

## **Minutes of the Executive Meeting of the Academic Senate**

**September 29, 2005**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Jerry Brunetti at 3:00 p.m. September 29, 2005. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Jerry Brunetti, Vice Chair Jane Sangwine-Yager, Past Chair Jim Sauerberg, Robert Bulman, John Ely, Paul Giurlanda, Robert Gorsch, Barbara Grant, Jim Hawley, Patrizia Longo, Lidia Luquet, Joan Peterson, James Temple, Ed Tywoniak, and Parliamentarian Michael Barram. Arriving late was Norm Bedford. Absent with notice was Hugh McAllister.

Also present were: Christa Kell, Dean Frank Murray, Dino Pruccoli, Chris Sindt, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. A MOTION was made by Senator Giurlanda and SECONDED by Senator Luquet to approve the minutes of the August 23, 2005 Executive Meeting as amended. The motion was approved by hand vote with one abstention. A MOTION was made by Senator Temple and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2005 General Meeting as amended. The motion was approved by hand vote with one abstention.

## **REPORTS**

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Brunetti reported that he has participated in the Budget Committee and the Provost's Academic Council of Deans meetings, there is nothing to report thus far. He also met with the President, Provost, Vice Provost and EPB Chair. At this meeting he shared a list of Senate concerns and emphasized the point that there is mistrust of the administration among much of the faculty. Two issues were clarified: Provost Stampf, like all senior administrators, has a one-year term, and Br. Ron said no decision had been made about the closing of the School of Extended Education (SEED) before the Trustees meeting.

Chair Brunetti reported that he has invited Br. Ron to meet with the Senate in executive session on November 17th.

Chair Brunetti requested and obtained the Faculty Salary Policy Report from Pete Michell. The report was distributed to the Senators.

Voting is underway by the Senate and the Educational Policies Board members for the nominees for the Core Curriculum Task Force. The Chairs, Vice Chairs and Past Chairs of the Senate and EPB will then select the six faculty members for the Task Force, guided by the voting.

4. Consent Agenda –Vice Chair Sangwine-Yager reported that the EPB had approved a Proposal for Study Abroad at Deakin University Australia by a vote of 10-0-3, which places the item on the Senate’s Consent Agenda. Thirteen (13) Senators agreed to remove the item from the Consent Agenda for discussion.

Questions arose as to whether there is a requirement of a 30% profit for the College. Senator Giurlanda asked if the Brothers in Australia were consulted regarding the choice of Deakin University. EPB Chair Chris Sindt said the EPB never discusses finances. The proposal was received by the EPB in August. He had three choices as the EPB Chair: 1) grant fast-track approval, 2) vet the proposal through the UPC and EPB (which would have taken months), or 3) vet the proposal directly through the EPB. In the spring of 2004 the EPB agreed with the Vice Provost not to approve any Study Abroad Programs until a governing board, mission statement, and a template were in place. Chris Sindt said the conditions had been met, and the EPB was extremely impressed with the progress that had been made. The EPB did have concerns about the progress of program review, but Dino Pruccoli was working closely with the PRC and the process of program review had begun. The Australian proposal fits into the template. The EPB approved the proposal by a vote of 10-0-3. Three abstentions were voiced due to concern of the expediency of the process.

Vice Chair Sangwine-Yager asked Dino Pruccoli if Deakin was chosen because it met the 30% overhead criterion rather than because it was the most student-centered? She expressed concern that schools were being selected for financial reasons and not primarily because of their educational mission. Dino Pruccoli answered that he and David Ford stayed with the Brothers, and the Brothers chose the schools for them to visit. The choice of Deakin was aided by the Brothers. He further explained that the 30% criterion was not for each program, but for the Center as a whole. Therefore, even if a particular program did not meet the 30% criterion, they could have gone with it. Dino Pruccoli said they visited seven campuses. Deakin was chosen because of the staff and services offered, the ratio of advisors to students, the availability of a three-day orientation, and because three campuses provided more opportunity with a variety of majors. There was some confusion about the number of Deakin University students as stated in the report; clarification is needed.

Senator Tywoniak questioned the meaning of #7 of the Proposal, “What are the benefits of this program for both the students and SMC?” Are the benefits well known by other institutions that have had cooperative experiences at Deakin? Dino Pruccoli said that he spoke with other institutions that had worked with Deakin, large schools and private schools. Deakin was highly recommended.

Senator Hawley said he knows a number of faculty that teach at Deakin, and they are very good. He suggested that perhaps the report is weak, but as questions are posed the answers are satisfactory. He suggested that in the future the report could include access to the website and ways to collaborate information from other institutions that have had experience with the institution.

Senator Ely asked if someone would watch over the SMC's students since a SMC faculty member would not accompany them. Dino Pruccoli answered that there is a support center for the international students.

Chris Sindt added that a rubric is being developed for Study Abroad Programs and this is the first proposal to come forward under the new guidelines. The EPB is incorporating the Study Abroad Programs into the Program Review process for the future.

Chair Brunetti noted that important general and process considerations had been raised. He raised expressed mild concern that the Senate was raising questions when two faculty committees had already reviewed and approved the proposal. He asked the Senate how it wished to proceed. A MOTION was made by Senator Ely and SECONDED by Senator Hawley to place the issue back onto the Consent Agenda.

Senator Giurlanda expressed his concern with the protocol. There was not sufficient information presented to come to a rational decision about this particular proposal. Were Senators expected to "rubber stamp" items? There were clearly issues raised that he felt needed discussing. He did not wish to offend or disrespect his colleagues on the EPB.

Chris Sindt said the EPB was currently working on the issues of concern raised surrounding Study Abroad Programs in general and the Deakin University Proposal. He asked that the Senators trust those on the EPB to carry out their tasks.

Vice Chair Sangwine-Yager asked Chris Sindt for assurance that the EPB will consider financial issues when approving Study Abroad Programs. She was concerned that SMC was choosing the cheapest campuses. Chris Sindt answered that the EPB could consider the question, but that the EPB was not charged with overseeing the finances relating to a particular proposal. He further acknowledged that the EPB would continue to review the Study Abroad Programs, including the Australia proposal, in terms of whether the information about it was sufficient. However, in the meantime, students would be attending Deakin University in Australia.

The motion to place the items back onto the Consent Agenda was approved by a hand vote of 12-1-1.

5. Committee on Committees – Vice Chair Sangwine-Yager reported that the CoC had met twice. They were considering several serious issues surrounding the election process.

6. Senate Self-Assessment Subcommittee – Senator Longo reported that the subcommittee was in the process of collecting the data from the online faculty survey.

7. Rank and Tenure Subcommittee (RATS) – Senator Tywoniak reported that RATS had been charged to examine the issue of post full professor review and make a recommendation to the Senate by March 1st. There were two committees addressing this issue: RATS and an ad hoc committee of the Provost. Some of the key questions are: the nature and scope of the problem,

lines of authority of those working in the issue and whether the Senate is ultimately responsible for governance of R&T, collaborative effort with R&T members.

8. Vice Provost Job Description – Senator Temple reported that a job description had been drafted. He reported that he and Senator Hawley were working with Vice Provost Sweeney and Provost Stamp. He distributed a draft to the Senators and asked that it be reviewed for the next executive meeting. He explained that the last issue of concern is the nature of the involvement of the Vice Provost in the Rank and Tenure process. A recommendation was distributed for the Senate to consider at the next executive meeting.

Senator Ely asked that the Provost's job description be distributed to the Senators for comparison in considering the Vice Provost description. Past Chair Sauerberg agreed to send it out to the Senate.

9. Implementation of the Academic Honor Code – Dean Murray presented the yearly report on the implementation of the Academic Honor Code in compliance with the terms of the approval by the Senate and EPB. The purpose of the implementation of an Academic Honor Code was an attempt to move the culture to an affirmative position, making students responsible for their own work. The increase in students accepting a “no contest” resolution in the second semester indicated that students were recognizing the violations and accepting the consequences. The “XF” grade is a standard sanction. One of the concerns early on was that the students on the Honor Council would feel compassionate toward their fellow students and be unable to apply the standards. But 70% of the cases before the Honor Council resulted in a “XF” penalties. When warranted, the Honor Council has considered individual circumstances. Of those students that received an “XF” grade in the fall and attended the Integrity Seminar in the spring, the majority of them have successfully removed the “X” from their record. The faculty recorded 57 reports, 54 were resolved. Three students have failed to respond. Dean Murray reported his confidence that the system is working in all of its aspects

## **NEW BUSINESS**

10. Motion Regarding SEED Task Force and the Core Curriculum Task Force - A MOTION was made by Past Chair Sauerberg and SECONDED by Senator Longo to place the Motion on the agenda of the next General Meeting. Past Chair Sauerberg explained that last spring the EPB and Senate approved a Resolution, accepted by the Provost, expressing concern that the alternate proposal for the future of the School of Extended Education (SEED) would not receive a fair hearing. There was concern that the administration would allow the proposal to be seen by the Board, but hint that it was not worthy of consideration. Provost Stamp declared that she would present the proposal to the Board, accompanied by Penny Washbourn. It was reported that the Provost stepped away at the last instant and did not present the proposal, asking Penny Washbourn to do so instead. This was contrary to the agreement with the administration. At this point, it is difficult for faculty to now support a new task force for the core curriculum due to the mistrust felt by faculty. The motion requested the following:

That the Academic Senate not proceed with the appointment of a Core Curriculum Review Task Force until it is convinced that the Administration will behave with good faith toward the actions of the Academic Senate, and, in particular, accepts the Core Curriculum review Task Force as an independent, authoritative body with the membership as proposed by the Academic Senate.

Senator Ely stated that he was very frustrated, but he asked for clarification as to what the resolution was asking for.

Senator Luquet suggested referring to the inappropriate treatment of Penny Washbourn and the distrust between faculty and administration, and stating that these actions take away the energy needed to face the business of the College. She also suggested that a record of the violations of the Faculty Handbook be formally recorded and that a friendly tone be used in these communications.

Senator Tywoniak reported several comments made by colleagues that the Core Curriculum was important to the faculty and that the motion was holding the faculty hostage. On the other hand, he reported, colleagues noted that because of the importance of the Core Curriculum revision, it appeared that this was the proper line to draw in the sand. This would be a loud message to all involved. He was convinced that the Senate was representing the voice of the faculty in this resolution.

Vice Chair Sangwine-Yager said she had requested a report be issued about the Faculty Salary Policy Task Force for months. She believed the timing of the report, issued September 27, 2005, was a result of the effectiveness of the impending motion.

Past Chair Sauerberg suggested that the executive members of the EPB and Senate could meet to select the members of the Task Force, but that the selection would not be announced, pending satisfaction of the resolution.

Senator Giurlanda said that if the Senate accepted the resolution it would place the ball in the court of the administration and it would be making a statement. He supported placing the item on the agenda of the general meeting.

Senator Bulman expressed concern that the motion presented was really three separate issues: anger at the method by which the SEED decision was made, concern over the Core Curriculum Task Force and to what extent its decisions would be accepted by the administration, and the overarching concern about shared governance.

Senator Ely said it was a broader issue of shared governance. There was a widespread feeling of frustration.

Senator Hawley agreed that it was a shared governance issue, which had a long history. He suggested that a detailed list of grievances be listed. The issue should not focus specifically on the Core Curriculum, but should also include other possible forms of

leverage. He supported the general idea of the motion, but suggested that it be framed more broadly in the “Whereas” as well as in the “Therefore” sections.

EPB Chair Chris Sindt said he had been extremely impressed by the administration’s participation in the process since the approval by the Senate of the Core Curriculum Proposal. He did not agree with the motion, and felt this was not the place where the administration deserved to be punished.

Past Chair Sauerberg stated he was open to rewrites of the language but that he felt the Core Curriculum Task Force and the SEED Task Force were parallel: They both had to do with fundamental issues for the College; both were task forces set up by the President; both were task forces given more or less authority; both were public and open groups; both were groups with administrative support. The Provost did accept the Senate’s motion that the SEED proposal go forward and Provost Stampp offered to present it to the Trustees. The President and CFO attended a number of SEED Task Force meetings. It was fully supported by the administration until the morning of the Trustee’s meeting. All evidence indicated that the administration was supportive of the Core Curriculum Task Force process, but what would happen at the end of the process? In response to Senator Hawley’s suggestion, he answered that a laundry list of items tended to be diffuse. He proposed that Senators offer amendments to the draft in order to clearly state the parallels.

Senator Peterson said she was concerned that the punishment would affect more than the administration. She had submitted three students’ names for the Task Force and there was much excitement on campus about the core curriculum. She understood there was concern among the SEED Task Force members; however, she had not noted much concern about the SEED issue on campus. Many people on campus were interested in the core curriculum, and she was concerned about lumping the issues together. She also said she was reluctant to act when there had been no explanation from Provost Stampp as to her actions. Senator Peterson was not convinced that everything needed to be placed on hold to get reassurance from the administration.

Senator Grant stated that she saw this as an issue related to the lack of faculty participation in shared governance and related to old business, such as the representation on the Board of Trustees and issues regarding the Faculty Handbook. This appeared to be a strategic opportunity for faculty, as it was an issue the administration was engaged in and wished to move forward on.

Senator Bedford agreed with Senator Peterson that he would like to hear an explanation from Provost Stampp. However, faculty were frustrated by their level of work which was not recognized by administration. He would like to see the term “good faith” mean something between the administration and faculty. He would support strengthening the “good faith” language in the resolution.

Chair Brunetti commented that it was a great idea to bring this motion forward because it provided an opportunity to discuss many concerns of the faculty; however, he did not

support it. He opposed it because he said the resolution was not specific. He said much of the resolution was based on the bungling of the SEED proposal by administration. The faculty had not been given an explanation by the administration. The connections between the actions of administration regarding the SEED Task Force and the Core Curriculum Proposal were tenuous at best; the issues were very different.

Chair Brunetti accepted some responsibility in that he had accepted as not substantive the administration's addition of resource positions to the membership of the Task Force without consulting the Senate. He feared that the faculty would be disappointed with the Senate should it interrupt the Core Curriculum Task Force without a sound reason. He supported the sentiments expressed in the resolution, and shared the discontent and the frustration with administration; but he did not wish to stop the Core Curriculum Task Force.

Chair Brunetti clarified that approval of the resolution would stop the Core Curriculum Task Force. The motion would be placed on the agenda of the next general meeting. In the meantime, the Senate and EPB executive members would proceed to select the faculty representative to the Core Curriculum Task Force. Should the motion not be approved at the general meeting, the membership would be announced; otherwise, the membership would not be announced.

The Senate agreed to extend the meeting by 10 minutes.

Vice Chair Sangwine-Yager expressed concern about the growing membership of the Task Force. Although the six faculty members were the only voting members on the Task Force, the administration continued to add members.

It was agreed that the resolution needed to be amended and the Senate agreed to do this by email prior to the General Meeting. A roll call vote was taken on the motion to place the resolution on the agenda for the General Meeting as follows:

Jerry Brunetti	Yes	Barbara Grant	Yes
Jane Sangwine-Yager	Yes	Jim Hawley	No
Jim Sauerberg	Yes	Patrizia Longo	Yes
Norm Bedford	Yes	Lidia Luquet	Yes
Robert Bulman	No	Joan Peterson	Yes
John Ely	Yes	James Temple	Yes
Paul Giurlanda	Yes	Ed Tywoniak	Yes
Robert Gorsch	Yes		

The motion passed by a vote of 13-2-0.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky

Academic Senate Secretary