

2016/2017 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
October 24, 2016**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Nine Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Kimbarow, Sabalius,
Van Selst, Lee
Absent: Pérea

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Lee, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Sen
Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Papazian, Faas, Blaylock
Absent: Lanning, Feinstein

COB Representatives:

Present: Reade, Rodan, Campsey
Absent: None

Deans:

Present: Green, Stacks, Jacobs,
Schutten
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Laker, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Caesar, Balal, Tran,
Torres-Mendoza
Absent: Spica, Medina

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Sullivan-Green, Chung, Hamed-Hagh
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters
Absent: None

H&A Representatives:

Present: Frazier, Grindstaff, Riley
Ormsbee, Miller, Khan
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski
Absent: None

SCI Representatives:

Present: Kaufman, White, Cargill, Boekema
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley
Absent: None

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Trulio, Curry, Hart
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Higgins, Trousedale
Absent: Kauppila

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of September 26, 2016 were approved as written.

The minutes of October 10, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Sabalius.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kimbarow recently attended the Senate Chair’s meeting in Long Beach. The major topic was the pending tuition increase. The rest of the meeting was mostly administrative about what was going on at each campus.

Announcements:

Chair Kimbarow reminded Senators that the election was in two weeks and to consider voting yes on proposition 65. This is critical to the continued funding for the CSU.

Senators were invited to the annual holiday party at the President's home on December 4, 2016 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Senators were reminded to save the date for the Senate Retreat on Friday, January 27, 2017 from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

The annual Senate photo will be taken at the next Senate meeting on November 21, 2016 in this room.

B. From the President of the University –

President Papazian announced that she has been in active discussions about how to ensure the safety of students, faculty, and staff on and near our campus.

President Papazian is looking at the nature of the alerts that are given out to the campus. There are certain requirements that the campus has, but the key to sending out these alerts is “a clear and present danger.” The question is what if it isn’t a clear and present danger, or the incident happened in the past. One of the problems that we have is that when too many alerts are issued people stop reading them, and then when we actually have an alert people won’t read the emails. There may be other ways to communicate incidents that happen on campus. President Papazian will be working on developing a policy that makes sense.

President Papazian believes in being as transparent as possible even with the press about the issues and ongoing investigations on campus. It has been the President’s experience that when you let the press know that this is a privacy issue or an active investigation, they usually respect that.

President Papazian has been meeting with local legislators. She recently met with Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren who had not been on campus for some time. They talked about ways they might work together. Hopefully this will lead to some positive opportunities for the campus. President Papazian also met with Assemblyman Low and he is very interested in bringing policy changes that promote student success. President Papazian then met with Mayor Liccardo and they talked a little bit about the joint agreement with the city and SJSU regarding the MLK Library. About 90% of the incidents that occur in the library involve non-academic and non-university personnel. That is a challenge. However, we are committed to the partnership and so is the city. The city has introduced someone to work in the area of mental health with the library to help with the needs of the local homeless population and to link them up with resources in the area. Dean Elliott will be working and following up with her city counterpart on library issues.

President Papazian announced there were several wonderful events recently at the Hammer Theatre. The mayor and President Papazian hosted a reception there to kick off their partnership. There was also an extraordinary film at the Hammer Theatre last night that had to do with human trafficking.

President Papazian has also spent some time with the leadership of the Research Foundation. The Research Foundation supports our faculty, and our students. We need to find that true balance for our faculty between research and teaching mission. President Papazian is fully committed to the research mission, because in “our 21st Century environment, healthy and good teaching is informed by active and engaged scholarship as appropriate.”

Last night President Papazian was at the Hispanic Foundation Ball, which was actually an amazing event. This is an educational foundation that raises money to support our Hispanic students. They have a wonderful initiative now in the area of STEM where they are raising money for scholarships for students to come to universities in the area to pursue STEM careers. Many of the students come to SJSU. The President is in the process of identifying space in our library for undocumented students. Where they can come get the support they need.

President Papazian spent some time in Omaha to chair the C. Peter Magrath Community Engagement Scholarship Award Committee. The McGrath Award is the award that we won at SJSU last year for CommUniverCity San José. The President was very proud of the work that SJSU had done.

President Papazian has also been asked to be on the Board of HERS. This is a women’s leadership in higher education group. President Papazian is very committed to fostering leadership of all kinds, but especially women’s leadership. President Papazian has benefited greatly from the mentorship and generosity of many and feels this is a way to give back to the community.

President Papazian will be at the National Association of System Heads Workshop and will have to miss the next Senate meeting. This workshop will focus on how to support student success. The President will be highlighting our partnership between Academic and Student Affairs. How that was developed, and what the goals and processes are.

Finally, the President has been asked to serve on the search committee for the new CSU Vice Chancellor for Human Resources.

The Chancellor has launched a conversation with our students around the possibility of a tuition increase. The reality is that nobody wants a tuition increase, but at the same time mandatory costs go up. The shortfall between the Governor’s proposed budget and the budget we need to actually deliver the programs, including the graduation initiative, is about \$159 million.

President Papazian announced that Measure B is a transportation measure that would bring Bart to San Jose. SJSU is the largest footprint in the Bay area with 39,000 people, but we haven't been asked for our input on this. Now we are becoming part of the conversation, because President Papazian has been talking to everyone about it.

Questions:

Q: Some proposed tuition increases are intended as leverage on the Governor and legislators. Other tuition increases are planned in conjunction with the Governor and legislators, which kind of tuition increase is this one?

A: There is another avenue. What would suffer is the graduation initiative, because that needs funds. This means putting faculty in the classroom. From a quality of education point of view, there is no doubt that we need to be moving towards hiring more tenure/tenure-track faculty. However, the funding needs to be there, because you can't hire people with one-time money.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

EC Minutes of September 12, 2016 – no questions.

EC Minutes of October 3, 2016 – no questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

Consent Calendar of October 24, 2016 – approved (49-0-0).

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

V. New Business – None

VI. Unfinished Business: None

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.

A. University Library Board (ULB) – None.

B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –

C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – None.

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1632, Amendment B to University Policy S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Composition of Recruitment Committees (First Reading)*. This came to PS as a referral from people interested in searching for interdisciplinary positions and wanted to know if there was a way to

staff a search committee with people from more than one department and in the existing policy there is no way to do this. This amendment makes it possible for the home department, if it chooses to do so, to elect members from other departments to round out a search committee. The home department would retain a majority of the members.

Questions:

Q: My question is in regards to section 3.2.4 and a search for a tenured position, has the committee considered allowing probationary faculty to participate in recruitment so that the department as a whole can work together on recruiting their new faculty member?

A: The committee has considered it and in fact there was a time when probationary faculty could not serve on a search committee at all, but now they can serve on a search committee for a faculty member of equal or lower rank. However, the committee has not considered allowing an assistant professor to serve on a search committee for an associate or full professor for the same reasons they don't serve on RTP committees. Maybe we should consider that. The concern was that an assistant professor should not be hiring someone that could be evaluating him/her.

Q: Would the committee consider building in some language around balance and diversity?

A: There is some general language, but the committee will look at this again.

Q: Can the committee please consider 3.2.4. We rarely hire people that are tenured in my department, and when we do they are usually hired into a chair position. Probationary faculty would have a great stake in this because this would be their immediate supervisor.

A: When it comes to hiring a Chair, the Chair's policy has a parallel process and all faculty in the department have a role in that. However, it is a separate role than in the RTP process.

Senator Peter presented *AS 1633, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (Final Reading)*. Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the effective date in the 2nd Resolved clause from "Spring 2016" to "as soon as possible." **The Senate voted and AS 1633 passed as amended** (39-0-2).

Note: The Senate discussed a difference in the free response questions between the SOTE and SOLATE. The SOTE and SOLATE cannot be amended on the Senate floor and must be amended by the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB). Emily Slusser, Chair of SERB, explained this was a mistake.

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1626, Modification of Bylaw 6.13: Conversion of College Seats to at-large Seats (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1626 passed** (31-0-1).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1628, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents (Final Reading)*. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 27 to read, “unanimous consent from, the Executive Committee and the President can correct the error(s).” Senator Van Selst presented a motion to return the resolution to committee. **The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion passed** (29-0-2).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)*. The information about voting rights currently can be found in multiple documents, particularly the voting rights and selection and review of department chairs policies. Both of these policies are currently under review. Since they are both under review, we need to keep the last resolved clause which starts on line 36. This allows us to keep one piece of the voting rights policy, while scrapping the rest. Lecturer votes related to department chair recommendations remain advisory until University Policy S14-8, Selection and Review of Department Chairs, is amended or rescinded by the Professional Standards Committee.

The O&G Committee went through multiple rounds of discussion on section 2.1 regarding whether there were times that voting should be required. The consensus was yes, and this is added to section 2.1.

In section 3.1, voting rights specific to curriculum would be restricted to regular faculty. Regular faculty are defined as our tenure and tenure/track faculty. Then in section 3.3, faculty on loan to another department can request departmental voting rights in that department and the regular faculty in that department can subsequently grant them voting rights in their department. This was important and the committee went back and forth about it and decided that the department should have a say in this. Section 3.6 clarifies that faculty suspended from their department retain their voting rights. O&G discussions regarding this section included feedback from Faculty Affairs. Article 17 and Article 19 of the CFA contract refer to several kinds of suspensions, however, all of them assume the faculty member is coming back after the suspension. You cannot deprive them of voting rights when they return from suspension.

In section 4, the language for temporary faculty parallels the language for permanent faculty. In section 5, O&G had a lengthy discussion. What was proposed is that faculty serving as chair outside their department have full voting rights in the department that they chair and retain voting rights in their home department.

O&G does understand that bylaw 1.7 will have to be amended if this policy passes at final reading.

Questions:

Q: In section 1.1.1, line 109, page 4, it reads, “Engagement in deliberations prior to voting should be the norm as it leads to more informed decision making.” However, 1.1.1 is referenced in sections 3.4, 3.5, and 5.2, and in section 3.4 it takes on a requirement and is no longer a recommendation, so what is the committee trying to accomplish—to broaden or restrict voting rights?

A: O&G struggled with sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. Section 3.4 is talking about leave, and if you are on leave you should be part of a deliberation before you vote.

Q: A person could vote and not be informed, and a person could be informed and sleep through the deliberations. Why is this struck in section 4.4?

A: If faculty are on partial leave they should still be there.

Q: In line 138, section 2.1.1.1, it talks about situations where departments form a special department curriculum committee and the deliberations that occur there, and faculty outside the department committee can ask that the decision be reviewed. My question is what was the deliberation around this and why is it necessary?

A: One of the examples we heard included a committee of two or three making a curriculum decision that goes straight to the college and faculty don’t have any input. The balance O&G came to was to say that the faculty member could request that the item be considered. O&G tried to find a middle ground that would not halt or slow down the business of the department.

Q: I understand it would be inappropriate for a faculty member to go to a chair and have the chair immediately forward that course to the college, but in this particular situation you are saying there has been a department curriculum committee and if that faculty member is concerned about curriculum then they should serve on that department curriculum committee.

A: Let me clarify. You said voted on by the faculty, in several cases the faculty are appointed to the department curriculum committee, and so that is another reason for having the opportunity to question things.

Q: Why would this then be only for curriculum, why not for scholarship department committees, etc.?

A: O&G got feedback that if you open this up to everything under the sun, nothing will get done. For curriculum issues, it was important to have checks and balances.

Q: For junior faculty serving on the department curriculum committee did O&G consider the potential repercussions for them when having discussions with tenured faculty that might be upset with the department curriculum decisions?

A: O&G saw no repercussions, but we will bring this back to the committee.

Q: I read ambiguity in the language in section 2.1. It is not clear to me whether this means every single regular faculty member has to vote in a given election, or an election must be held and all regular faculty members have a right to vote.

A: The point of this is that voting is required for these things.

Q: Then I think you need to say that all regular faculty members are required to vote.

A: All regular faculty are not required to vote, but voting is required.

Q: Would you agree there is ambiguity there? I think the committee should work on

this.

A: The committee will review the language.

Q: In line 158, section 3.2, this sounds like language appropriate for temporary faculty members, are there permanent faculty that aren't wholly within a department?

A: There are five of them. Faculty Affairs gave the committee some good data on this and 99.2% of faculty work in one department, but .8 % work in more than one department.

Q: On line 203, it states "excluding those relegated to regular faculty..." Can we say something like "entrusted to," or "designated for"?

A: Sure, the committee will consider it.

Q: On the matter of temporary faculty, notwithstanding the fact that there are probably good reasons to oppose allowing temporary faculty to vote on curriculum, and notwithstanding the fact that there have been situations on this campus where temporary faculty have outvoted the permanent faculty on curricular matters at times when the full-time faculty have been severely opposed to the curricular matter, but given the fact that there are other departments where temporary faculty don't do such things and do write curricula, propose courses, pass them and teach them, (for example, Senator Khan is a lecturer in our department and holds a doctorate) is there room to compromise such that individual departments could have the leeway to allow temporary faculty voting on committees on curriculum matters?

A: This is university policy and it applies to faculty across the university, so whatever comes out of it we cannot have a clause that says departments can say what the rights are of lecturers. However, the committee will consider it.

Q: Section 1.3 and 7.1.3 indicate that faculty only vote in meetings, for example let's take the example of the person that requests a vote on a curriculum matter, does that faculty member have to bring that up in a department meeting and then make the request faculty vote on the request to determine whether there should be a vote on the matter, or might there be room in the policy to allow some departments that hold votes outside of meetings, to have items voted on by faculty members in other places?

A: I believe that provision is already here because it does say that the regular faculty can decide on the process, and the process can vary from one type of decision made to another type of decision made and how you are going to do them. However, we will review the policy and make sure that is in there.

Q: Section 7.1.3 says formal voting shall only be conducted after a proposal has been discussed and those eligible to vote are those who participate in deliberations in person prior to the vote.

A: That only pertains to a formal vote, one where you are required to make a motion, have a second, have discussion, and then vote.

Q: So this policy doesn't regulate non-formal votes?

A: The committee will review this for clarity.

Q: There are several policies where voting is regulated such as in the Board of General Studies policy, etc. It would be great if this policy could list all voting policies in section 2.1.

A: The only two policies we found that were relevant were the RTP policy and the Selection and Review of Department Chairs policy, and we can give you policy numbers for those.

Q: In Section 7.1, should procedures be in place in departments, or may faculty change the voting procedures each time they vote?

A: When it comes up is how I read that.

Q: Can disruptive faculty tie the hands of the department because they may with every vote say, “no, we need a different kind of vote for this matter?”

A: The committee will review and discuss this.

Q: May volunteer faculty vote? Also, can we refer to lecturers as lecturers and not temporary faculty? May department chairs exclude faculty from voting if they deem them as not having participated in the deliberations?

A: The committee will review and discuss this.

Q: On line 96, it says, “The ideals of higher education are rooted in principles of democracy and shared governance.” This policy is actually curtailing the voting rights of temporary faculty, and many temporary faculty members serve on curriculum committees. This policy goes against the ideal of shared governance. What is the rationale behind limiting the rights of temporary faculty?

A: Lecturers are part time and the consensus in all the feedback O&G got is that one problem departments are faced with is that there are more lecturers in terms of FTEF than regular faculty, and regular faculty have made a commitment and are here long term as compared to lecturers that are only here part time.

Q: There is some ambiguity in section 7.1.3. If I am present but do not speak, am I participating? One could read it that way. This needs to be rethought.

A: The committee will discuss this.

Q: Can we define what deliberation means?

A: The committee will review and discuss this.

Q: In our department, we have moved to all electronic voting. Voting remains open for a week after a department meeting to allow people that are not there to vote. This policy appears to change that. There is also an implicit assumption in the policy that committee actions get reported out to the department at some level. And, I just don't understand section 3.9.

A: Section 3.9 came up because faculty felt pressure to participate and there is no obligation for faculty, other than regular faculty members, to serve on committees that deliberate on matters entrusted to the regular faculty. This is curriculum predominantly, but we will play with the language to clarify.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1635, Amendment A to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (First Reading)*. Concern has been raised that having students on every administrator search and review committee may not be a reasonable arrangement. This amendment allows some flexibility in the formation of search and review committees to enable them to be tailored to the particular position up for review or selection.

Questions:

Q: Can you give an example of an administrator position that would not require student representation?

A: I don't know, but the issue was raised in the search for the AVP of Faculty Affairs.

Q: I strongly believe that students should be represented on every search for the high level administrator searches. If there are exceptions, then we should lay out those exceptions instead of passing a blanket rule.

A: I hear you. What I would say is that there is an obligation in this policy to keep the search committees small, but to have diverse representation. The relationship between students and the AVP of Faculty Affairs position is indirect at best, and if you are going to create a search or review committee and have a student it is at the price of one less chair or faculty member. Maybe this is a place where a student is not needed.

Q: Did O&G check with students to see if they had objections to relinquishing their seats on these committees?

A: There is a student representative on O&G.

Q: In the spirit of shared governance, I would suggest that if there is an instance where a student might not be needed, they should be consulted and given the opportunity to decline participation rather than creating a policy that suggests that they not serve on the committee. I can't see any Vice President position where the students will not be working with the VP on some level.

A: That point was raised. In committee discussions the example used was the hiring of faculty in the departments. Students are not usually involved in those committees. However, I get your point.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1634, Constitutional Amendment, Modification of Senate Constitution Related to Membership (First Reading)*. This is the first step in a process that leads to an amendment to our constitution. Amendments to our constitution can be proposed to the faculty-at-large provided that amendment receives a majority vote in the Academic Senate. Today is the first step in that process and this amendment proposes a change in the administrators on the Academic Senate. This amendment would remove the VP for University Advancement and replace him with the Chief Diversity Officer.

Questions:

Q: What is the position of our VP of University Advancement on his removal from the Senate?

A: We have had multiple discussions with the VP of University Advancement and he feels strongly that his time could be better spent in service to the university by using the time he would be spending in the Senate and on the Executive Committee to work with donors. The direct relationship of University Advancement to the business of the Senate is very small and he recognizes that. He would still be happy to make annual reports to the Senate on the University Advancement activities. Part of the discussion involved consideration for having the Senate Chair serve on the Tower Foundation Board. This is in response to a long-standing discussion in the Executive Committee with all the administrators.

Q: Could you give us the history of this Vice President's service on the Academic Senate?

A: When you look back in time, this position did not have a very robust advancement effort. That component of their work was not as big as it is now. The Vice President of University Advancement has only been on the Academic Senate for about eight years.

VIII. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.

A. CSU Statewide Senators –

The Faculty Affairs Committee that Senator Sabalius sits on discussed the Academic Freedom policy. The Chancellor's Office is now in discussion with the ASCSU on Academic Freedom. The Faculty Affairs Committee also discussed how to provide long term lecturers with more job security, and plans to increase tenure density.

Both the Chancellor's GE Advisory Committee and the Senate Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committees discussed actions regarding implementation of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report.

Senator Lee reports that the Senate Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee discussed how to inform the legislators that if they want to legislate on transfers between community colleges and the CSU, they should consult with the ASCSU and find out what's actually going on before determining that there should be some regulation put in place. There will be some communication to the legislature about that. Essentially, there was a claim that we were doing very little to help students out whereas we have devoted many, many worker hours to helping out.

Finally, the Chancellor's request for a tuition increase was discussed and it sounded like there may be an equivalency between the amount requested and the amount required for faculty raises, so there might be an effort for some state bodies to pit students against faculty. However, our committee decided we should support our Chancellor, because we have to fund the things we say we are going to do and wait until there is actually an eminent move to raise tuition before making a final decision on that matter.

Senator Sabalius announced that 15 years ago when he started on the CSU Statewide Senate, the way we treated lecturers was an exception. However, over the last decade more and more campuses have come to include lecturers and now look to us as an example of how to do things. We are still on the forefront in this area and set a good example for the entire CSU system.

B. Provost – None

C. Vice President of Finance and Administration –

Because of the rain this evening the campus safety walk has been moved to Wednesday night. It will be at 7:30 p.m. starting near the FD&O Building.

Also, one of our students sent an email this weekend about the noise in some of the classrooms from the construction. VP Faas will be meeting with the student this week. If faculty have problems with this just contact VP Faas and he will work with FD&O to come up with a solution to the problem.

Questions:

Q: Now that students are in the new dorm, can you give a brief update on how things went?

A: I'd be happy to, but I'm going to let VP Blaylock speak to that. However, they are really happy. The students and resident advisors are thrilled.

Q: What is the formula we have for staffing our Police Department?

A: We are down a number of officers right now. We are competing with the City of San Jose for officers. Some of our officers have been taken by surrounding cities. We are trying to make sure our salaries are comparable with the surrounding areas to be competitive. We are sourced from a budget point of view correctly. This is done on a campus-by-campus basis.

Q: A number of years ago we had a non-motorized vehicle policy. I've noticed recently that there are two buildings where we seem to be having skateboard activity that is damaging the buildings and one of those is the new stairs adjoining the ramp from the 4th street garage. There are chunks out of the steps now. The other is the Northside of Uchida Hall where the new Auditorium is, the outside wall seems to have been used for skateboarding.

A: We will look at those areas.

Q: There is another area and it is the courtyard near Sweeney Hall. The skateboarding disrupts my class.

A: We will look into that.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs –

Moving the students into CV2 was very special for a number of reasons. First, we had a chance to reflect on the transition itself. Our custodial and maintenance staff all

worked together. This Wednesday we are having a lunch for our custodial staff to express our appreciation for the spur of the moment work they did for us.

What was amazing was that students were scheduled by floors to move into CV2 and we had hired professional movers to help the students. At 7 a.m. the students were waiting outside to move in, they didn't want to wait for the movers. These students then came back and helped their friends move in. The students have given the new resident halls the title of "The Hotel," because there are so many amenities.

This is our fifth year hosting about 2,000 high school students and they will be able to apply to the campus while they are here on this Saturday. For the first time in the history of financial aid in this country, the deadline has been moved up to October 1st from January 1st or 2nd, so students are applying now. We have a chance on Saturday to get them into the financial aid conversations. All 31 districts in this region will be represented.

One of the faculty Senators referred a student to Cal Fresh and in two days that student was receiving \$150 a week for food. Also, last week we had the food pantries here and in one hour we served 329 students in the Event Center. VP Blaylock and Provost Feinstein are talking about doing some cooking demonstrations, because at the event they were giving away recipe cards and some students didn't know how to cook the produce that we had. We may have a "Chopped" competition with faculty.

The African-American College Readiness Summit is next month. This summit has grown so large the middle and high schools had to be separated.

Questions:

Q: Can you tell us a little more about what you are doing to counsel some of our homeless students about getting financial aid?

A: The Economic Crisis Response Team (ECRT) launched a new website August 1, 2016. As of September 16, 2016, there were 103 students that had signed up for food or housing. We know that hungry students don't do well in classes. Often students do not know how to complete the financial aid process, or where to turn in a crisis. Over 70% of the students referred to us come from faculty.

Q: Where do faculty send a student they suspect is homeless?

A: Send them to the Financial Aid and Scholarships or to VP Blaylock directly.

Q: Could you create some materials for the campus that tell us where to direct students for what services? Maybe these materials could be made a part of the new faculty orientation?

A: Yes.

E. Associated Students President (AS) – None

F. Vice President for University Advancement – None

IX. Special Committee Reports – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.