

2016/2017 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
November 21, 2016**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

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

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Sen
Absent: Lee

Administrative Representatives:

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

COB Representatives:

Present: Reade, Rodan
Absent: Campsey

Deans:

Present: Stacks, Jacobs, Schutten
Absent: Green

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Laker, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Balal, Spica, Tran,
Medrano, Medina
Absent: Caesar

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Chung
Absent: Sullivan-Green, Hamedi-Hagh

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters
Absent: None

H&A Representatives:

Present: Frazier, Grindstaff,
Ormsbee, Miller, Khan
Absent: Riley

Emeritus Representative:

Present: None
Absent: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

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

Honorary Representative:

Present: None
Absent: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

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

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Higgins, Trousdale,
Kauppila
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of October 24, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Van Selst (43-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kimbarow commented on the recent presidential election and noted that at SJSU we would continue to provide a safe and welcoming campus for all our students.

Chair Kimbarow introduced the ASCSU Chair, Chris Miller.

B. From the ASCSU Chair –

Chair Miller announced that she has been visiting all of the campuses. The Executive Committee of the ASCSU establishes priorities at the beginning of the year. The priorities this year are to promote academic quality by censoring three areas. Those areas are shared governance, faculty advocacy and governmental relations, and CSU relationship with the Academic Senate. Visiting the campuses gives Chair Miller the opportunity to see what happens at different campuses. For instance, many campuses do not have food and drinks at their Senate and Executive Committee meetings.

Chair Miller has been to San Francisco, Sacramento, San Bernadino, Fresno, Sonoma, Channel Islands, and Pomona. Next week Chair Miller will be at San Diego State. Chair Miller has been learning a lot about what it means to represent the faculty in the CSU system. For instance, what to do when an irate parent emails her and says her child has to take early start and what is Chair Miller going to do about it? Chair Miller has also learned what it means to be a representative for the CSU and the faculty.

Chair Miller made a presentation to the American Association of University Presidents Shared Governance Conference. We, the CSU, are the largest system representing comprehensive universities in the nation. Chair Miller attended a presentation while there by the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities. Our Board of Trustees is a member of that Association.

The association did some research on shared governance in higher education. Their study was titled, “Shared Governance—Is okay good enough?” One of the elements in the study that struck Chair Miller is as follows, “The principle of shared governance acknowledges the authority distributed to both the administration and the faculty as a basic tenet of higher education.” The report notes that “when it works well, shared governance brings a wealth of ideas to critical conversations and creates a sense of inclusiveness that strengthens and supports decisions and can be an essential institutional asset.” As Chair Miller travels to different campuses, she has been speaking about shared governance.

As far as answering the question, “Is okay good enough? Chair Miller believes that it is not good enough. We have to do more to ensure shared governance is not just “okay.” Chair Miller believes we need to be just as audacious in promoting shared governance as we are in promoting the graduation initiative. Without shared governance the goals of the graduation initiative will not be able to be accomplished. The people who did this study asked the Chancellor to participate in the next phase. The next phase involves doing 12 case studies and they have asked to interview the Chancellor, the ASCSU Chair, and the Board Trustee, Rebecca Eisen.

Some resolutions that the ASCSU has recently approved include a resolution asking for increased funding for the CSU to avert tuition increases, and a resolution supporting the support budget for the Board of Trustees which includes \$75 million for the graduation initiative. The ASCSU went further and recommended that half of those funds be earmarked for improving tenure density. Another resolution that was passed dealt with APR 158 and the ASCSU pointed out that they are very interested in transfer issues. The

ASCSU also passed a resolution asking for a taskforce on general education issues. There was a resolution in response to the C- grading in the golden four suggesting following the rules for general education credit from the institution where the student completed the course. The final resolution endorsed all the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force, and encouraged the Chancellor's Office to follow through with those recommendations. The ASCSU has been seeing some good progress in terms of responses to resolutions.

Some issues the Senate has discussed but have not yet resulted in resolutions include; Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property, and what a Trump presidency will do to higher education. Many students have been shaken to their core and are really fearful of about their future and the future of their families. The ASCSU will be keeping an eye on that.

C. President of the University –

President Papazian thanked Senators for attending today and for all their hard work on behalf of our students. President Papazian had the pleasure of watching Chair Miller advocate for us at the Board of Trustee's meeting.

We are in a unique moment where there are shared interests. Where it is in all of our best interests to work together for the greater good and purpose across the state and locally.

The local newspaper reported over the last couple of days on the "positive economic outlook for the state of California both in terms of the budget and in terms of its rainy day fund. This is a time where the state has the capacity to reinvest in the most significant economic driver and that is the education of its young people."

Many of our student are fearful of what the future holds. We need to continue to provide an environment where our students can succeed.

Questions:

Q: Senator Rodan announced that he had been trying to use some software in his class and he wanted to use the professional development funds he got from the department to purchase the software licenses and was told he could not use those funds to pay for software. Senator Rodan considers this an intrusion into the way he conducts his class.

A: President Papazian responded that she really had no idea about the funding and the Provost is not here today, so she will have to check with him and report back to the Senate.

Q: Are faculty being provided resources in their classes to support conversations and concerns students have regarding the recent presidential election and what the future may hold for them?

A: President Papazian has every confidence in our faculty that they will arrange their syllabus to engage students. In addition, there are broader resources available for the kinds of conversations students may want or need to have. Many of these have been

ongoing conversations through the Student Affairs Division, and President Papazian encouraged all students to take advantage of what they have to offer. President Papazian thinks that faculty need to continue to focus on providing education in the classroom as much as possible.

Q: Senator Chung runs two international programs that take students abroad for several weeks out of the year, and also brings about 100 students from all over the world to SJSU. Since the College of Engineering doesn't have a permanent dean yet, Senator Chung is basically doing this himself. Senator Chung asked the President what he should do in terms of his programs?

A: President Papazian responded that Senator Chung has an Interim Dean, and while in that position he/she has the authority of a dean. The permanent dean has been selected and will be here this summer. President Papazian advised Senator Chung to work with the leadership in the Dean of Engineering Office and also in the Provost Office.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

EC Minutes of October 17, 2016 –

Questions:

Senator Boekema asked about page 2 where it talks about the Science building discussions moving forward, this is not very informative. What progress has been made in financial planning and funding with regard to this building?

Answer:

VP and Senator Faas announced that just this week at the Board of Trustees meeting our Science Building was approved for up to \$127 million. We started this summer in the \$87 million range. This is very positive news.

EC Minutes of October 31, 2016 – no questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

Consent Calendar of October 24, 2016—approved (43-0-0).

Election Calendar of 2017—approved (43-0-0).

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Peter presented *AS 1636, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Reaffirming San José State University's Commitment to an Inclusive Campus Climate and our Determination to Provide a Safe, Supportive, and Welcoming Community (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and AS 1636 was approved (39-0-1).

Senator Tran requested that his vote be changed to approved. The Senate voted and the Tran motion passed (40-0-0). The vote on AS 1636 will now reflect (40-0-0).

V. New Business – None

VI. **Unfinished Business:** None

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

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1628, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents (Final Reading)*. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, “the document” at the end of line 26 to read, “the policy recommendation.” **The Senate voted and AS 1628 was approved as amended (38-1-1).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1629, Policy Recommendation, Concurrent Membership on Operating and Policy Committees (Final Reading)*. Senator White presented an amendment to strike the sentence that begins on line 36 and ends on line 39 that reads, “If concurrent membership is unavoidable, the administrator will serve as an ex officio nonvoting member on the operating committee and an ex officio voting member on the parent policy committee unless otherwise dictated by university policy pertaining to committee membership.” **The Senate voted and the white amendment failed (7-29-1). The Senate voted and AS 1629 passed as written (38-0-0).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1634, Modification of Senate Constitution Related to Membership (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1634 passed as written (39-0-0).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1639, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Senate Bylaw 4.1, Senate Executive Committee Membership (First Reading)*. AS 1639 is a bylaw amendment that parallels the constitutional amendment that was just passed (AS 1634). This policy recommendation would modify the administrative representation on the Executive Committee. It would remove the Vice President for University Advancement and replace that seat with the Chief Diversity Officer. [There were no questions.]

Senator Shifflett announced that she was pulling *AS 1635, Amendment A to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)* from the agenda today. She gave the following explanation, “Once an item goes out to the campus, it is not uncommon for the committee to get questions that have nothing to do with the amendment proposed. This needs to go back to O&G to address two things that came up that did not have to do with the proposed changes from O&G. The first item is can we build in some language that clarifies that when

you need five faculty members on a search or review committee do all five have to come from different departments? The answer is yes, but it isn't written in the policy so we need to clarify this. The second thing we need to do is build in language to allow for the addition of members to address the diversity or expertise needed on a search committee, so we need to take this back to O&G for consideration.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Department Voting Rights (First Reading)*. This is a first reading for the third time.

Section 2.2 clarifies that the department can now establish areas that lecturers can vote on except those excluded by other policies. Section 2.2.1 establishes that voting can be conducted in multiple ways if department guidelines provide for that. Section 3.6 clarifies what to do regarding voting rights for faculty on suspension.

Questions:

Q: On line 50 it specifies voting by tenured and tenure-track faculty is required and there are several interpretations possible.

A: That was a mistake, O&G meant to fix that. O&G had three emails regarding that.

Q: I am particularly pleased that the language has been changed from regular and temporary faculty to tenure/tenure-track faculty and lecturers. Would the default position for departments be that lecturers have no departmental voting rights unless they actually establish bylaws in order to grant voting rights to lecturers?

A: My interpretation is that the default position you are speaking about pertains to curriculum only. The default position on curriculum is that voting is the purview of the tenure and tenure-track faculty unless it is opened up to lecturers by department policy.

Q: I'm wondering why on lines 178 and 179 FERP faculty are singled out as people who need to take part in deliberations preceding a vote?

A: That was in the old version of the policy. We changed that in this last first reading. The FERP section is now 3.5.

Q: In 2.4.1. you might want to reference back to bylaws, because when I read that section it appears as if for any given issue people might choose one of those ways. You need to tie that in with the other restrictions or clarifications. Congratulations on distinguishing between Articles 17 and 19. That was a brilliant move. I think that you might want to either put a footnote or the title of the article, because occasionally things get renumbered.

A: Thank you.

Q: I have a question about line 160 and "representative committees," can't they also have tenure/tenure-track and lecturers?

A: Thank you.

Q: On 2.4 you have in parenthesis, "Inclusive of establishing and modifying courses,

standard texts and materials.” I think “standard texts and materials” might be more than is necessary.

A: Thank you.

Q: Would the committee consider making 4.2 the new 4.1 and 4.1 the new 4.2. Section 4.2 seems to come first.

A: Thank you.

Q: I misunderstood 3.5, do FERP faculty have full voting rights even when off?

A: Yes.

Q: Could you explain the purpose of Section 1.3 regarding the “Formal vote”?

A: This goes back to last semester when we started to gather information. People were asking questions that led us to believe they weren’t clear on what a formal vote was, so we decided to add a section describing it.

Q: Are other types of votes less sanctioned?

A: No.

Q: If they are, then why do we need a definition of a formal vote?

A: That is a good question and we will take it up.

Q: When and under what circumstances are a professor’s voting rights suspended? I believe that if a professor is suspended disciplinarily, or put on paid/unpaid leave involuntarily that they should not be allowed to vote. Could you please indicate the current wording or reasoning for allowing this?

A: Yes, Article 19 states that, “This article shall pertain to all bargaining unit employees excluding temporary employees that have been employed for one semester, quarter, or less. Sanctions imposed in a disciplinary action shall be limited to a dismissal of the motion, or suspension without pay. Our clause is about suspension and it applies to suspension without pay as a disciplinary action. That is the condition under which the voting rights are removed.”

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1638, Policy Recommendation, Bylaw 2.2, Pertaining to Term Length for Senate Chair (First Reading)*. This resolution would do away with the one-year plus one-year arrangement we have had for the past 20 years. In its place we would make the term of the Senate Chair two years. The Vice Chair would also be elected to a two-year term, and then serve as Chair for two years, and then serve as Past Chair for one year. This policy recommendation keeps in place the fact that in alternate years when there is no Past Chair, the Senate would elect a Faculty-at-Large member to sit on the Executive Committee.

Questions:

Q: Traditionally, the vote to renew for another year is an important event, so I’m wondering what the motivation for the change is?

A: The sense is that a person coming in has the stability to plan for a two-year term and this gives them a stability that is not there currently and allows them to plan for a longer term. These two things seem to be very important in helping the chair become

part of the leadership team of the university.

Q: Did the committee consider what would happen if the Senate made a mistake and elected someone who did not work out? This is really not a one-year plus one-year, this would be two-years as Vice Chair, then two-years as Chair, and finally one-year as Past Chair. A single vote would result in a term of five-years. Wouldn't it be good to have a check and balance somewhere along the line?

A: I hear what you are saying, but the cost of that is the uncertainty and the perception that a Senate Chair is temporary and he/she might be engaged with differently. Good food for thought. I will bring back to the committee.

B. University Library Board (ULB) – None.

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – None.

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

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1637, Policy Recommendation, Required Enrollment for Culminating Graduate Students (First Reading)*.

This policy rescinds University Policy F11-2 on continuous enrollment for graduate students. In 2011 we passed a policy that stated that if graduate students received a Report-in-Progress grade on their thesis or project, they were required to maintain continuous enrollment in the university. The way that has been handled is that students register for a 1-unit class in a special session. This helps offset some of the cost of them remaining in the university. This policy acknowledges that the time a student needs to remain in a Report-in-Progress grade in one department may be different from another department. The proposal is to create a three-tiered fee system of 1-unit-, 2-unit, or 3-units that a department would make a case for why they need to be in that unit program.

Questions:

Q: In our department we give out permission codes, are we bypassing the department entirely with this?

A: No, when you give out a permission code a student is still registering for that course, you are just giving them a code to register for it. What this does is allow the student to register in special session for a much cheaper price.

Q: You said programs would be assigned to a tier?

A: That's correct. Programs would have to make a case for the tier they need to be in. It is the opinion of the Graduate Studies personnel that it would become a logistical nightmare to try and do this on a student-by-student basis. If you take a look at your program and see 50% of your students are using lots of resources, and 50% of your students are using very little resources, then you might want to make a case for the 2-unit or middle tier.

Q: Why wouldn't a program want to make an argument for the lowest tier?

A: They can do that, but the idea is that there are actual costs to the department.

Q: However, if you read it, the money doesn't come back to the department?

A: Actually, the details of what will come back to the department are still TBD.

Q: As it is written now, it doesn't come back to the department.

A: It goes back to the college.

Q: Could you clarify under item 2, lines 80 and 81, why that sentence is in there?

A: Essentially, if a student gets an RP or an I grade, they are not finished with the degree, so they continue to be students of the university and they are still working on what they need to complete.

Q: Is it possible to automatically establish that a department gets a 1290 class instead of all of us having to go establish them?

A: It is important for the protection of the student that there be some kind of review to determine which level is the appropriate level.

Q: On lines 80 and 81 it refers to a student having up to the last day of the semester to submit their work. So if the student isn't graduating that semester and they turn in their work on the last day of the semester, is this implying they are paying for the fall, but graduating in the spring?

A: The intent is not to make the student pay for an additional semester if they have finished all their work. The intent is if the student is not done with all their work and needs additional supervision, then the student must register for another semester.

Q: If I have a student that is going to do 3 units in the fall and 3 units in the spring, do I have to give them a RP in the fall because they are not quite done?

A: For a thesis you are not supposed to give credit until the thesis is done.

Q: There was a memo sometime back from Graduate Studies saying that students could get more than 6 units of RP and this seems to imply that they are now being limited to 6 units again?

A: No, if there is a reason a student wants to remain in regular session units, they can register for them and not the special session 1290 class. They can continue to register for the 298 and 299 classes, and pay the higher fees. However, you cannot do a third of your graduate units in 298 and 299 units.

Q: This strikes me as a little bit complicated. I'm looking at the three tiers here. I'm wondering if the difference here isn't really between a lab-based program vs a non lab-based program. The numbers of times faculty work with students could depend on the faculty member and could look very different. The cost issue seems to really be a materials cost and there might be a simpler way.

A: It is a fair point and we discussed this. On the other hand, you could say each and every faculty member on each and every thesis has to make a proposal on how much each thesis would require in time and resources. We weren't willing to go that way. This is a middle ground.

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1640, Policy Recommendation, Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating Activities Policy (First Reading)*.

The original discussion on this item started two years ago. I&SA wanted to modify the policy in such a way that faculty could not schedule final exams before the final exam period/or during dead day. The current I&SA Committee decided that a final exam is the appropriate culminating experience for many courses. The policy we are recommending ensures that you have to have some sort of final evaluation in each class. This does not mean that a student has to sit down and have a discussion on final exam day, but there must be some sort of culminating experience due during the final exam period, and not during a regular day of class. If you are giving a final exam it must be during the final exam scheduled time, and if you are giving some other type of culminating experience you cannot have a due date prior to the beginning of final exams.

Questions:

Q: If for example you are assigning a take home exam, under this policy it could be due not at the time of your final exam, but any time during the time final exams take place?

A: The policy says no earlier than the first day of the final exam period. It would be up to the discretion of the faculty member. The current policy says that if you are giving a final it must take place at the final exam time, if you are doing something else you must meet with the class at the final exam period and discuss some aspect of whatever the final project happens to be. The current policy is silent on the specifics of take home exams.

Q: The way in which my department has always interpreted this is that whatever kind of final exam/project is given it cannot be due earlier than the normal time the final exam would be given. This spread out the workload for students so that every student didn't have all exams due the first day.

A: The concern on the part of many people on the committee was that if you found that the final exam time for your course was the final day of final exams, you would only have 1 ½ days to possibly review and grade the papers.

Q: What is the current enforcement if a faculty member doesn't schedule the exam when it is supposed to be? What will happen as far as enforcement for the new policy?

A: The deans have oversight of this. Our enforcement mechanism in the new policy is no worse, but the reality is that a final exam and sitting around for several hours doing nothing isn't the best use of time. This policy at least decriminalizes existing behavior.

Q: If you have a 30-page paper and that ends up at the end of the final exam period, you can ask the dean to change the date for your final exam. I think the cost of that vs having every paper due the first day of the exam period could be catastrophic for the student. The requirements for the dates are very useful and there are ways to move those dates.

A: We are not requiring that things be due on the first day. We can encourage some language that asks faculty to spread out the exams and due dates.

Q: I would support that you consider how papers are actually scheduled during final exams. This policy allows for say 4 papers to be due on the first day, and if I have an actual in-class final, I might have to accommodate the fact that a student has 4 papers due that day.

A: This policy gives preference to actual in-class final exams over other culminating experience, so the paper would have to be rescheduled.

Q: Does this mean a faculty member can change the date of the final two weeks from the final to the first day of finals? Also, in line 50, are we saying that the 298 and 299 classes do not have culminating experience?

A: Those 298 and 299 classes are currently exempted. Our syllabi policy protects students from the egregious changing of due dates.

Q: This policy states that department chairs will oversee culminating activity and this seems broad and I'm not sure how a chair would oversee this?

A: This language echoes what is in the existing policy except it changes responsibility from the dean to the chair. The committee felt chairs are more likely to know what is going on in the department and more likely to know what is curricularly appropriate in their field.

Q: Around line 57, there is a Part A about performance. Does this apply to the physical education process?

A: Is it impractical for you to complete a culminating activity in the 2 hours and 20 minutes of exam time?

Q: In some cases yes.

A: Then if this passes the faculty member should approach his/her chair and see what should be done.

Q: How are online classes addressed in this document? All online classes are anchored in the schedule per other classes as to whether they are synchronous vs asynchronous.

A: Whether it is a synchronous or asynchronous online class it has a final exam and the final exam, has a date and that is when the final exam should be scheduled.

Q: I would like there to be some discussion as to whether this is how SJSU wants to handle asynchronous classes.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1632, Policy Recommendation: Amendment B to S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Composition of Recruitment Committees (Final Reading)*. Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike the words “a minimum of” on line 59. **The Senate voted and AS 1632 was approved as amended (37-0-1).**

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

A. Vice President for University Advancement – None

B. CSU Statewide Senators – See ASCSU Chair comments.

C. Provost – None

D. Vice President of Finance and Administration –

VP Faas encouraged Senators to go down to the Event Center during one of these pantry events that VP Blaylock has and see the people there. The people getting these donations are dressed exactly like you are dressed today. There was no one in that line that looked like they didn't have a piece of clothing to their name. This hunger problem is invisible to us. You can't see who really needs help and who doesn't need it. When you see 569 students waiting to get food, you know we have a problem. We are just now stepping up to the challenge of dealing with this issue.

The number one concern of fourteen out of fifteen groups in the Campus Climate Survey was campus safety. VP Faas has been working on a number of security changes since he arrived six months ago. Just recently VP Faas attended the security night walk. About fifteen people went on the walk. There was nothing overly serious, but there were some lighting, skateboard, landscaping, and fencing issues. Every three weeks VP Faas meets with his staff regarding campus safety issues such as bluelights, cameras, locks, and even clocks on the wall in classrooms. VP Faas is working through them one-by-one.

UPD is authorized to have 32 officers on their staff, and this is up from 28 last year. We have two in the academy right now. VP Faas and his team are making progress and addressing many issues, such as comparable pay for police officers in UPD. UPD has a safety escort program and anyone including faculty, staff, and students can be escorted by UPD to their vehicles. There are 16 or 17 cadets that are available to walk you to your vehicle. UPD also just setup a Chief's Student Advisory Board. This board is composed of students working with UPD and getting involved in solving safety issues. VP Blaylock was at the first meeting and thought it went very well as did Chief Decena.

VP Faas and his staff continue to work on the walkways. There is a lot of construction going on across campus and there will continue to be a lot of construction going on as this is an old campus. One thing VP Faas has looked at is the fencing. Traditionally, fencing has had wind areas so that the wind won't blow the dirt around a construction site. What VP Faas and his team have done is to remove the fencing around the corners so that you can see the other side as you approach the corner. This helps to limit the blind spots.

Also, many dead trees have been removed. Anytime a tree is taken down, a new tree is planted.

VP Faas and his team are also working on some safety options for the MLK Library. Many students don't feel safe in the library after hours. VP Faas and his team are looking for ways to secure the upper floors of the library in the evenings for university students and personnel.

Another project is improving lighting on South Campus. There have not been problems with tailgating this year. That is partially because of the approach UPD is taking, and partially due to attendance.

Questions:

Q: With the recent surge in stairwell and stairway gropings, cameras seem like something to consider. Are you considering any additional cameras?

A: We are continually adding more cameras on campus. However, it is important to us that these cameras are only being used for UPD purposes. They are not going to be used to monitor work. Also, the storage of tape is expensive. UPD is trying to decide what is the appropriate thing to do. Signs will be put up where cameras will be used.

Q: Who is watching these cameras?

A: UPD

Q: Having our officers out walking around and interacting with students, faculty, and staff would go a long way in easing fears on campus. Unfortunately, it has been years since I've bumped into one on campus. Are there any plans to increase the foot patrols?

A: UPD went to the fraternities and spoke with them to be sure that the activities during things like Rush week were safe and so far this year there has been a big decrease in incidents. I agree with you that having a proactive approach goes a long way in decreasing incidents. This is why we are working to hire more cadets so we can get them out on rounds. However, I don't want them to be seen too much. It makes people very uncomfortable when there is too much of a police presence.

E. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Blaylock distributed a flyer on the mobile food pantry. Last week Student Affairs had their second pantry activity on campus. At the last event VP Blaylock reported to the Senate, that they had 349 students and just over 80 volunteers. This time the truck broke down on the way to campus. Student Affairs had to rush out to get a new truck. Students were already lined up at the Event Center waiting, and while it ordinarily takes two hours to setup, the volunteers set a record with a 17-minute setup. There were over 90 volunteers that served 569 students in 1 hour and 15 minutes. VP Blaylock got promoted from the Broccoli station to the Potato station. Henceforth, given the nickname VP "Spud" Blaylock by the Senate Chair.

Our student leaders are incredible. They are collecting over \$2,000 a month at our food stations across the campus from the coin boxes people are donating to. The teams of volunteers are terrific. They take the money and purchase food for the pantries, and they keep them stocked. They work very hard behind the scenes to make it work for our students.

At the next event, Student Affairs is hosting “Chopped,” in which the Provost and several faculty members have committed to a cook-off. There will be demonstrations on how to cook some of the vegetables we are distributing to students as well.

This past Friday, Student Affairs hosted the African-American College Readiness Summit. The campus hosted 548 African-American students from local high schools.

Two weeks ago, we hosted the Advancing Latino/a Achievement and Success (ALAS) Conference. There were over 2,000 students and their families here on campus. The mayor did the welcome, and there was a Latino speaker.

This past Friday we had all our local community colleges on campus. There were 78 people here that spent a day learning about the campus. This is called a Meet and Greet Summit and this was only the second time SJSU has done this. Fifty-seven percent of our enrolled students this fall came from the community colleges.

The staff of Academic Affairs raised over \$4,700 to support the student hunger fund on our campus. There are few campuses in America where the staff donate their hard earned money to ensure students don’t go hungry.

F. Associated Students President (AS) –

AS just passed a resolution in support of joining the Institute of International Education. This is an international consortium in support of student refugees that provides scholarships.

AS also passed a resolution in support of Santa Clara County’s Measure B.

The third resolution passed by AS was in support of “Indigenous People Day.” AS is asking the university to recognize Indigenous People Day instead of President’s Day.

AS issued a statement of solidarity with the Lakota Sioux tribes fighting against the Dakota Acts pipeline. AS is asking for the support of the university and the CSU system.

AS is currently looking at the ways the Student Success Excellent in Technology Fee (SSETF) contributes to Athletics. There is currently \$5.4 million that is not being distributed in the SSETF and AS is looking into ways this could be distributed more equitably among the other groups the IRA goes to.

AS just held their 2016-2017 AS Scholarship Awards Banquet. AS gave out \$82,000 in scholarships to students that demonstrated leadership and have been involved on campus.

AS has started discussions about the proposed CSU tuition increase and ways to create programming and engage our students.

Students really appreciate the support when faculty attend their events and also appreciate the faculty members that take time to discuss the election results in their classes.

IX. Special Committee Reports – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.