

Minutes of the Academic Senate

May 15, 2008

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Carla Bossard at 3:00 p.m. on May 15, 2008. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Carla Bossard, Vice Chair Brother Charles Hilken, David Alvarez, David Bowen, Zach Flanagan, Joan Peterson, Charles Hamaker, Deane Lamont, Lidia Luquet, Phil Perry, Martin Rokeach, Ed Tywoniak, and Parliamentarian Valerie Burke. Absent was Past Chair Ted Tsukahara.

Also present were: Jerry Brunetti, Rebecca Carroll, Dean Tom Carter, Provost Beth Dobkin, Debra Holtz, Annalee Lamoreaux, Linda Rose, Sue Marston, Steve Miller, Dean Frank Murray, Tom Poundstone, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Mary Volmer, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the April 24, 2008 meeting were approved as submitted.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Bossard reported a meeting will be held for first year advisors on August 26th. The freshmen class theme is Feast or Famine. She urged faculty to complete the Campus Climate Survey sent by email.

Chair Bossard reminded Senators that the joint Senate/EPB/Core Curriculum Task Force meeting would be held on May 19, from 3-5 p.m.

Consent Agenda - The following items were accepted on the Consent Agenda:

- a. Turnitin.com Recommendation from EPB
- b. Proposal for Study Abroad Seville from EPB
- c. Honors Program Proposal from EPB

Vice Chair Sweeney explained that the Honors Program Proposal is a request to accept it as an expansion from a living/learning community to a four-year program including curricular and co-curricular components. It includes the creation of an Honors Advisory Committee. The honors distinction is part of the program, but the concept of an honors track is not.

4. Vice Chairperson's Report – Brother Charles reported that the faculty elections are complete. Brother Charles submitted and reviewed a written report from the Committee on Committees (CoC), in response to the charge from the President's Building on Strengths Strategic Plan section 6.2., to analyze the current committee structure. (The full report is on file in the office of the Academic Senate.)

5. Provost's Updates – Provost Dobkin reported that over 60 faculty and staff attended a forum to set the goals for the College Committee on Inclusive Excellence (CCIE). Robert Bulman will co-chair the committee with the Provost. Provost Dobkin asked the Senate to recommend representatives for a small task force to review the implementation of a June summer session. She said summer school is needed to help deal with students who do not have enough credits to graduate. A stipend would be offered to those faculty volunteering to teach the summer session.

6. Fast Track Guidelines – Dean Frank Murray appeared before the Senate to explain the history behind the creation of the fast track guidelines. The question of fast track guidelines arose with the fast track approval of the new BA in Leadership program. In the past the fast track approval process applied to graduate programs, and the Guidelines are posted under the Graduate Policies Committee. The BA in Leadership is an undergraduate program designed for professional adult learners.

Dean Murray said there are several ways to address program needs: through the type of degree, the school, or through the budget. All undergraduate programs operate out of one centralized budget process. The adult and graduate programs operate each program separately and are responsible for budget targets, faculty assignments, and student enrollments independently. Proposals for new adult or graduate programs operating under this budget process have had to come forward to the faculty bodies for approval. Questions regarding enrollment, numbers of students, tenure track faculty needs, and tuition levels were required for approval, but the answers would not be known until the program was already in existence. Fast Track Guidelines were initiated for those programs that had to meet budget restraints in advance, but where the budget information would not be known until the program had been operating. The fast track would provide a way to establish the program and demonstrate its viability in advance. To protect the academic integrity the sign off procedure includes the approval of the director of the program, the dean of the school, the provost, the CFO, legal counsel, and the chair of the EPB to review the educational aspects of the program. The EPB chair is to provide faculty advice to the administrative process. A deadline is set by the EPB chair before final approval is required (one or two cycles).

A recent fast track proposal for BA in Leadership came from the School of Liberal Arts. The program is an undergraduate program that serves adult students. Undergraduate programs are not allowed to use the fast track guidelines. However, the BA in Leadership serves adult students and has the budgetary restrictions of the adult and graduate programs.

Senator Luquet reported that in researching the development of the fast track guidelines, it was discovered that the fast track guidelines were never formally approved. The guidelines are placed on the website under the Graduate Policies Committee and refer only to the graduate programs. It was suggested that language be brought forth in the fall to formally approve the fast track process. Dean Murray offered to work with Senator(s).

7. Educational Policies Board – Steve Miller reported that the EPB held its final meeting on Monday, May 12, 2008. Three items were approved and forwarded to the Senate’s consent agenda. Barbara McGraw registered the Center for Engaged Pluralism. The AARC reported on the advising statement, which will continue to be addressed by the AARC in the fall.

OLD BUSINESS

8. Resolution for Improving Inclusiveness – Senators Rokeach and Flanagan submitted the following resolution for approval. A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and SECONDED by Senator Hamaker to approved the resolution. The following resolution was approved by voice vote, with one abstention, as amended (new language in bold).

As a Catholic institution, Saint Mary’s College of California affirms that every human being is created in the image of God and therefore possesses a complete and inalienable dignity – a dignity that transcends class, color, creed or merit.

In light of this principle, the Academic Senate shares the concern, sadness, and outrage of our entire community about ongoing patterns of uncivil behavior here at Saint Mary's College. We strongly reject any behavior – whether intentional or unintentional – that degrades or demeans the dignity of any members of our college community. In a spirit of solidarity and urgency, we respectfully request that the Provost, in coordination with the new College Committee on Inclusive Excellence (CCIE), provide workshops to increase cultural competence for all faculty, staff, and students, guided by the expertise of professionals in the field. Furthermore, we recommend that such workshops be mandatory beginning in the fall of 2008, with their success and continued necessity to be assessed **by the CCIE with a report to the Senate** in the spring of 2011.

9. **Responses to Senate Actions** – Chair Bossard reported on the Provost's response to outstanding Senate action S-06/07-16, Revision to language in the Faculty Handbook regarding Timelines. The Provost suggested several revisions to the Faculty Handbook language as proposed by the Senate to FH Section 1.6.1.2.1.1, Timelines. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Brother Charles and SECONDED by Senator Bowen to accept the Provost's amendments. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

10. Resolution on R&T on the Placement of Peer Teaching Observations in the R&T Files – Senator Luquet proposed the following amended FH language to section 1.4.2.4.1. : She explained that the proposed amended language is in response to a request from R&T Chair Rebecca Carroll at the December 6th Senate meeting.

1.4.2.4.1 Duties of a Departmental Chairperson, Undergraduate Department

3. Teaching Effectiveness

b. Written evaluation of class visitation.

- i. The visitor is required to submit a written evaluation of the visit to the faculty member and then to consult about the valuation with him/her. A copy of the evaluation is to be placed in the departmental file. **The Chairperson will attach these written evaluations of the visits to Form B as an integral part of Form B in the case of a promotion or tenure review. Similarly, in the case of an interim review, the written evaluations of class visitations will be attached to the written review of the candidate's performance submitted by the department chairperson (FH 2.6.2.2.1.2) as an integral part of that written review.**

A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and SECONDED by Senator Hamaker to accept the proposed amendment. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Vice Chair Brother Charles noted that this is a first step and the Senate needs to continue to address the question of principle. Senator Flanagan may bring a proposal to the Senate in the fall such as, "All class visitation letters should not go into the confidential file."

11. Resolution to amend FH Section 2.13.2.3, Scholarly Leave of Absence and FH Section 2.6.2.1.3, Tenure to Reconcile "will" and "may" language.

It was brought to the attention of the Senate by R&T Chair Rebecca Carroll that there was a discrepancy in the language between the FH Section 2.13.2.3 and FH Section 2.6.2.1.3 regarding the usage of the word “will” and “may”. Senator Luquet reviewed the Handbook language and proposed the following:

LEAVES

FH 2.13.2.3 Scholarly Leave of Absence

Tenure and tenure-track faculty shall be eligible to apply for a one-term Scholarly Leave of Absence, not to exceed one semester every four years, to pursue a scholarly or creative project, as recommended by the Dean and approved by the President. [*One academic year or less of scholarly leave of absence may be counted as part of the probationary period*] **For the relation between Scholarly Leave of Absence and the probationary tenure-track period at the College, see FH 2.6.2.1.3.**

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

FH 2.6.2.1.3 Tenure

The normal length of probationary tenure-track letters of appointment is one year; all such letters of appointment are eligible for consideration for annual renewal. The total length of the probationary tenure track period at the College will not exceed seven years. Faculty appointed to a probationary tenure-track position can have up to a maximum three years of experience recognized towards tenure. Scholarly leave of absence for one year or less will count as part of the probationary period [.] **except** [In] **in** the case when a faculty member already has been granted **the** maximum years towards tenure (three) [.] . **In this case**, whether or not the scholarly leave of absence will count as part of his probationary period is subject to prior approval by the provost.

A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and **SECONDED** by Senator Hamaker to approve the recommendation. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

12. Faculty Appreciation of Staff Award - Chair Bossard offered the following resolution:

Whereas the staff of Saint Mary’s College of California supports the mission of the College by their continual facilitation of the faculty’s academic endeavors on behalf of student learning and growth,

Be it resolved that the faculty, with the support of the Office of the Provost, will award two faculty recognition of staff awards in May of each year.

A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and **SECONDED** by Senator Bowen to approve the resolution. Chair Bossard said there will be an additional staff award presented by the Staff Council to staff that do not work directly with faculty. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

13. Resolution on Professional/Adult Programs – Vice Chair Brother Charles explained that Associate Dean Chris Sindt made a presentation to the CoC regarding committee representation for faculty involved in the programs that serve professionals. Therefore, the following resolution was presented for approval:

Whereas undergraduate programs for professionals (e.g. LEAP and Leadership), referred to in the Faculty Handbook as adult programs are more closely aligned by calendar, finances, and principles of operation to graduate programs,

And **whereas** said professional programs are already grouped together with graduate programs as “adult and graduate programs” elsewhere in the Faculty Handbook,

And **whereas** in the language current in academia adult programs are commonly called professional programs

Be it resolved that the following changes be made in the Faculty Handbook in the sections treating faculty elections and committee and service.

[For section 1.6, boldface represents proposed additions. For section 1.7, a summary proposal is given below for implementation by the Faculty Handbook Review Committee.]

1.6.1.1.4 Faculty Qualifications for Election

In elections conducted by the Academic Senate the following are criteria for election:

1. In elections conducted by the Academic Senate the following are criteria for election:

a. Representatives must be faculty who appear on the Rank and Tenure roster.

b. Faculty representing the undergraduate program in their School must teach a majority of their courses in the undergraduate program of that School. Faculty representing the graduate **or professional** program in their School must have taught at least two graduate **or professional** courses in the School the previous scholastic year.

....

d. Faculty representing a program, undergraduate, graduate **or professional**, in their School must be elected from the respective program. A faculty member may stand for election in one program in a School only. In case of dual appointment or multiple eligibility, the faculty member decides in which program he/she will stand for election.

....

1.6.1.1.5 Voting Rights

1. Elections conducted by the Academic Senate:

a. Ranked Faculty. All ranked faculty will automatically receive notice that the election ballot has been electronically posted. They will simultaneously receive individual passwords to be used when casting their ballot. Faculty members may vote in one School only. For school-designated positions, all faculty members must declare

on the preference survey which pool of eligibility
(graduate/**professional** or undergraduate and school) for which
they qualify, determined by the School where the majority of
courses are taught in a given scholastic year.

....

1.7. Committee Structure

[All references to graduate faculty membership and representation in committees be changed to “graduate and professional” faculty. This shall include the renaming of the Graduate Educational Policies Committee as the Graduate and Professional Educational Policies Committee.]

Be it further resolved that references to “adult and graduate” programs in the remainder of the Faculty Handbook be changed to “graduate and professional” programs.

A MOTION was made by Senator Perry and SECONDED by Senator Lamont to accept the proposed language. The Senate was not in total agreement as to the use of “professional” vs. “adult learners”. Senator Hamaker suggested adding the definition of “professional” to the section heading. Chris Sindt strongly urged the Senate to use the term “professional” rather than “adult”. Brother Charles agreed to add the definition of “professional” to the Handbook. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

14. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cathe Michalosky