

2017/2018 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
April 9, 2018**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-five Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
Lee, J., Rodan

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Willey, Feinstein
Absent: Papazian, Faas, Wong(Lau)

COB Representatives:

Present: Bullen, He, Jensen
Absent: None

Deans:

Present: Elliott, Stacks, Jacobs
Absent: Ehrman

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Busick, De Guzman,
Donahue, Gill, Norman
Absent: Hospidales

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Chung, Pyeon, Sullivan-Green
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Bacich
Absent: Ormsbee

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, Kim
Absent: White

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Hart
Absent: Trulio

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Trousdale, Higgins,
Kauppila
Absent: Matoush

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of March 12, 2018 were approved as amended.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

The President is in Washington D.C. and will not be here today.

B. From the President of the University – No report.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of March 5, 2018 – No questions.

Executive Committee Minutes of March 19, 2018 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of April 9, 2018 was approved. AVC Riley noted that the Committee on Committees is in the process of staffing the Writing Requirements Committee, an administrative committee reporting to the Board of General Studies (BOGS).

AVC Riley announced the results of the Senate General Elections as follows:

From CASA, Senator B.J. Grosvenor was re-elected.

From the COB, Senators Steven (Daoping) He and Maria Bullen were re-elected along with a new Senator, Susanna Khavul.

From the College of Education, Senator Roxana Marachi was re-elected.

From the College of Engineering, there is a new Senator elected, Anand Ramasubramanian. There is also one vacant seat remaining in the College of Engineering.

From the General Unit, there are two new Senators, Nyle Monday from the MLK Library and Matheo Hurtado Martinez from Athletics. In addition, Senator Toby Matoush was re-elected.

From the College of Humanities and the Arts, Senator Sharmin Khan was re-elected.

From the College of Science, Senator Rachel French was re-elected.

From the College of Social Sciences, Senators Julia Curry and Mary Wilson were re-elected.

From the CSU Statewide Senate, Senator Simon Rodan was re-elected.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

The Election Calendar of 2018-2019 was approved unanimously.

V. Unfinished Business:

A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1688, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds F83-10, ELM Exam; Sanctions; Probation (First Reading)*. Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1688 a final reading. The motion was seconded and approved. **The Senate voted and AS 1688 was approved unanimously.**

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1689, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S80-9, Resource Analysis Required for Curricular Proposals (First Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1689 a final reading. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. **The Senate voted and AS 1689 was approved unanimously.**

B. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA) Committee:

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1686, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S66-11, College Reports to Selective Service Boards (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1686 was approved unanimously.**

C. Professional Standards (PS) Committee:

Senator Peter presented *AS 1690, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S13-6 (Campus Awards) To Provide for System Award Nominations (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: On lines 484 and 485, does the reference to the last three mean the last three years of winners on our campus, or does it mean the last three applicants from the current year? My second question is whether the committee is the group that determines if something we do is similar?

A: The answer to the first question is the last three awardees. I'm not quite following what you are asking in the second question?

Q: On lines 481 and 482, does the committee determine if we have a parallel internal SJSU award?

A: That would probably have to be determined before the committee was formed by the chair of the Senate in conjunction with the Executive Committee.

Q: On lines 474 to 476, when it talks about the prior recipients, will this award require current members of the faculty, or can some of the faculty be retired?

A: Unless it specifies otherwise, the faculty would have to be current faculty members. Our current award committees use only current faculty and this is meant to parallel those committees.

Q: Would the committee consider expanding the membership to possibly include retired personnel, since this is a culminating award usually given at the end of one's career and retired faculty could offer more knowledge?

A: Certainly, the committee will consider it.

Q: Has the committee considered the Oscar's problem and whether it might be good to include new eyes with a fresh view, instead of the same committee members year-after-year?

A: The committee will consider this.

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1678, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17-6, Departmental Voting Rights (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1678 was approved unanimously.

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action items (In rotation):

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1693, Policy Recommendation, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (First Reading)*.

O&G has modified the charge and membership of the ADAPC. There is one error in lines 86 and 87 where it reads, "and greater community." That was an error and should be removed.

Questions:

Q: Will all the ex officio members be voting members?

A: Yes.

Q: Why is the AS representative not designated by AS and instead specific to the AS Director of Programming?

A: O&G looked at the duties and responsibilities for all directors in AS and decided the AS Director of Programming was the best fit.

Q: Would the committee consider leaving this as the AS President or designee, because some of the positions change title and AS is in the process of changing the AS Board of Directors and their charges.

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: How many current members are on ADAPC?

A: The ones listed here plus another 3 seats.

B. University Library Board (ULB):

Chair Taylor presented *AS 1592, Sense of the Senate Resolution, To Support Open Access Publishing and Promote the Retention of Author Rights Among SJSU Faculty (First Reading)*.

This Sense of the Senate Resolution was proposed by the University Library Board. This resolution is a request for this body to throw its weight behind encouraging our faculty to publish in open access journals. There is some language in this resolution that defines what that means. Electronic journals are expensive and getting more expensive. You can now pay a little extra to get your article freely available in a hybrid journal. No one actually saves any money from that. Some of the private universities, like Harvard and the UC system, are now restricting their faculty from publishing in any journals that do not allow them to retain any rights after the fact. If you would like to publish a paper by a Biology professor at Harvard and you are a journal editor, then you need to agree to allow that professor to publish either a pre or post print version of their article in the campus repository. This resolution is not a policy resolution. We are not looking to dictate behavior, but we think it is important for the campus to make a statement about the importance of open access publishing.

Questions:

Q: Thank you. I think this is very important. I was wondering if there might be anything you could add to address repository open access journals?

A: Yes, the committee will consider it.

Q: Could you include some language about predatory journals?

A: The committee will definitely look at it.

Q: If this were to become policy at say Harvard and the UC System, would this then become a CSU System-wide issue?

A: If this body were to adopt this Sense of the Senate Resolution then we would consider having our CSU Statewide representatives bring forth something similar at

the CSU Statewide level. Only then would we have the gravity to affect this type of policy.

Q: A Sense of the Senate Resolution generally points to concerns and brings forth some options or recommendations for actions. I could read this in a negative way. In line 35, this suggests that the RTP committees are not using high quality and rigorous peer-reviewed journals to publish their scholarly work in.

A: Do you have a suggestion as to the language? We thought by saying “continue” that it implied it was already being done.

Q: I’ll follow up.

Q: I think this is a little optimistic. There are more open access journals that are not quality journals than are quality journals. I also believe that supporting open access needs resources, and the money must come from somewhere. That is going to come down to departments to pay for open access. Also, not all disciplines have open access options. This is implying that is what the university wants, so what happens if it isn’t an option for them? This puts pressure on those faculty members.

A: Thank you. The committee will consider it.

Q: There is a view that open access means not peer reviewed or predatory. There are negative connotations to open access. Perhaps the way to do that is to emphasize retaining rights from publication in our repository. I think we need to emphasize that faculty retain rights even when they publish in a main stream journal if a free copy is put up on our repository that gives open access as well as publishing in a conventional setting. There might need some wordsmithing. The other question I have is how did this end up passing in the UC? Is it only because they are powerful so they can force journals to accept this, or are the journals just accepting this and working with the UC without coercive pressures? How far can we go?

A: That is a great point about retaining rights versus publishing in open access journals. We would like our resolution to address both.

Q: Could you explain your last resolved? What is contained in that UC policy that is not already in this resolution?

A: Good question. With regard to the UC Open Access policy, it was passed by the Academic Senate of the UC and it grants the license to distribute those works in the institutional repository. In cases where the publisher precludes that item from being in the repository, or has an embargo for example, then those type of conditions apply, but it is a blanket license to distribute.

Q: In terms of the formality of the Sense of the Senate, we can only resolve to do things that the Senate can do. In other words, we can’t resolve that RTP Committees do anything. We can only encourage RTP Committee to do things. We also can’t resolve that the faculty do anything, we can only resolve that the Senate encourage faculty to do something. Would the committee consider cleaning up the language?

A: Yes.

Q: To what extent have the librarians and the faculty on the campus weighed in on this with their advice and suggestions?

A: The input has generally been from the University Library Board and its members.

Q: I think it is very important that the Senate weigh in on open access, but it is just a matter of whether or not we can afford it.

A: The committee will consider.

Q: I have a question about the votes. There were a significant number of people absent during the vote. Can you comment on this?

A: We have had some problems filling some seats on the ULB this year. For example, Cabrera is on sabbatical and Kim was named but never seated. Chair Frazier suggested Chair Taylor speak with him about this. Chair Taylor also noted that a lot of people were also absent that day.

Q: Did the ULB consider Senate Management Resolution SM-S08-2, that created a task force that dealt with Open Access and then they gave a final report that is on the website that may help here?

A: Thank you. We did not know about this. The committee will look at this.

Q: On lines 40 to 43, could you clean-up the language in the second half of this?

A: Thank you.

Q: How much data do you actually have on this?

A: Quite a bit of data, we have librarian (level four) research impact. It also turns out to be a happy by product of moving to the faculty 180 system.

Q: In regards to RTP, I was wondering to what extent you would like to have RTP recommendations in this resolution? Especially given that faculty are already publishing with open access.

A: That is a great question. We are not the Professional Standards Committee. Our idea here is to encourage and make aware. We are certainly not trying to craft a resolution that would make RTP Committees nervous or feel manipulated. This is strictly just an awareness resolution.

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1691, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds University Policy S09-5, Priority Registration (First Reading)*.

University Policy F17-4 established the process for priority registration. That policy rescinded University Policy F14-1 and F14-1 rescinded University Policies F11-3 and F09-1. University Policy F09-1 rescinded University Policies F97-1 and F06-5. We are trying to rescind an amendment for a policy that no longer exists. University Policy F09-5 amended F97-1 and that has already been rescinded. That's why we are asking for this clean-up.

The Senate discussed that fact that with the Senate Administrator's new system of policy numbering and giving amendments letters while keeping the same policy number, this type of issue should not occur with future policies. As a point of parliamentary procedure, since the original policy was rescinded, the amendment would also be rescinded. However, since the amendment was a standalone policy, O&G asked C&R to rescind it.

The Senate Administrator commented that bylaw 16 allows her to bring to the policy committee's attention any policy that should have been rescinded and was missed by accident and if the policy committee agrees, then they can direct the Senate Administrator to rescind the policy. The Senate Administrator will then report this to the Senate. The Senate agreed to consider handling it this way in the future.

Senator Buzanski presented a motion to suspend the rules and make this a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Buzanski motion passed. **The Senate voted and AS 1691 passed unanimously.**

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1694, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S14-10, Master's Committee Structure and Processes and Thesis Embargoes (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Can't I, if I'm an interim dean, continue as a committee member and still give the student all the support they need? Why not leave the policy as it is and not specify that an MPP can chair a student committee, and put the chair in a position to say as provost or dean no you can't?

A: This is a referral that came in and we are trying to address the questions that were posed.

Q: Under I.C. when it talks about qualified individuals it says including part-time temporary faculty. Couldn't that instead say, "lecturers"?

A: The committee will consider, but the only thing we inserted was language in section I.B.

Q: I understand the continuity argument, so for example if Dean Kaufman was chairing a student's committee before he entered the administrative track then this amendment would allow him to continue as chair, but would this amendment also allow Dean Jacobs to become a new chair of a thesis committee?

A: Yes, what we tried to do was keep this at the local level having consent from the department chair and school directors.

Q: This seems a little awkward that a chair could end up telling a dean whether they can chair a committee.

Q: I would just like to emphasize that if the department chair says no that they will be saying no to their leader and that could be complicated. This could create some toxicity in the college in the long term, so will the committee reconsider this?

A: Yes, the committee will discuss this again.

Q: My request to the committee is that the rationale be made clearer. The whereas makes it appear to be self-evident that an MPP should automatically be able to chair, but there is no context there or rationale?

A: The committee will consider it.

C: In the committee when we were discussing this, we weren't thinking of it just in alignment with your direct supervisor or administrator. We were thinking that it could be interdisciplinary, so it could be in a completely different college. From that perspective, there is perhaps a little less pressure on a chair to deny someone that is an administrator in a completely different area. We were trying to think of the array of possibilities.

Q: I believe in the beginning you said you had spoken to MPPs to find out if the original intent was to have MPPs as chairs, or not have MPPs as chairs, and it seems you got feedback on both sides. My question is with that being said, what was the impetus to then put this forward going only one direction, when the input represented two sides?

A: The referral was asking for clarity about the language and when it was discussed by the chairs and directors, they felt the language should remain the same. Then when we discussed with the MPPs, the concern was that this might be prohibitive if the individual was in an interim position and that could put the student at a disadvantage. The policy as it is written right now doesn't love MPPs serving as chairs on committees, but the referral that came to us was specifically to clarify the language. The answer might be that the language is clear as it stands, but as a committee we felt that it was worth bringing to this body to have the body review it instead of just the committee.

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1695, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F88-9, BA/BS Differentiation and Definition (First Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1695 a final reading. The Senate voted and the Shifflett motion passed with 1 Nay. Senator Chin presented an amendment to the Resolved clause to read, "Resolved: In compliance with Title 5 Sections 40508, 40500, and 40501, F88-9 shall be amended as follows:"

The amendment was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Chin amendment passed with 8 Abstentions.**

Senator Van Selst presented a motion to return to committee. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion failed (9-31-

5). **The Senate voted and AS 1695 passed as amended with 1 Nay and 2**

Abstentions.

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1696, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S17-13, Undergraduate Student Honors at San José State University (First Reading)*.

This is an amendment to the Student Honors policy as a result of a referral regarding

how students achieve student honors. Student Honors used to be based on a semester achievement rather than a two semester achievement. We have found that the new policy has increased the number of students that receive honors significantly. In order to be in compliance with the policy, and also assist the Provost Office in being able to honor all students, we are proposing that we amend section 2.7.1 so that it would lose the language that gives a procedural direction to the Provost Office. Instead of directing that students be honored at the spring convocation, it would instead say they will be recognized by the Provost Office.

Questions:

Q: I believe this came about because we do not have a facility large enough to hold all of the students for the Honors Convocation, is this correct?

A: Yes.

Q: Does this then lead us down a path of doing away with Honors Convocation?

A: I think that depends on how you look at it. From conversations with the Provost Office, there is no intent to eliminate the Honors Convocation. This just gives the Provost Office the flexibility to make the decision to perhaps honor students at alternating years, or something along that format.

Q: At the risk of saying the obvious, isn't the solution to restrict the honors to a more elite group that will fit in the building rather than watering down the language of the policy so that some years there may not be an honors convocation depending on the size of the group?

A: There was discussion about that. The primary reason the committee leaned against that is that this new version of doing it semester-to-semester is consistent with other CSUs, also determining honors should not be dependent on physical facilities on campus. Students should be honored for an achievement they have made and not whether they can fit in a building or not. The other thing to consider is that we are increasing our student body, so if we restrict it now and in a few years we have more students coming on campus then will we have to restrict it even more to continue to fit in the facility?

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented *AS 1682, Policy Recommendation, Amends University Policies S99-8 and S99-8, Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom and Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented several friendly amendments. On line 90 delete "the statement" where it is repeated. On line 158, take the bold off of "1.3.2." On line 198, replace "emereti" with "emeriti." On line 199 replace "2 years" with "two-year." Senator Sen presented a friendly amendment to strike the word "touch" on line 28. Senator Peter presented an amendment to change line 203 to read, "3.1.2. One student, for a one-year renewable term." The amendment was seconded. The Peter amendment passed unanimously." Senator Stacks presented an amendment to line 203 to change it to read, "3.1.3. One Administrator, for a one-year renewable term." Senator Buzanski presented a substitute amendment to the Stacks Amendment to change line 203 to read, "One Administrator to serve for a term designated by the

President.” And, to change line 218 to read, “3.4.3. The Administrative representative shall possess knowledge and interest in Academic Freedom and shall be designated by the President after consultation with the Executive Committee.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Stacks withdrew her amendment. The Senate voted on the Buzanski change to line 218 and the amendment failed. The Senate then voted on the amendment to line 203 and it passed with 1 Abstention. **The Senate voted and AS 1682 passed unanimously as amended.**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1683, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F81-7, Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit: (GRIF)*.

Senator Peter announced that he had received some suggestions for changes from Senator Stacks and that the Professional Standards Committee was withdrawing the resolution in order to consider these suggestions.

VII. State of the University Reports:

A. AS President:

AS President Manzo announced that AS still has scholarships available and students can apply through Friday, April 13, 2018.

Elections are underway and the results will be announced by this Thursday. There are currently several AS Director vacancies still available.

AS is working on a draft of their 8 million budget.

The AS student government is being restructured. One idea being proposed is an academic council with eight representatives from the eight different colleges. It would also have a graduate student representative.

AS will be reviewing their Executive Director on an annual basis.

There were 20 students that applied for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) funds that AS allocated to the Crisis Response Team in the amount of \$501 each. AS is looking into whether they can use the leftover funds to provide funds for Temporary Protective Status (TPS).

Questions:

Q: You mentioned elections, can you comment on the percentage of students that participated in the elections?

A: The AS President served on the elections board two times. The first year they were able to increase the percentage of students that voted to 8%. The second and third year it increased to 9%. Last year voting increased to 13% and that is the highest AS has ever had it. Last year AS tried to increase the incentives to get students to vote and gave out door prizes to students that voted, they also lowered the number of voting days to three days, and AS provided iPads for students to vote on. In addition, AS held candidate debates. However, AS still has not been

able to significantly increase voting. This year there were also quite a number of vacant seats that no one ran for.

B. Provost: No report.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance: No report.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs:

On Saturday there will be over 10,000 prospective students on campus along with their families for Admitted Spartan Day.

Summer registration begins today with sections starting on June 4, 2018.

Fall registration begins on May 1, 2018.

April 11, 2018 is the 20th Anniversary of the MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center on campus.

This is Asian-Pacific Islander, Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender (LGBT) Pride, and Sexual Assault Awareness month.

Student Affairs had 527 students at the mobile food pantry today.

SA is looking for a place to have a permanent food pantry setup on campus.

Question:

Q: I understand there was money allocated from the Chancellor's Office for a permanent food pantry. Can you comment on this?

A: Senate Bill 85 passed and allocated \$245 million to the CSU as a whole and SJSU applied for grants and received \$130,000. That will be used primarily for a permanent food pantry. The funds will be used to assist with CalFresh signup and Student Affairs is looking for ways to address with student homelessness.

E. Chief Diversity Officer: No report.

F. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): Updates distributed electronically.

G. Statewide Academic Senators:

There is a lot of activity at the CSU Statewide level around mental health.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Report on Athletics by Professor Annette Nellen, Chair, Athletics Board, Professor Sen Chiao, The Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), Marie Tuite, the Director of Athletics, Jacquelyn Duysen, Associate Athletics Director for Compliance, and Eileen Dailey, Senior Associate Athletics Director, Student-

Athlete Academic Services, Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.

Chair Nellen commented that the Athletics Board is setup under University Policy F07-2. The Athletics Board has responsibility to protect the environmental and educational rights of the athletes, and to ensure the integrity of the athletic program. It has a special responsibility relating the programs of athletics to the objectives of the university. While the board has these generalized responsibilities, the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics has direct control over its programs and the President has primary responsibility for our Athletics program. The Athletics Board reports both to the Senate and to the President. The Athletics Board makes an annual presentation to the Senate.

Sen Chiao, the FAR, commented that the FAR is a conduit between the university and the Division of Athletics. This past year it has been his pleasure to attend weekly meetings with the coaches and the athletes. He is happy to report on the quality and integrity of these meetings.

Jacquelyn Duysen, the Associate Athletics Director for Compliance, reported that student athlete time demand is a rule under scrutiny by the NCAA right now. The purpose of this rule is to ensure that our student athletes aren't overspending themselves. This rule applies to all required athletic related activity. When our teams are in season, they are maxed out at 20 hours per week for all athletic activity. However, things like having to get taped up, physical therapy, and involuntary workouts, don't currently count in their 20 hours and the Athletics Division is always trying to balance these things out. The Athletics Division takes involuntary workouts very seriously. They must be totally voluntary and the coach cannot know about it. One of the things that Director Duysen makes very clear to her coaches is that if they tell the student that these workouts must be voluntary, but their actions suggest otherwise, the NCAA will consider them involuntary. Students are here to get a degree. Student-Athlete well-being is one of the core values in Athletics. Student Athletes are surveyed about a number of things at the end of each year and involuntary workouts is one of the items they are asked about.

Last year when Director Duysen reported to the Senate, one of issues they were having was getting textbooks in time for student athletes. Director Duysen thanked the Senate for their help. Last year on December 1, 2016 only 40% of faculty had put in their book requests, but this year 100% of faculty put in their book request by December 1, 2017.

Questions:

Q: Do you actually track the hours?

A: Yes, Director Duysen gets the hours from the coaches and then she anonymously sends them out to random students to get their feedback. In addition, students are asked to randomly meet with the Athletics Director and give their feedback regarding things like voluntary workouts.

Q: How many of the 20 hours include travel?

A: None of the travel hours are included.

Eileen Dailey, Senior Associate Athletics Director for Student-Athlete Academic Services reported that SJSU is the national leader in Arthur Ashe Nominations this year with 41 nominations of students of color with a 3.2 or higher grade point average.

Our single year APR for athletics is 972 this is a little lower than we would like to be, but well ahead of the NCAA benchmark of 930. We would like to be at a 985. Our four-year bench mark is a little better at a 980. If a university falls below the 930 benchmark they are subject to scholarship loss, and a loss of practice time as well as other sanctions.

Athletics has the wonderful grades first initiative on campus. The response rate is currently at 46%. The cohort athletics is seeking information on is EOP students, student athletes, underrepresented students that don't fit into the EOP category, and undeclared students. Athletics requested information from professors for about 4,000 students in these categories. What know was they needed to if the students were going to class, whether they are struggling and need a tutor, etc. Athletics hopes by 2021 to have increased the response rate from professors to 90%.

Athletics has been training athletes with regards to Title IX for the last five years. It has become mandatory by the NCAA. Athletics has trained all new incoming student athletes on "One Love," and returning students are participating in the "Sex Signals" program offered on campus. In addition, all athletics staff have received "Unconscious Bias" training by the CDO Kathy Wong(Lau). Football has gone above and beyond in this area and each student has had supplemental training as well. In addition, the Julie Paisant, the Deputy Title IX Coordinator has come out and talked about "Consent and what that means," and Dr. Harry Edwards came out and talked about "Domestic Violence."

Marie Tuite, Director of Athletics, reported that on May 19, 2018, she became the permanent Director of Athletics at SJSU. SJSU is a Division I institution. There are 128 Division I level institutions. Athletics has 20 programs this year and will have 22 next year. There are 13 for women and nine for men. Athletics will be adding indoor and outdoor track next year. There are 450 student athletes and Athletics has a staff of about 130 people.

Director Tuite announced that she has been an adjunct professor at the University of Washington for the past twelve years and she teaches in their master's program.

The Athletics Division recruits athletes that have a good moral compass, are interested in getting a degree, and are interested in competing at a high level. SJSU has a culture of compliance. She tells coaches you will have time to win here, but you will not have time if you don't follow NCAA rules.

Revenue generation is the Athletics Director's job and the job of the entire Athletics Division. The Athletics Division just secured two of their largest gifts. They received a \$5 million donation to the football program, and the tennis classic that has been at Stanford will be held at SJSU this year.

Campus engagement is also very important to Director Tuite. The priority for use of South Campus is athletics first, then Kinesiology classes, then club sports, and finally use by the general student body.

Questions:

Q: Can you comment anything about students and concussions and what we are doing about this? As for fundraising, what are you doing differently than any of the other Athletic Directors?

A: First, Director Tuite is not going anywhere. SJSU is where she wants to end her career. Also, President Papazian is the fifth President Director Tuite has worked for. We have to get football in a place where they are something everyone can get excited and get behind like a number of our other programs. We have the right coach now. Also, we are finishing a number of projects on South campus and donors are taking notice of it.

Director Tuite doesn't know what is going to happen in the sport with regard to concussions. They happen in football and soccer and it is a serious issue.

IX. New Business: None

X. Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.