

2004/2005 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
April 25, 2005**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-Four Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Nellen, Van Selst, Kassing,
Sabalius, Greathouse
Absent: McNeil

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Sigler, Ashton, Phillips, Lee

Deans:

Present: Breivik, Stacks, Meyers
Absent: Wei

Students:

Present: Kelly, Nguyen
Absent: Lam, Stillman, Gadamsetty,
Bjerkek,

Alumni Representative:

Present: Thompson

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Thames, Liu

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Hooper, Gonzalez, Fee

COB Representatives:

Present: Donoho, Campsey, El-Shaieb

ED Represent:

Present: Parsons, Maldonado-Colon, Lessow-Hurley

ENG Representatives:

Present: Singh, Pour
Absent: Choo

H&A Representatives:

Present: Heisch, Desalvo, Vanniarajan, Van Hooff, Hilliard
Absent: Williams

SCI Representatives:

Present: Veregge, McClory, Kellum, Scharberg, Bros

SOS Representatives:

Present: Hebert, Von Till
Absent: Propas

SW Representative:

Present: Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –

The Senate minutes of April 4, 2005, were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Nellen said, “First, a reminder, we will be meeting in Engineering 189 on Friday, April 29, 2005, from 1:00 p.m. to 4 p.m. Next, we have the results of our 2005/2006 general elections. Our new Senators include: Debra Griffith from the General Unit, Joyce Osland from the College of Business, Judith Lessow-Hurley from the College of Education, Jerry Gao from the College of Engineering, Thomas Leddy and Brian Belet from the College of Humanities and the Arts, Sally Veregge and Susan McClory from the College of Science, and Kenneth Peter from the College of Social Science. We also have two new Deans that will be joining us—Joan Merdinger and Tim Hegstrom. And, we still have an

open seat in the College of Applied Sciences and the Arts that the college is working on filling. In addition, we have two seats that just opened up as a result of resignations, one in the College of Humanities and the Arts, and one in the General Unit for one-year terms. We are currently conducting special elections for replacements in these colleges.”

Chair Nellen said, “I’d like to extend my congratulations to Senator McClory who was recently named Outstanding Lecturer of the year. She will be honored this Wednesday at the Faculty Service Recognition Luncheon.”

Chair Nellen said, “I’d also like to introduce one of our new faculty members, Dr. Slobodan Simic. He is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Mathematics, and he is visiting us today.”

Chair Nellen said, “I’d like to remind you that if you are continuing with the Senate in 2005/2006, please consider running for one of the Senate Officer positions—Vice Chair, Associate Vice Chair, or one of the policy committee chairs. Nominating statements should be turned in to Eva Joice, Senate Administrator, by May 9th, 2005. On your nominating statement please tell us what position you are interested in, why you are interested, and a little bit about yourself. Senate Officer elections will be held at the first Senate meeting of 2005/2006 on May 16, 2005, from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.”

Chair Nellen said, “I’m ending my remarks here today on a very sad note. We recently lost one of our dedicated faculty members to cancer, Dr. Phyllis Lindstrom. Dr. Lindstrom was Chair of our Extended Studies Committee prior to her illness. She passed away on April 20, 2005. I met Phyllis when I became Chair of the Senate, and I was very impressed with her enthusiasm for her work both in her College and the Senate. She was a wonderful person. There will be a service in celebration of her life in Morris Daily Auditorium on Sunday, May 22, 2005 at 1 p.m. A memorial fund has also been established to benefit Education Leadership students in the College of Education. Contributions may be made to the SJSU Foundation and sent to Dr. Barbara Gottesman in the College of Education.”

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Kassing said, “I have a few announcements I’d like to share with you. VP Bob Ashton and I, along with Nancy Stake and Chuck Davidson, spent a day in Sacramento (March 14, 2005) visiting our legislators. We asked them to support us in three areas: the CSU Budget; granting CSU the authority to give doctoral degrees; and to support a bill changing a portion of Title V which would allow us to continue our Affinity program. We found very good support for these three areas. The UC system is challenging our request to grant doctoral degrees pretty severely.”

Interim President Kassing said, “I’d also like to extend my congratulations to Senator McClory on her selection for the first Outstanding Lecturer Award. I had the pleasure of contacting her first.”

Interim President Kassing said, “The University Planning Council (UPC) has gotten started, and they’ve been working very hard.”

Interim President Kassing said, “The budget discussions in Sacramento seem to be holding right now. I’d also like to share the [CSU Impact Study](#) with you, please pass it around. It is also online. It is a study done by the CSU on the impact of the CSU system on California. It talks a lot about our system and our campus.”

Interim President Kassing stated, “VP Ashton has asked me to share with you that there is a groundbreaking ceremony on May 5, 2005, for the Cesar Chavez Memorial.”

Interim President Kassing said, “When the Chancellor asked me to serve as Interim President, one of the things he asked me to do was to get a President’s house. I think we got one, and I’d like to tell you a little bit about it. We expect to close on the house, Friday, April 29, 2005. It is located in the Rose Garden on University and Garden Streets. Spartan Shops has purchased the house. VP Rose Lee will be working on exactly what we are going to do with it—whether we are going to bring it over to the state-side, or whether we are going to lease it from Spartan Shops.”

Questions:

Senator Sabalius said, “I’d like to know more about the stadium plans that I hear San José State University is planning to build in conjunction with the City of San José.” Interim President Kassing said, “Cindy Chavez has asked us if we would join with the city in a joint master planning effort for south campus and the areas surrounding it. The idea surfaced about 15 to 18 months ago with Proposition P. Proposition P was the city referendum that generated about \$25 million to build two sports parks—one for soccer and one for softball. The city identified two sites for those parks, and has been trying to put that money into play. However, there seems to be some challenges, such as noise, and a hazardous waste issue since one site is a landfill. The city asked us about a year ago if we would be willing to give some thought to using south campus as a site for that. We had a couple of meetings with the city, but it didn’t work out. When they came in with the proposal, they had completely covered the south campus with soccer fields, and we would have had limited use of them. I suggested that we might consider sharing facilities. We suggested that they consider pushing South and West. In a sidebar to that conversation, there is some effort by the city council to try and salvage the Earthquake franchise. I think that will be a challenge. We wouldn’t argue for a new stadium, it works for us.”

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

April 4, 2005 – No questions

April 18, 2005 – Senator Buzanski said, “I am a little disturbed by item number one. Particularly the idea of limiting the Senate meetings to 2 ½ hours. As you may remember, in the past we used to have Senate meetings every other week, and now we are down to once a month. We don’t seem to have enough time as it is, and I think the idea of going to 2 ½ hours would be counterproductive. We need additional time in the Spring semester. Also, the idea of putting the President’s remarks at the end is revolting to me.” Chair Nellen said, “Those comments are being directed to Senator

Donoho. Unfortunately, at 4:30 p.m. the room isn't as full as it is today, and we are looking for a way to improve this. You can email any suggestions to Senator Donoho."

B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None

C. Consent Calendar – Associate Vice Chair Maldonado-Colon announced that the Committee Preference Forms went out, but very few came back in. Associate Vice Chair Maldonado-Colon asked Senators to give her their committee preferences as soon as possible. Associate Vice Chair Maldonado-Colon presented the 2005/2006 Committee appointees, and the Senate approved them.

D. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1283, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Planning for San José State University's Sesquicentennial Anniversary Celebration (Final Reading)*.

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented a friendly amendment to change "sesquicentennial" in the first Whereas clause to read "sesquicentenary." **The Senate voted and AS 1283 passed unanimously as amended.**

Senator Heisch presented *AS 1286, Sense of the Senate Resolution – Promoting Liberal Education (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1286 passed with one abstention.**

V. Unfinished Business - None

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items – In rotation

A. Professional Standards Committee –

Senator Bros presented *AS 1289, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Online SOTEs (Final Reading)*. Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to change "insure" to "ensure," and to change "and" to "any" in the 3rd Resolved clause. Senator Stacks presented a friendly amendment to add "annual" after "provide" in the 2nd line of the 4th Resolved clause. Senator Hebert presented an amendment to change the Financial Impact to "Unknown." The Senate voted and the Hebert amendment failed. Senator Thames presented a friendly amendment to add a new 3rd Resolved clause to read, "Resolved, that we urge the Provost to continue exploring methods to reduce the costs of the paper method of collecting SOTEs should the online collection not be feasible, be it further." Senator Stacks presented an amendment to add a new Resolved clause to read, "Resolved, that we urge the Provost to authorize funding and that the cost of development and implementation not exceed \$100,000 prior to the evaluation of the proposal." The Senate voted and the Stacks amendment failed. Senator Vanniarjian presented a friendly amendment to add a new Resolved clause that reads, "Resolved, that we urge SERB to explore recurring costs in implementing this project." **The Senate voted and AS 1289 passed as amended with four abstentions.**

B. Curriculum & Research Committee –

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1284, Policy Recommendation, Modification to F01-3, Fee Waiver for Teaching Associates (First Reading)*. Dr. David Matthes presented a report on the Teaching Associates Fee Waiver program for the Curriculum and Research

Committee.

Dr. Matthes said, “The Curriculum and Research Committee will be asking you about making a change to the existing Teaching Associate Fee Waiver program. I hope to give you enough information that you can make a decision on this issue. I would like to remind you why the Senate brought this proposal originally. The purpose of the fee waiver was to support San José State University’s graduate programs; to support the experience Teaching Associates get; and to recognize the service provided and challenges faced by Teaching Associates. One of the methods we used to evaluate the program was to survey existing Teaching Associates, and the Chairs of departments that use Teaching Associates. The Chairs felt it was appropriate acknowledgement for the contributions Teaching Associates had made; that it enhanced the educational experience of the students in the department; it had helped recruit and train some high quality graduate students; it reduced the number of hours Teaching Associates were forced to work off campus; and it had not been particularly burdensome. The Teaching Associates responded that the program made them more committed to their field; that it gave them a stronger connection with San José State University; that it helped them stay in the program; that they were involved in research; that they had done better in their own courses; and that without the program they would have had to work more off campus.”

Dr. Matthes said, “It was pretty clear that the program is doing what we had hoped it would. The impact was pretty clear in that six out of eight colleges were using Teaching Associates.”

Dr. Matthes said, “When we started the program, there were about 81 or 82 Teaching Associates per semester. This number has gone up to about 115 per semester on average.”

Dr. Matthes said, “We had set a threshold limit of 3%. That is, when the number of Teaching Associates reached 3% of the total FTES, we would consider putting the program into early review. It turned out that at the very end of this review period, the number of Teaching Associates went over 3%.”

Dr. Matthes said, “The cost of the program is based on the number of Teaching Associates and the amount of their fee waivers. As university fees have increased, so has the cost of the Teaching Associates’ fee waivers. However, the cost of paying for the fee waivers is far lower than the cost of losing the students that would otherwise not be taking classes at San José State University, or the cost of covering these classes with full-time faculty members.”

Questions:

Senator Sabalius asked, “The California Faculty Association (CFA) is very concerned that Teaching Associates not be used to replace lecturers. Do you know of any instances where this has happened?” Dr. Matthes said, “I don’t know of any instances or patterns. Of course, there is always the possibility that the Chair would make this decision in times of difficult budget cuts. I think you have to count on the fact that the Chairs will make sure their courses are covered by properly trained personnel. Teaching Associates are only allowed to teach undergraduate lower-division sections or labs.” Senator Sabalius said, “I

do know of some instances of this.”

Senator Stacks said, “Some of us were concerned about this when the policy was passed, and that is why Teaching Associates are limited to four semesters. After the four semesters, if the student still wants to teach, they are put into the lecturer pool.”

Dr. Matthes said, “Let me wrap this up with our recommendations. First, given the benefits that Chairs of departments and Teaching Associates themselves reported from this program, and the fact that the costs are reasonably well balanced by whatever benefits might come, we recommend that you continue the program. Second, since the program is going so well, we recommend that you change the threshold value for review of the program from 3% to 4%. Right now we are hovering right around 3%, so you would be hearing from us every other semester. And, we recommend that you change the period over which the threshold value is calculated to an annual figure rather than a semester figure. Third, we recommend that the review period be changed from every two years to every five years in recognition of the program working so well.”

Senator Buzanski asked, “Can you estimate what the maximum expenditure would be by moving from 3% to 4%?” Dr. Matthes said, “Close to \$200,000.”

Senator Hebert asked, “Are there limitations on the number of sections that a Teaching Associate can teach during a semester?” Dr. Matthes said, “There are limits on both the number of classes they can teach and the number of semesters they can teach. Teaching Associates are limited to teaching four semesters, and they can teach only 2 labs or 2 lecture sections per semester.”

Senator Stacks asked, “Are you aware of other universities that use Teaching Associates?” Dr. Matthes said, “When we started the program, I surveyed other CSU campuses, and there were a handful that were using them. I’m not sure how that has changed.”

Senator Wilson said, “In the report you say that the Teaching Associates closely match the age, gender, and ethnicity of our undergraduates, can you comment on this?” Dr. Matthes said, “That was actually a rationale for the program. We didn’t go out and demographically survey them. The thought was that the Teaching Associates are being drawn from our student pool.”

Senator Vanniarjian said, “Will moving from 3% to 4% affect the hiring of part-timers?”

Senator Stacks said, “It was my understanding that Teaching Associates are not given preference for hiring. Lecturers come before Graduate students in hiring.”

Senator Singh asked, “Can you tell me which colleges are using Teaching Associates?” Dr. Matthes said, “About six out of the eight colleges use them, and about half of the departments in the university as a whole.”

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1282, Policy Recommendation, Revision and Reissuance of the General Education Guidelines (First Reading)*. Senator Lessow-Hurley

thanked Gail Evans, VP Robert Cooper, the members of the Board of General Studies (BOGS), Scot Guenter, the members of the University Library Board, and the members of the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) for their efforts. Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "Let me give you some history behind the guidelines. You may recall in 2002 the Senate retreat was on general education. When we initiated the general education review, we asked Chairs and faculty for feedback. BOGS and C&R met in the Spring of 2004 to plan a strategy. Scot Guenter facilitated three forums on revisions to the guidelines in Spring 2004. Surveys also went out to all faculty that had taught general education in the past two years, and a survey was sent to Deans and Chairs. All the data and draft revisions were submitted to VP Robert Cooper in January 2005. The draft of the new general education guidelines went out to the campus community in February 2005, and then there were another series of forums on that draft yet again. In March 2005 three forums were held. The final revisions were incorporated, approved by BOGS, and sent to C&R in March 2005. Everyone had access to them online. That leads us to this policy which basically suggests that we adopt the guidelines. I'd just like to be perfectly clear that this is a first reading. This is not a reading on the guidelines. You will not have the opportunity to rewrite the guidelines. The only document that we can alter at this point is the policy recommendation. We cannot debate the content of the guidelines. Presumably, if you have had any problems with the guidelines, you have had them heard already. Having said that I'm going to turn the meeting over to Dr. Gail Evans and VP Robert Cooper."

Senator Norton said, "I do not believe it is appropriate for the Senate to adopt a set of guidelines that they cannot amend or revise."

Senator Stacks said, "I thought the guidelines were going to be up for discussion, and then as a result, you got to do an up or down vote."

Chair Nellen said, "A recommendation could be made to C&R to take back to BOGS if there is a big enough change. However, I think to keep the integrity of the program, and the rationale for having BOGS, the recommendations need to go back to BOGS as opposed to this body making changes to it that might impact something we are not aware of in those guidelines."

Senator Singh said, "The nine units in residence, are they coming from the R, S, V, Z areas?" Dr. Evans said, "Yes." Senator Singh said, "Are Humanities 1 A/B and 2 A/B going away with these changes?" Dr. Evans said, "No, they are not being touched at all."

Senator Veregge said, "I have to agree with Senator Norton that the last time the general education program was reviewed, it came to the Senate for a full discussion. I think the guidelines should be open for discussion and for recommendations to go back to BOGS."

Senator Singh asked about the new name for general education. Dr. Evans said, "SJSU Studies is the proposed new name for what used to be called Advanced Studies courses."

C. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1279, Policy Recommendation, Modification to Senate By-*

laws, Clarification of the General Unit (Final Reading). The Senate voted and AS 1279 passed unanimously.

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1287, Senate Management Resolution, Creating a Faculty Diversity Committee (Final Reading)*. Senator Veregge presented a friendly amendment to remove “Director, EEO/Title IX Coordinator” from the membership. Senator Sabalius proposed an amendment to change the last Resolved clause to read, “Resolved, that the Faculty Diversity Committee will replace the existing Affirmative Action Committee.” Senator Norton said, “A policy cannot be amended by a Senate Management Resolution. Senator Sabalius withdrew his amendment. Senator Van Selst proposed an amendment to modify the last Resolved clause to read, “Resolved, that the Professional Standards Committee review S89-15 with the likely goal of replacing the Affirmative Action Committee.” The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed. Senator Nguyen made a friendly amendment to remove the “One student” from the membership and to replace it with “the Associated Students Director of Faculty Affairs, and the Associated Students Director of Campus Climate Affairs.” Senator Singh proposed an amendment to change the last Resolved clause to read, “Resolved, that the Faculty Diversity Committee shall review S89-15 and report to Professional Standards Committee.” The motion was not seconded. **The Senate voted and AS 1287 passed as amended with 2 Nays.**

D. Budget Advisory Committee -- None

E. Instruction & Student Affairs Committee --

Senator Thames presented *AS 1285, Sense of the Senate Resolution, SJSU Shared Values (Final Reading)*. Senator Veregge made a friendly amendment to add “, Scholarship,” after “intellectual inquiry” in the 2nd line of the Shared Values section under Learning. Senator Van Selst made a friendly amendment to change the Shared Values section under Community to read, “We value collaborative relationships within and” Senator Nguyen made an amendment to add “Associated Students” after “the President’s Office” in the first line of the 4th Resolved clause. The motion to amend was not seconded. Senator Stacks made a friendly amendment to add a new 5th Resolved clause to read, “Resolved, that the Senate appreciates any sponsorship Associated Students might provide to reinforce and promote the values; and be it further.” **The Senate voted and AS 1285 passed unanimously.**

Senator Thames presented *AS 1288, Policy Recommendation, Final Examination Policy (First Reading)*. Senator Thames said, “The reason we are bringing this policy today is that we don’t have a final exam policy on campus, even though we publish final examination guidelines in the schedule of classes. We were discussing the Greensheet policy in the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee meeting, and we wanted to refer to the Final Examination Policy and couldn’t find one. The Undergraduate Studies office found a memo dated back in 1977 asking the Senate to make a Final Examination policy, but we can’t find where it was ever done.” Senator Norton said he thought the Final Examination policy predated the Senate. Senator Thames said, “We decided to not recommend that we establish a list of courses that are changed twice a year by the Deans. We decided to leave that authority to the Deans. We changed it a little bit, but left it basically in tact.”

Senator Sabalius said, “Why do we have a Final Exam policy? Can’t faculty be trusted to determine this?” Senator Sigler said, “Anybody that has ever served as Dean knows that we need a policy.” Senator Thames said, “We deliberately kept the language examination or evaluation, because there are a lot of ways faculty have of giving examinations or evaluations.” Senator Buzanski said, “We have had a Final Examination policy ever since I have been here for forty-five years. The situation arose where some faculty would not give a final examination, and some of us complained about that. We do need to have a policy on this.” Senator Sabalius said, “This would rule out take-home finals, correct?” Senator Thames said, “We heard of several instances of faculty members that would have a take-home paper, or an examination and would have it due at the final examination period. The faculty member would then use this period to discuss it with the student.”

F. University Library Board –

Senator Heisch handed out a report from the Library. Senator Heisch said, “Let me begin by letting you know that we will be bringing you a draft policy on donation of books to the Library.”

Senator Heisch said, “This report has been worked over several times, and I hope it is clear to all. One thing I’d like to make clear from the beginning is that the comparison data from CPEC is from 2001/2002. I think all of you know that in the year 2004, students had checked out 100% more material than they did in the previous year. I’d like to call your attention to page 8. Notice that our expenditures per FTE have been going down. If you will notice on page 9, the Library staffing per FTES is astonishingly low.

Senator Buzanski said, “Can you explain the difference between the expenditures of the other large CSU campuses and San José State University? Why aren’t we spending a comparable amount?” Senator Heisch said, “That is a good question.” Senator Breivik said, “Since the elimination of the Orange book, that I’ve never personally seen, campuses have been on their own as to how much is spent for their Library.” Senator Heisch said, “Let me go on to page 14. Please recall we opened our amazing new Library in Summer 2003, and we opened it with the same staffing we had in Clark Library. There were no additional staff members, because there was no funding to support that. By 2002/2003, the university budget was 47% higher than it was in 1990/1991, but the Library budget was only 26% higher than it had been in 1990/1991. In moving into the new building, there were a number of things that we had to do that we hadn’t had to do before in Clark. For instance, there are four instructional labs and meeting rooms that have to be booked. Audiovisual has also got to be provided. The Library has been able to continue to run by having an overextended and dedicated staff. However, gratitude will not be sufficient in the long-term. Finally, if I may just point out on page 15, you have a figure there that shows you the decline in purchasing power of Library materials. This is money from the General Fund budget since 1990/1991, and I just want to point out that these are not constant dollars. On page 16, there are some recommendations that have carried over from our last report in 2002/2003. The first recommendation is to bring Library funding from state appropriations to a comparable level with other large organizations. We have been able to add a \$14 IRA fee this year, but it is devoted to: extended hours of operation, electronic,

video, technology support, and some staff help.

Finally, there is an SJSU Library Advisory Council that has been setup, and they have an ambition goal to raise \$7.5 million by 2015.”

Senator Norton said, “Shouldn’t this report be presented to the Resources Planning Board (RPB)?” Senator Heisch said, “We’re reporting to the Senate because the University Library Board reports to the Senate, and because you asked us to.”

Senator Buzanski said, “I’m still wondering about the six large CSUs, we aren’t included in the six, in other words the six largest CSUs figure removed us from the six, is this correct?” Senator Heisch said, “Yes.”

Senator Breivik said, “The other libraries are cutting staff and we haven’t, however, they haven’t opened a brand new Library.”

Senator Stacks said, “Has the University Library Board thought about bringing a Sense of the Senate Resolution?” Senator Heisch said, “I love Sense of the Senate Resolutions and we could probably have one by Friday.”

VII. Special Committee Reports -- None

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions: In rotation.

A. Vice President for Student Affairs – No Report

B. Associated Students President –

Associated Students President Rachel Greathouse said that last Wednesday was a statewide day of action for all students across CSU campuses. Senator Nguyen went to Sacramento to lobby our legislators. There is a particular Assembly Bill that we are supporting, Assembly Bill 700 through Senator Horton. This bill is in regards to financial aid and Cal grants, etc. The bill supports changing the requirement that a student under 24 can get financial aid, but a student over 24 cannot. We are also hosting our Associated Students Award Ceremony this Thursday at 6:00 p.m. in the Ballroom. And, we have a food festival on May 14th in front of the Associated Students House. We also have the Cesar Chavez Groundbreaking Ceremony on May 5th at 2:00 p.m., and we have the Tommie Smith/John Carlos Groundbreaking Ceremony on May 27th at 1:30 p.m. I also want to take this time to thank Chair Nellen for helping out with the transition of the new Associated Students Board of Directors. They really appreciated it. I also want to thank Senators Kassing and Phillips for speaking at the CSSA conference we hosted in this room last weekend. We had all student leaders from the twenty-three campuses here.”

C. Statewide Academic Senator(s) –

Senator Van Selst said, “There are five things on the forefront right now. One is the doctoral authorization. There is also work on Athletics. The CSU Statewide Senate will be asking all remaining campuses to look at joining the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). SB 5 (The Student Bill of Rights) actually died in committee, but it is going to come back next year.

As you may have predicted, the assembly of forces for the transfer-agreement for the lower division transfer program is lower than we'd like, but it is progressing. There are also resolutions on protecting institutional memory and history."

Questions:

Senator Veregge asked, "On the lower division transfer agreement, first we were led to believe we only had to identify forty-five units. This has been done in various disciplines, now we are being asked to identify another fifteen units." Senator Van Selst said, "The first forty-five units are statewide, the last fifteen are up to the campus specifically. In many cases it is fifteen units of electives." Senator Veregge said, "There is a little confusion now that there are no CAN numbers. Do you have any insight on this?" Senator Van Selst said, "Yes, CAN numbers are basically used to transfer articulated courses. The CSU doesn't want to be constrained by having other people tell us what is in our courses, so we basically left the CAN system and started a yet-unnamed CSU system."

Senator Singh said, "We used to have a common code for all Engineering courses, now all the departments have different numbers." Senator Van Selst said, "We need to talk."

Chair Nellen said, "I have a comment about the resolution on joining the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). I did give our comments to our three CSU Statewide Senators on this. One of the resolved clauses said that they wanted the Chancellor to tell the Division 1A schools to join the coalition. I said that was a little bit too direct in singling us out to do this, since the other two Division 1A universities have joined. If they wanted us to do this, then they should just tell us."

D. Provost – Moved to next meeting

E. Vice President for Administration – Moved to next meeting

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.