

Presentation of the Resolution to Censure UCSD Chancellor Khosla
for his decisions and actions surrounding
the use of non-campus police on May 6th, 2024
for inclusion on the Agenda of
the UCSD Senate Representative Assembly meeting
on June 4th, 2024,
for discussion and vote by the Representative Assembly

I. Preamble

The motion here put before the Representative Assembly for discussion and vote is a Resolution to Censure UCSD Chancellor Pradeep Khosla for his decisions and actions concerning the use of non-campus police to remove protesters, a majority of which were UCSD students, from UCSD's campus on May 6th, 2024.

The act of 'censure' here proposed is the formal statement of disapproval and condemnation of the Chancellor's specific decisions and actions surrounding the removal of the UCSD student protesters on May 6th 2024.

The decisions and actions in question are those which led to the Chancellor's authorization of approximately 200 non-campus police officers to enter campus early on the morning of May 6th, 2024, and to forcibly remove UCSD student protesters not just from the location of their protest but from campus entirely. The use of force included batons and chemical sprays.

One important motivation for putting this Resolution to Censure before the Assembly is to give a unified formal expression to the considerable number of strongly worded statements of disapproval of the Chancellor's actions which have been issued by a wide range of groups of Senate faculty across UCSD's campus. (§III provides some representative examples of such statements, which, taken collectively, have been signed by several hundred Senate faculty, across numerous departments and programs.)

A second and equally important motivation is to give an occasion for the Assembly as a whole to determine and officially state its own judgment on these specific decisions and actions by the Chancellor, and to do so separately from any judgment about Pradeep Khosla's overall fitness to remain in his role as Chancellor. Because the proposed act of Censure does not by itself imply or necessitate any judgment about overall fitness, support for this Resolution to Censure is therefore independent of, and compatible with, approving, rejecting, or abstaining from other Resolutions concerning the Chancellor which might come before the Assembly, such as: Resolutions expressing 'confidence' in the Chancellor (support for the Chancellor

remaining in his position) and Resolutions expressing ‘no confidence’ in the Chancellor (support for removing the Chancellor from his position).

II. Resolution to Censure

The Resolution to Censure to be discussed and then voted on is the following:

The UC San Diego Senate Representative Assembly hereby resolves to censure UC San Diego Chancellor Pradeep Khosla for his decisions and actions concerning the use of non-campus police to remove UC San Diego student protesters from campus by force on May 6th, 2024.

III. Supporting material

Below we provide links to several examples of statements from groups of Senate faculty expressing condemnation of the Chancellor’s decisions and actions in relation to the use of non-campus police to remove UCSD student protesters from campus on May 6th 2024. This list of statements is meant to be illustrative and is not in any way intended to be exhaustive. Taken together, these statements have the support of several hundred UCSD Senate faculty signatories, across a wide range of departments and programs.

Across these various statements, there is, to be sure, variation in the scope and degree of the condemnation of the Chancellor’s decisions and actions, and also variation in the grounds or reasons which are given for the condemnation, and, finally, variation in what consequences are called for, concerning the Chancellor’s present and future standing with the university. Support for the above Resolution to Censure does not require or imply support for all that is affirmed in these several statements, or support for all of the reasons given by each of these statements. The Resolution to Censure is meant to give expression to a common target across all of these condemnations (i.e., the Chancellor’s decisions and actions surrounding the use of non-campus police in relation to UCSD students), and also to give expression to the shared, forceful degree of disapproval in these statements, and, finally, to have the Assembly’s own decision on this matter be registered in a formal way in the official record through an Assembly vote.

Anthropology (9 faculty signatories)

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IWQfF8h7OBsCGTONTWEkhhBEXrp_r51HIK7imH9xTv_4/edit

Black Studies Project and Black Diaspora and African American Studies Program Joint Statement (program statement)
<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScDSn2b8JYHdmlhcTo2hxSd2N87XjUmWdoR-zdwpDtfMm3Ing/viewform>

Communication (department statement; see also SDFA list below)
<https://communication.ucsd.edu/about/department-statements1.html#Statement-on-the-Events-of-May->

Ethnic Studies (department statement; see also SDFA list below)
<https://ethnicstudies.ucsd.edu/about/statements-commentaries.html#Press-Release:-UCSD-Faculty-Cal>

Latin American Studies (57 faculty signatories)
<https://las.ucsd.edu/>

Literature (department statement; see also SDFA list below)
<https://literature.ucsd.edu/facultystatement.html>

Music (15 faculty signatories)
<https://sites.google.com/ucsd.edu/statement-on-may-6th/home?authuser=1>

Philosophy (22 faculty signatories)
<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/gtjzik4wmw1fgs6mm1cu/signed-statement-really-final.pdf?rlkey=yk3gqwjehtmlr0wu0o4vedgpr5&e=2&dl=0>

Sociology (14 faculty signatories)
<https://sociology.ucsd.edu/about/statement-by-sociology-faculty-on-emcampment-arrests.html>

Visual Arts (18 faculty signatories)
https://visarts.ucsd.edu/20240506_facultystatement.html

San Diego Faculty Association (200+ UCSD faculty signatories)
<https://sites.google.com/view/sdfastatement/home>

including:

Anthropology 8
Astronomy and Astrophysics 2
Cell and Developmental Biology 2
Chemistry and Biochemistry 1
Cognitive Science 2
Communication 16

Computer Science and Engineering 5
 Linguistics 5
 Economics 4
 Educational Studies 2
 Electrical and Computer Engineering 4
 Ethnic Studies 14
 Global Policy and Strategy 2
 History 19
 Literature 32
 Mathematics 3
 Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering 4
 Medical School 1
 Music 7
 Neurobiology 1
 Neuroscience 1
 Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences 1
 Philosophy 8
 Political Science 3
 Physics 3
 Psychology 8
 Rady School of Management 3
 School of Public Health 3
 Scripps Institute of Oceanography 5
 Sociology 9
 Structural Engineering 1
 Theater and Dance 11
 Urban Studies and Planning 4
 Visual Arts 11

IV. Signatories in support of the Resolution to Censure

UCSD Faculty in support of the **Resolution** to Censure
 [list as of Tuesday morning May 28th; updated list can be found [here](#)]

<i>Full Name</i>	<i>Faculty status</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
1. Clinton Tolley	Professor	Philosophy
2. Saba Bazargan	Associate Professor	Philosophy
3. Monte Johnson	Professor	Philosophy, UC San Diego
4. Karen Kovaka	Assistant Professor	Philosophy
5. Jonathan Cohen	professor	department of philosophy

14e_Resolution: Censure Chancellor Khosla

6. Kerry McKenzie	Associate Professor	Philosophy
7. William Bechtel	Professor Emeritus	Philosophy
8. Patricia Marechal	Assistant Professor	Philosophy
9. Daniel Widener	Professor	Department of History
10. Pamela Radcliff	Professor	Department of History
11. Ben Cowan	Professor	History
12. Marez, Curtis	Professor	UCSD
13. Ross Frank	Associate Professor	Ethnic Studies
14. Anthony Burr	Professor	Music
15. Nir Shafir	Assistant Professor	History
16. Hasan Kayali	Professor	Department of History
17. Sarah Schneewind	Full Professor	History Department
18. Nydia Pineda de Avila	Assistant Professor	History
19. Ulrike Strasser	Professor	Department of History
20. Nancy Kwak	Associate Professor	History, Urban Studies and Planning
21. Julia Ortony	Associate Professor	Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
22. Sara Johnson	Professor	Literature
23. Wilfrido Terrazas	Associate Professor	Music
24. Rihan Yeh	Associate Professor	Anthropology
25. Anna Joy Springer	Associate Professor	Literature Dept. & CGS
26. Ivano Caponigro	Professor	Linguistics
27. David Serlin	Professor	Department of Communication
28. Elana Zilberg	Associate Professor	Communication

29. Cathy Gere	Professor	History
30. M. Myrta Leslie Santana	Assistant Professor	Music
31. Brian Goldfarb	Associate Professor	Communication
32. Kelly Gates	Associate Professor	Communication
33. Julie Burelle	Associate Professor	Theatre and Dance
34. Ricardo Dominguez	Professor and Chair	Visual Arts
35. Tage Rai	Assistant Professor	Rady School of Management
36. Gary Fields	Professor	UCSD Dept. of Communication
37. Brandon Som	Associate Professor	Literature Department
38. Denise Demetriou	Professor	History
39. Vanessa Stalling	Associate Professor	Theatre and Dance
40. Andy Lamey	Teaching Professor	Philosophy
41. Grant Kester	Professor	Visual Arts Department
42. Sarah Creel	Professor	Cognitive Science
43. Jody Blanco	Professor	Literature
44. Daniel C. Hallin	Distinguished Professor Emeritus	Communication
45. Nina Zhiri	Professor	Literature
46. Amy Cimini	Associate Professor	Music
47. Karl Gerth	Professor	History
48. Mary Blair-Loy	Professor	Department of Sociology
49. Bonnie Kaiser	Associate Professor	Anthropology, Global Health
50. Frank Biess	Professor of History	Department of History

51. Mohan Trivedi	Distinguished Professor	ECE Jacobs School Engineering
52. Amy Sara Carroll	Associate Professor	Literature
53. Rayan Saab	Professor	Mathematics
54. Paul Sepuya	Associate Professor, MFA Faculty Director	Visual Arts
55. Deborah Hertz	Professor	History Department
56. Rosie C. Bermudez	Assistant Professor	Department of History
57. Tom Vogl	Associate Professor	Economics
58. Robert Castro	Professor	Dept. of Theatre & Dance
59. Ek Francisco Garfias Royo	Associate Professor	School of Global Policy and Strategy
60. Anya Gallaccio	Professor	Visual Arts
61. Eric Cho	Assistant Professor	Visual Arts
62. Jorge Mariscal	Emeritus Professor	Literature

V. Signatories in support of the Petition to include the Resolution on the RA Agenda

UCSD Faculty in support of the **Petition** to include the above Resolution to Censure on the Agenda for the Representative Assembly meeting on June 4th, 2024, as an item for discussion and voting.

[list as of Tuesday morning May 28th; updated list can be found [here](#)]

<i>Full Name</i>	<i>Faculty status</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
1. Clinton Tolley	Professor	Philosophy
2. Saba Bazargan	Associate Professor	Philosophy
3. Monte Johnson	Professor	Philosophy, UC San Diego
4. Karen Kovaka	Assistant Professor	Philosophy

5. Jonathan Cohen	professor	department of philosophy
6. Kerry McKenzie	Associate Professor	Philosophy
7. William Bechtel	Professor Emeritus	Philosophy
8. Patricia Marechal	Assistant Professor	Philosophy
9. Daniel Widener	Professor	Department of History
10. Pamela Radcliff	Professor	Department of History
11. Ben Cowan	Professor	History
12. Marez, Curtis	Professor	UCSD
13. Ross Frank	Associate Professor	Ethnic Studies
14. Anthony Burr	Professor	Music
15. Nir Shafir	Assistant Professor	History
16. Hasan Kayali	Professor	Department of History
17. Sarah Schneewind	Full Professor	History Department
18. Nydia Pineda de Avila	Assistant Professor	History
19. Ulrike Strasser	Professor	Department of History
20. Nancy Kwak	Associate Professor	History, Urban Studies and Planning
21. Julia Ortony	Associate Professor	Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
22. Sara Johnson	Professor	Literature
23. Wilfrido Terrazas	Associate Professor	Music
24. Rihan Yeh	Associate Professor	Anthropology
25. Anna Joy Springer	Associate Professor	Literature Dept. & CGS
26. Ivano Caponigro	Professor	Linguistics
27. David Serlin	Professor	Department of Communication
28. Elana Zilberg	Associate Professor	Communication

29. Cathy Gere	Professor	History
30. M. Myrta Leslie Santana	Assistant Professor	Music
31. Brian Goldfarb	Associate Professor	Communication
32. Kelly Gates	Associate Professor	Communication
33. Julie Burelle	Associate Professor	Theatre and Dance
34. Ricardo Dominguez	Professor and Chair	Visual Arts
35. Tage Rai	Assistant Professor	Rady School of Management
36. Gary Fields	Professor	UCSD Dept. of Communication
37. Brandon Som	Associate Professor	Literature Department
38. Denise Demetriou	Professor	History
39. Vanessa Stalling	Associate Professor	Theatre and Dance
40. Andy Lamey	Teaching Professor	Philosophy
41. Grant Kester	Professor	Visual Arts Department
42. Sarah Creel	Professor	Cognitive Science
43. Jody Blanco	Professor	Literature
44. Daniel C. Hallin	Distinguished Professor Emeritus	Communication
45. Nina Zhiri	Professor	Literature
46. Amy Cimini	Associate Professor	Music
47. Karl Gerth	Professor	History
48. Mary Blair-Loy	Professor	Department of Sociology
49. Bonnie Kaiser	Associate Professor	Anthropology, Global Health
50. Frank Biess	Professor of History	Department of History

14e_Resolution: Censure Chancellor Khosla

51. Mohan Trivedi	Distinguished Professor	ECE Jacobs School Engineering
52. Amy Sara Carroll	Associate Professor	Literature
53. Rayan Saab	Professor	Mathematics
54. Paul Sepuya	Associate Professor, MFA Faculty Director	Visual Arts
55. Deborah Hertz	Professor	History Department
56. Rosie C. Bermudez	Assistant Professor	Department of History
57. Vanesa Ribas	Associate Professor	Sociology
58. Tom Vogl	Associate Professor	Economics
59. Robert Castro	Professor	Dept. of Theatre & Dance
60. Deborah Stein	Associate Professor	Theatre & Dance
61. Ek Francisco Garfias Royo	Associate Professor	School of Global Policy and Strategy
62. Charles Curtis	Distinguished Professor	Department of Music
63. Anya Gallaccio	Professor	Visual Arts
64. Eric Cho	Assistant Professor	Visual Arts
65. Jorge Mariscal	Emeritus Professor	Literature

Dear UC San Diego Faculty Senate member,

In addition to the above **Presentation** of this Resolution, which was originally included in the material sent to the Representative Assembly in preparation for the June 4-6th Assembly meeting, the following two documents are included to provide background for the ballot item 'Resolution to Censure the Chancellor' you are now being asked to vote on (marked '14e' on the Representative Assembly meeting Agenda for June 4-6th 2024):

I. **Slides** presented at the UC San Diego Senate Representative Assembly meeting, June 4-6th, 2024, which provide an overview of the Resolution to Censure

II. A short **Discussion Guide** intended to help further clarify the Resolution to Censure, in light of the discussion and votes held during the Assembly meeting itself

Thank you for taking the time to think through this and all of the other ballot items,

Organizers of the Resolution to Censure
June 10, 2024

Resolution to Censure the Chancellor

presentation to the UCSD RA meeting
June 4th(-6th), 2024

overview: resolution to censure the Chancellor

1. **text:** *'The UC San Diego Senate Representative Assembly hereby resolves to censure UC San Diego Chancellor Pradeep Khosla for his decisions and actions concerning the use of non-campus police to remove UC San Diego student protesters from campus by force on May 6th, 2024.'*

2. **'censure':** 'censure' is independent of, and compatible with, approving, rejecting, or abstaining from a vote on 'confidence' or 'no confidence'

3. **object** of censure: censuring the Chancellor for these specific decisions and actions is compatible with having an on-balance positive, negative, or neutral judgment about Pradeep Khosla's performance during his tenure as Chancellor

4. **judgment:** censure is not a judgment about the rightfulness of either (i) the student protest itself or (ii) the cause which the student protest was meant to support; it is a judgment about the Chancellor's actions and decisions.

5. **reasons:** see next slide

key reasons given for why the Chancellor's decisions and actions merit censure

some of the main reasons for disapproval and condemnation of the Chancellor's decisions and actions which were highlighted in the various UCSD faculty statements (cf. the 'supporting material' in §III in the Presentation of the Resolution; also below):

(i) the Chancellor's failure to protect the **free speech** of the protesting students

(ii) the Chancellor's failure to pursue **de-escalative options** (including via campus police) to address any concerns regarding **safety** in and around the protest, despite UC-systemwide policy calling for this (compare the 2012 Robinson-Edley report)

(iii) the Chancellor's failure to pursue (let alone exhaust) meaningful **dialogue** with the UCSD **student** protesters, during the week of the protest's existence, even when given concrete opportunities by faculty senate leadership,

(iv) the Chancellor's failure to engage in **deliberation** with and seek counsel from UCSD **senate faculty** leadership itself, during the week of the protest's existence, as to potential decisions and actions (failure to respect shared faculty governance),

(v) the Chancellor's failure to protect the protesting **students** from **disproportionately punitive actions** associated with arrest and interim suspension (including being barred from campus and from their dormitories)

(vi) the importance of the Senate's forcefully and **officially marking these failures**, so as to **deter** similar decisions and actions from the present Chancellor and those to come

supplementary material: UCSD faculty statements expressing condemnation of the Chancellor's actions

<p>Anthropology: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lWQfF8h7OBsCGTONTWEkhhBEXrpr51HIK7imH9xTv_4/edit</p> <p>Black Studies Project / Black Diaspora: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScDSn2b8JYHdmlhcTo2hxSd2N87XjUmWdoR-zdwpDtfMm3Ing/viewform</p> <p>Communication: https://communication.ucsd.edu/about/department-statements1.html#Statement-on-the-Events-of-May-</p> <p>Ethnic Studies: https://ethnicstudies.ucsd.edu/about/statements-commentaries.html#Press-Release:-UCSD-Faculty-Cal</p>	<p>Latin American Studies: https://las.ucsd.edu/</p> <p>Literature: https://literature.ucsd.edu/facultystatement.html</p> <p>Music: https://sites.google.com/ucsd.edu/state-ment-on-may-6th/home?authuser=1</p> <p>Philosophy: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/gtjezik4wmw1fgs6mm1cu/signedstatement-really-final.pdf?rlkey=yk3gqwjehmlr0wu0o4vedgpr5&e=3&dl=0</p>	<p>Sociology: https://sociology.ucsd.edu/about/statement-by-sociology-faculty-on-emcampment-arrests.html</p> <p>Visual Arts: https://visarts.ucsd.edu/20240506_facultystatement.html</p> <p>SD Faculty Association: https://sites.google.com/view/sdfastatement/home</p> <p>collective UCSD Faculty statement and testimony from first-hand visits to the student protests: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1aHgGiddDhgE0-IDxsTUf1Nk_n1F3n0nhF2vJ8NSFfXc/edit</p>
--	--	---

supplementary material: 'censure' in the context of the US senate



About Censure



Article I, section 5 of the United States Constitution provides that "Each House [of Congress] may determine the Rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member." Among the ways in which the Senate has disciplined its members is censure, sometimes referred to as condemnation or denouncement. Censure is a formal statement of disapproval in the form of a resolution that is adopted by majority vote. The term "censure" is not found in the Constitution, and the word does not have to appear in the resolution. A censure does not remove a senator from office nor does it deny to a senator his or her rights or privileges. Since 1789 the Senate has censured nine of its members for conduct that senators determined to be inappropriate or detrimental to the Senate.

Discussion Guide for the Resolution to Censure the Chancellor

[*note*: this Guide was written after the June 4-6th Representative Assembly meeting, in light of the discussion and votes that were held there. The main goal is to help further address some points that came up during those debates, and especially to help further clarify, on the one hand, the relation between this Resolution to Censure (RA Agenda item 14e) and the two other faculty-petitioned Resolutions that will be included on this same Ballot (Agenda items 14a and 14d), as well as, on the other hand, its relation to the four Questions which are included on the Senate Council Ballot (Agenda item 10a). A further hope is to also provide some guidance for how to think through all of these Resolutions and Questions more generally. – *Organizers of the Resolution to Censure*]

A. 'Censure' vs. 'No Confidence'

1. While the act of 'Censure' involves more than merely expressing some degree or other of disapproval (as is asked about in Council Ballot Question #1 on 10a) – since censure is an expression of a strong condemnation – censuring is a *weaker* expression of disapproval than expressing 'No Confidence' in the Chancellor (as is asked about in Senate Question #3 on 10a).

2. That Censure is *weaker* than expressing 'No Confidence' is especially important to highlight, given the positioning of the Council Ballot Question about Censure as Question #4 on 10a. Because it is positioned after/below the Question about No Confidence (Question #3 on 10a), this might give the misleading impression that Censure is an even more severely negative act than expressing No Confidence. (Indeed, this sort of impression seemed to have been unfortunately conveyed by the Resolution to Censure (14e) being placed after the Resolution on No Confidence (14d) on the Assembly's Agenda, judging by the very brief discussion at the Assembly meeting surrounding the Resolution to Censure.) In fact,

the order of severity goes in the opposite direction: expressing 'No Confidence' is a more negative judgment of the Chancellor than the one involved in the act of Censure.

3. As is explained in the accompanying Slides and Presentation material, 'Censure' is a strong negative judgment (disapproval, condemnation) directed specifically at the Chancellor's *decisions and actions* in relation to the UCSD student protesters. 'No Confidence' goes beyond this judgment to render a further negative judgment, and one with a wider scope, since it is one directed at the Chancellor's *overall fitness* to remain in his position.

4. Because of this difference, someone's voting to 'Censure' the Chancellor's decisions and actions (via Question #4, or Resolution 14e) leaves it open whether or not they also mean to support the *further, stronger, broader* act of expressing 'No Confidence' as well. Conversely, since everyone who votes 'Yes' (via Council Ballot Question #3, or via Resolution 14d) to express 'No Confidence' in the Chancellor would seem to thereby also be signaling support for a 'Censure' of the Chancellor's decisions and actions, it would therefore seem likely for those voting 'Yes' on 'No Confidence' to also vote 'Yes' on the weaker act of Censure (via Question #4 and Resolution 14e) – not least in the interest of trying to make sure that at least one official negative judgment of the Chancellor's actions is filed by the faculty, in the event that both 'No Confidence' items fail.

5. Examples of 'Censure' and 'No Confidence' coming apart: Someone might have a very negative judgment of the Chancellor's decisions and actions in this specific case, while also judging the Chancellor to be, on balance, fit to continue as Chancellor, and so vote 'Yes' on 'Censure' while also voting 'No' on 'No Confidence'. Similarly, someone else might also have a very negative judgment of the Chancellor's actions in this case, while being unsure about their judgment of the Chancellor's overall fitness, and so vote 'Yes' on 'Censure' while also voting 'Abstain' on 'No Confidence'. (For some discussion of the relation between Censure and 'Confidence', see below, §C.)

B. The relation between the Resolution to Censure and Senate Question #4

1. The original text of this Resolution (14e) to Censure the Chancellor (as given in the Slides and in §II of the Presentation material) was already very close to the 'Statement' which would result from voting 'Yes' on Question #4 (concerning 'Censure') on the Senate Ballot (10a). The main initial difference in the wording between the two was due to the fact that the Resolution to Censure was first formulated (in 14e) so as to be an act of the UCSD Representative Assembly, where it was first debated and voted on, whereas the Statement from Senate Council was formulated from the outset so as to be an act of the whole UCSD faculty (the whole 'San Diego Division of the Academic Senate'). At the Assembly meeting, it was requested that this Resolution to Censure (14e) be included on a ballot to all faculty, along with the Resolutions for Confidence and No Confidence, for vote by the whole faculty as well. The wording for this Resolution (14e) on the current electronic ballot now before you has been amended from a call for the Representative Assembly vote, to a call for a vote on Censure by the whole San Diego Division of the Academic Senate.

2. Because this brings the two propositions even closer into line, the explanation given in the Presentation materials of the motivations behind the formulation of this Resolution (14e), and then the reasons given in the Slides to support this Resolution, might thus be taken also as indicating motivations and reasons for voting 'Yes' on Senate Ballot Question #4 as well.

3. In contrast to the near-coincidence of the text of this Resolution to Censure (14e) and Question #4 from 10a, the wording of the two faculty-petitioned Resolutions concerning 'Confidence' (14a) and 'No Confidence' (14d) coincides much less with the wording of the Statements in the Senate Ballot Questions #2 concerning 'Confidence' and #3 concerning 'No Confidence', respectively. This fact was pointed out repeatedly during the Assembly meeting, with

supporters and detractors of these Resolutions alike highlighting the varying though potentially significant degrees to which the formulations of these two faculty-petitioned Resolutions (14a, 14d) diverge from the formulations of the 'Statements' which would result from voting 'Yes' on the corresponding Senate Council Ballot Questions (#2, #3).

3.1. The importance of the divergence of 14a from Council Ballot Question #2 was emphasized repeatedly by supporters of the faculty-petitioned Resolution concerning 'Confidence', during the discussions of this Resolution in the Representative Assembly meeting. Supporters of the Confidence Resolution wanted to make especially clear that their own 'Resolution' (14a) contained different and quite specific content that they were asking the faculty also affirm and endorse, content that went well beyond the general affirmation of 'Confidence' in the Chancellor that would be endorsed by voting 'Yes' on Council Ballot Question #2.

3.2. Because of this divergence between the Resolution for Confidence (14a) and the Council Ballot Question #2 which parallels it, someone could want to vote 'Yes' on the general question of Confidence in the Chancellor, as posted in Question #2 (in 10a), but not want to approve or endorse the specific formulation of Confidence that is given in the 'Resolution' version (in 14a) – and so ultimately vote 'No' or 'Abstain' on the Resolution Ballot version (14a), despite voting 'Yes' on Question #2 (in 10a). Similarly, someone could be unsure about the general question of Confidence, and so 'Abstain' on Question #2, but be sure about not wanting support the formulation of Confidence in the Resolution version (14a), and so vote 'No' on the Resolution version.

3.3. It was less clear from the debate whether the supporters of the faculty-petitioned Resolution expressing 'No Confidence' (14d) meant for there to be any significant differences in their formulation of their Resolution and the Statement on the Council Ballot Question #3. Even so, if someone were concerned about any of the wording in the Resolution version, they might want to vote 'Yes' on the

general question of No Confidence in the Chancellor, as posted in Question #3, but be unsure as to whether or not they would want to approve or endorse the specific formulation of No Confidence that is given in the 'Resolution' version (14d), and might vote 'Abstain' on the Resolution version. Similarly, someone could be unsure about the general question of No Confidence, and so 'Abstain' on the Question #3, but be sure about not wanting to support the specific formulation of No Confidence in the Resolution version, and so vote 'No' on the Resolution version (14d).

4. Returning back to the 'Censure' items: because the re-formulation of the Resolution concerning Censure (14e) for this ballot (ie as an act of the whole Senate faculty) and the Statement which would result from voting 'Yes' on Council Ballot Question #4 are now so closely overlapping, it would seem likely that one's votes on this Resolution (14e) and then on the Question #4 would also be very closely aligned.

C. 'Censure' and 'Confidence'

1. Especially in light of the divergence between the Resolution concerning 'Confidence' (14a) and the Statement that would result from voting 'Yes' on Senate Question #2, and their independence from one another, it is also worth emphasizing that a vote to approve 'Censure' of the Chancellor (again: concerning the specific decisions and actions in question) leaves open one's position on Senate Question #2 itself.

2. Perhaps you yourself are someone who has, on balance, a positive (or at least not especially negative) judgment about the Chancellor's overall performance in his role, but you have also come to form a decidedly negative judgment about the Chancellor's decisions and actions in this case (perhaps for reasons overlapping with those given in the Slides). It is open to you, then, to vote 'Yes' on Council Ballot Question #2 and express confidence in the Chancellor overall, while still also voting 'Yes' both on Senate Question #4 and on this Resolution to Censure (14e) as well. (For

example, you might vote for Censure (Yes on #4, 14e) so as to convey, to the current Chancellor and future Chancellors alike, your serious disapproval and condemnation of the specific course of his decisions and actions which led to the events of May 6th – even though you do not feel the need to couple this expression with a call for the Chancellor to leave his office.)

3. It is less clear how supporting the faculty-petitioned Resolution concerning Confidence (14a) is compatible with voting ‘Yes’ on either this Resolution to Censure (14e) or the Senate Question #4 concerning ‘Censure’. The formulation of that Resolution (14a) seems to include a strong endorsement, not just of the Chancellor’s overall fitness, but specifically of the Chancellor’s ‘decisions’ and ‘actions’ – while both the Resolution (14e) and Question #4 concerning Censure call for strong disapproval and condemnation of these very same decisions and actions.