

**Meeting of the Academic Senate
October 2, 2008**

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. on October 2, 2008. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chairperson Brother Charles Hilken, Vice Chairperson Tom Poundstone, David Alvarez, David Bowen, Jerry Brunetti, Gerry Capriulo, Zach Flanagan, Marty Rokeach, Ed Tywoniak, and Parliamentarian Valerie Burke. Absent was Past Chair Carla Bossard.

Also present were: Michael Barram, Mike Bonazza, Vice President Michael Beseda, Robert Bulman, Joel Burley, Dean Tom Carter, Erik Coloma, Provost Beth Dobkin, Emily Elliott, Tomas Gomez, Laura Heid, Dean Brian Jersky, Ann Kelly, Scott Kier, John Knight, Mary McCall, Barbara McGraw, Dean Frank Murray, Brittney Mazzeta, Jim Sauerberg, Chris Sindt, Carole Swain, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Ted Tsukahara, and Tiffany Warner.

2. Minutes of the September 18, 2008 meeting were unanimously approved as amended by voice vote.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Brother Charles reported that SMC's decline in the rankings of US News and World Report was discussed at the last Senate meeting. Faculty were concerned that the College's decision to not participate in the survey may have had an impact on the rankings. The issue is being submitted to the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) for consideration. Also, Senator Capriulo has delivered a resolution regarding the issue to be considered at the next Senate meeting.

Provost Council of Deans meeting: The Provost made an announcement of the possibility of budget cuts this year, students are experiencing a greater need. At least 300 students have a hold on January Term registration awaiting loans for tuition. Due to the financial crisis, endowments are down and payments on debt are up. The students are under great pressure as their status at SMC is in danger. There is a need to think of ways to cut costs.

Chair Brother Charles said there are several topics for possible forums in the future: faculty salary policy, communities of teaching and scholarship, and innovative research.

4. Vice Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Poundstone reported that there are two large scale public forums scheduled for November 20, 2008 from 3-5 p.m. and December 3, 2008 from 12:40 – 2:10 p.m. The Core Curriculum Task Force (CCTF) will be publishing the models and the Senate wants all three models broadly discussed. There may also be a special session of the UEPC to address the issue.

5. Provost's Updates – Provost Dobkin reported that there has not been a mandate to cut the budget, but given the way our students are affected there is a likelihood we will need to consider reducing expenses. She has asked the deans to consider where they may be able to cut expenses.

6. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Senator Tywoniak reported as the Senate liaison. The UEPC met with the GPSEPC in a joint session to review sabbatical proposals. The deliberations are complete, but the President has not yet made the

announcement. The UEPC will meet soon to consider the role of the UEPC in the CCTF recommendations. The original proposal included the EPB in the final approval process, but given that the EPB no longer exists, the UEPC will discuss what its role may be in the process.

7. Graduate & Professional Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) – Senator Brunetti reported as Senate liaison to the GPSEPC. The committee met jointly with the UEPC to review the sabbatical proposals. He added that the instruction materials were very broad, and he suggested that it would be helpful to have priorities stated.

8. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) – Vice Chair Poundstone announced that there is nothing to report since the last Senate meeting.

9. Program Review Committee (PRC) – Senator Rokeach announced that there is nothing to report since the last Senate meeting.

10. Associated Students of Saint Mary's College (ASSMC) – Chair Brother Charles introduced the ASSMC President, Erik Coloma. ASSMC includes the Student Senate and Executive team. These two entities stand as the student body's voice and as the liaison to administration. Erik introduced additional members of the ASSMC executive committee: Mike Bonazza as Vice President of Finance, Brittney Mazzeta as Vice President of Administration, and Tiffany Warner as Vice President of Student Affairs. There are 28 seats on the Senate and 22 are currently filled.

The mission of the ASSMC is "to represent students; to promote student morale and interaction; to ensure an active role for students in deciding College policies and priorities; to oversee all student clubs, media, and organizations; and to safeguard student rights." The purpose is to involve students and let them know they can make a difference and challenging students to get involved and see what needs to be improved on campus.

ASSMC is comprised of over 36 chartered student organizations and four affiliates, which include student media, awareness/activism organizations, diversity clubs, special interest groups, academic organizations, and student service groups. Often clubs will work together. There is a large student population involved on campus. Clubs help students to grow by encouraging them to develop skills and making them feel they belong on campus.

The Student Senate makes changes on campus that impact the community. The ASSMC strives to connect, motivate, and build. A few of the accomplishments of the ASSMC are:

- Insured that every piece of merchandise sold with a SMC logo came from a sweatshop free organization.
- Several years ago the ASSMC was instrumental in extended the Library hours to 1:00 a.m.
- Responsible for aiding the County Connection to provide free transportation by providing \$13,000 to keep the buses running.
- Provided digital signage around the campus.
- Currently developing a suggestion box and working to improve laundry services.
- To revamp resident hall lounges.

11. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) – Jim Sauerberg reported for the FWC regarding the Faculty Salary Policy. (The full report is on file in the office of the Academic Senate.) Goal #1 is “the average of salaries by rank should minimally be the average salaries by rank of

Pacific IIA institutions.” This is the first step in the faculty salary policy. Goal 1 has been met since 2004.

Goal 2 is a long-term goal, “should aim for the median of the assistant professor scale at Saint Mary’s to be at the median assistant rank average salaries of the WCC+1 schools.” SMC has been 10% below the goal for many years and it appears this will continue.

Goal 3 is an internal goal regarding the spread of salaries, “should aim for a salary structure that is equitable across ranks.” The range of salaries seems consistent with those of Pac IIA schools. Pac IIA schools increased at a small rate previously, but last year it had a great increase. If this continues, SMC may fall behind.

Jim Sauerberg reported that every three years the Faculty Salary Policy is reviewed. The review was conducted last spring and the final report was issued on 5-30-08. The report questioned why the campus was not making progress toward Goal 2. Brother Ronald’s response was that the college is currently unable to make progress on salary goal #2 and suggested it be modified or removed.

Senator Capriulo and Senator Brunetti were involved in the deliberations when the current salary policy was created. Senator Capriulo said there was no timetable established when the policy was created and faculty may need to add a timetable to the goal #2.

Jim Sauerberg stated that the FWC disagrees with Brother Ronald’s decision. There is no short term effect as salaries are set for this year. There could be limited effects in the future.

Jim Sauerberg said that goal #1 is currently financially feasible. Goal #2 will not go forward if the President is not interested and does not consider it a goal worth pursuing. The FWC is asking for faculty recommendations as to its response to Brother Ronald, i.e., Ask Brother Ronald to reconsider? Live without a salary policy? Live without goals#2? Develop a new policy?

Senator Capriulo said this is a bilateral agreement that calls for the other party to continue to go forward. Faculty have a bilateral agreement that is being ignored. Policies should be part of shared governance. A bilateral agreement is not voided because one party decides to ignore it. Senator Bowen suggested providing a counter argument to the President’s responses. Senator Brunetti said that a question regarding goal #2 is about identity, who do we want to compare ourselves to?

Senator Flanagan said there are differences in endowment and enrollment figures with the various schools, but the Pell grant and financial aid figures are a concern.

Jim Sauerberg said it is important for the FWC to ask what items have changed in the past three years since the adoption of the policy. The Pell grant size would be one figure. Provost Dobkin said that within the WCC only LMU comes close to us in comparison. There are differences in other statistical measures.

Vice Chair Poundstone asked who decides on what our comparison group is? Several faculty questioned the purpose of a comparison group and whether this group could be changed and how that would affect the salary goals.

Chair Brother Charles concluded that the FWC wants to hear from the faculty. He asked Senators to forward items to the agenda committee in order to forward with this issue. Jim Sauerberg was also said that any feedback, questions or suggestions can be forwarded to the members of the FWC.

12. An Act of Intolerance Protocol for Students, Faculty and Staff - Chair Brother Charles introduced the document which is proposed to be accepted for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook. Following are some comments/questions about the document:

- The document is too broad.
- Who will determine what an act of intolerance or harassment is, what is the difference between them?
- What is the motivation behind the person making the claim? It could cross over to a breach of privacy.
- Is the proposed policy an overreaction to WASC claims of incivility? Are we being responsible or reactionary? Are we misguided in trying to disprove WASC rather than facing our responsibilities of who we are?
- in agreement, but the document does not define an act of intolerance.
- What is an act of intolerance that does not rise to the level of harassment?
- What happens if an individual is found responsible, and who would decide that?
- How will we decide about a conflict of a civil code rather than an illegal activity?
- Are the disciplinary procedures for harassment and discrimination the same as that for acts of intolerance?
- Can see why we need a policy as opposed to no policy. Will the document allow something to be done that could not be done before?
- There is a level of interpretation. It could be abused, however.

Provost Dobkin said the document is a group effort. She felt the intention was to open the conversation and discuss whether a policy should be adopted. It is an attempt to learn how to separate the idea versus the person.

Scott Kier said this problem arises more often in the residence halls and this policy will give them a process to have the conversation. The Student Handbook has already adopted the Protocol. The educational piece is what has been missing in the past.

Mary McCall said part of the reason for the creation of the document was due to the results of the climate survey. People indicated that they did not know where to go if they experienced an offensive act that was not classified as harassment. The former discussion about an Ombudsperson position is related to this. The protocol will heighten awareness and help to create the kind of community where everyone feels appreciated.

Robert Bulman said the committee developed the document because there is a need. Pages 2-4 are procedural. There are questions as to what the Senate wants in the Faculty Handbook.

Emily Elliott explained that students, faculty and staff do not know where to go when a problem arises. This procedure should help in those situations.

Chair Brother Charles said there is a need for a statement in the Faculty Handbook. He suggested that there be a conversation between the faculty and the CCIE. He asked the committee to discuss the document and consider the remarks of the Senate.

Senators indicated that they were in favor of continued work on the document. The Senate added the following requests for consideration by the CCIE:

- a. better information about how page one could be incorporated into the FH,
- b. a specific definition of an act of intolerance is needed
- c. more information about a preliminary discussion before it moves to the Disciplinary Board; need for it to be more educational.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator