we are moving forward whether that be in collaboration with workshops, collaborations with some type of function we’re having on campus, collaboration with maybe some policies that are outside of the scope of 10+1 that might deal with the campus in general.”

The Feb 15 recording shows three times where it was clearly pointed out “what happened at the ‘Budget Committee’” with some of the classified siding with the administration. At timepoint 01:15:29 into the recording, Holmes said “I’ve talked to you about my frustrations literally with the Budget Committee, the Budget Committee administration; the Budget Committee classified that didn’t support this [BP 6200/6250 Budget Reserves] resolution. This body’s resolution, even though it’s a rely primarily upon. And we’ve come back and I’ve said that I’m disappointed with the Board of Trustees. But the fact of the matter is that I’m disappointed in every single administrator and every single classified who voted not to support our resolution, because essentially those people are not respecting the codified rely primarily upon.”

At timepoint 01:34:34 into the recording, Holmes said “Just as I informed the Senate in the Budget Committee that administration and a few classified didn’t support our 6250 resolution.” At timepoint 01:48:42 into the recording, a Senator brought up what happened with the classified at the Budget Committee. In my March 15th President’s Report, I explain what is the “Budget Committee” referred to by Holmes and how BC’s classified on the BC Budget Committee actually unanimously supported the faculty position.

### **[March 1 Senate meeting](#)**

For the March 1 meeting, I prepared the **[“Effect of Creating DEI Committee \(DEIC\) on EODAC” document](#)** that described what would happen to EODAC with the formation of the DEI Committee and how the Feb 15 approved EODAC charge would need to be changed . By March 1, we had the Cure+Correct from Holmes, so we couldn’t discuss DEI in the Senate until March 29, and, therefore, I couldn’t explain where the document came from. However, you can see that it comes right from [Holmes’ red font document](#) and the Feb 15 (and earlier) discussion.

The [“Effects of DEI on EODAC” document](#) I prepared says right at the top: the faculty would be withdrawn from EODAC as described by Article VIII of the Senate By-Laws section 13.

Furthermore, statements (2) and (3) and all of the sub-bullets of (3) ASSUME that statement (1) is a fact and only make sense if statement (1) is a fact. Why would the classified and administration components of the new EODAC tasks in statement (3) be determined by the faculty? If faculty are taking care of the faculty component of those tasks in the DEI Committee, do we really think the classified and administration reps on EODAC would agree to faculty voting on the classified and administration components?

Statements 1, 2, 3 of the document were assumed be FACT by McNellis and Holmes. [McNellis’ Cure and Correct](#) makes this crystal clear when he states that we should remove just the last line of the DEI Effect on EODAC document “because it constitutes your opinion”. The last line of the original version stated “easy in principle but probably will be very difficult to do in practice, especially if there’s disagreement between the two committees.” (Recall the three times the frustration with the classified action was expressed at the Feb 15 meeting and the whole reason for creating the DEI Committee in the first place is because of conflict with EODAC! The “opinion” has a substantial basis in evidence.)

If statement (1) is not a fact but is just an opinion of the Senate President, then why didn’t McNellis bring that out? Why didn’t the Senate bring that out when it approved the Cure and Correct? It is because they and the rest of us assumed statement (1) to be a true, factual statement—a logical conclusion based on the public record.

### [March 15, 2023 Senate meeting](#)

At the March 15 Senate meeting, at [timepoint 00:19:19 of the recording](#), Holmes says in his Public Comment, “I’m here today to discuss the reason why DEI [Committee] should exist. First of all, our President has identified that EODAC and DEI can co-exist. He’s published that document, although I would disagree with his last statement, saying that he highly doubts that they could work in cooperation with each other. I think they can.” That is the only comment Holmes makes about the “DEI Effect on EODAC” document. He did not disagree with other statements made in the document. That is the only comment made by *anyone* about the document at that meeting because Holmes’ Cure+Correct demanded that the Senate wait until March 29 to discuss the DEI Committee. Holmes’ Public Comment does seem to mark a softening of his view, though, toward the classified and administration on EODAC—the frustration and disappointment from the Feb 15 meeting is not visible.

### [April 19, 2023 Senate meeting](#)

It looks like there had been some discussion among *some* senators and officers outside of the meetings that had changed opinions about whether or not the faculty would be

removed from EODAC. At the April 19 meeting ([starts at 00:21:56 into the recording](#)) in his argument in favor of the DEI Committee formation, Holmes said that “EODAC could continue to coexist and it would be the responsibility of this body (the Senate) to determine its membership” (at timepoint 00:22:32 of the recording). That hints at faculty remaining on EODAC because the Senate approves only the faculty membership on a committee.

At timepoint 01:02:16 of the [April 19 recording](#) a senator says: “one of the arguments against it is that passing the DEI Committee would automatically remove the faculty from EODAC and maybe this is connected with the question, I don’t think that has to happen. It is not my understanding that Steven Holmes intended it that way—that he intended that if we pass it, then that removes the faculty, and he said, it can coexist. One of the things that I think would be great is that we could have a DEI Committee that it’s only for those 10+1 issues that protects our faculty rights towards it, then advises the EODAC. You can even have the faculty that are on EODAC be the same faculty on DEI. I’m not moving that or anything but it could be that case, and I think it would just provide a forum for our faculty right to be protected. So I think that we definitely have them coexist. I think you could have faculty on both of them, and that would be good.” We could still have a faculty caucus on EODAC without having a DEI Committee whatsoever. That was never a problem.

This new rationale is contrary to [statement \(1\) of the “DEI Committee Effect on EODAC” document](#) and ignores the [8 of the 12 tasks in the EODAC charge that Holmes said were 10+1](#)—will the faculty on EODAC just work on the 4 tasks not in the 10+1 while the rest of EODAC discusses/votes on the other 8 tasks? Would a new EODAC charge have just 4 tasks listed in it, so the faculty could participate and vote? The referendum did not overturn the Feb 15 Senate action approving the EODAC charge with all of the 12 tasks and the membership, so does the April 19 Senate action contradict the referendum result or not?

The new rationale seemed to make it reasonable for some Senators to vote in favor of forming the DEI Committee. However, others who voted against the formation of DEI Committee assumed that statement (1) was fact.

### **Isn’t it understandable why there’s confusion about whether or not the faculty will be removed from EODAC?**

Given the confusion and the upcoming consultation with the IEPi group about the DEI efforts at BC in the fall, it may be better to WAIT until the fall semester to get this figured out. I have it listed on the agenda as an action item but the action can be to postpone the DEI formation and removal of faculty from EODAC until we can sort this out in the fall. The faculty signups for EODAC can continue for now.