

**Minutes of the meeting of the  
Academic Senate  
April 23, 2009**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Brother Charles Hilken at 3:00 p.m. on April 23, 2009. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Brother Charles Hilken, Vice Chair Tom Poundstone, Past Chair Carla Bossard, David Alvarez, David Bowen, Jerry Brunetti, Gerry Capriulo, Zach Flanagan, Marty Rokeach, Ed Tywoniak, and Parliamentarian Valerie Burke.

Also present were: Michael Barram, Vice President Michael Beseda, CTO Ed Biglin, David Bird, Robert Bulman, Jane Camarillo, Nicholas Carmone, Karen Cowman, Provost Beth Dobkin, Patrick Ellison, Rebecca Engle, Sue Fallis, Jose Feito, Cynthia Ganote, Wayne Harter, Dana Herrera, Dean Brian Jersky, Chris Jones, Christa Kell, Brother Donald Mansir, Sue Marston, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Dean Frank Murray, Keith Ogawa, Maria Pagliarini, Norris Palmer, Joan Peterson, Mari-Anne Rosario, Jim Sauerberg, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Elizabeth Smith, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Kathleen Taylor, Mary True, Ted Tsukahara, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the March 12, 2009 and the April 2, 2009 meetings were approved as submitted.

## **REPORTS**

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Brother Charles reported that the Technology Committee has changed the policy regarding passwords. All faculty and staff will be required to change their password twice each year, beginning in July 2009.

Saint Mary's College has been awarded a grant from the National Science Foundation, for undergraduate research. Congratulations to the Senate Parliamentarian Valerie Burke, Professor Ronald Olowin and Elizabeth Gallagher.

4. Vice Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Poundstone reported that Steve Cortright is the incoming Senate Vice Chairperson. The final ballots are available online through Monday, April 28, 2009.

5. Provost's Updates – Provost Dobkin reported that the summer session currently has the minimum enrollment and she expects additional students to enroll. On May 8 an open meeting of the CCIE is scheduled to summarize the yearly activities. On May 19 a review of the draft report for the WASC special visit in August will take place at 3:00 p.m. The end of year faculty dinner is scheduled for May 15.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

6. The Undergraduate Core Revision – Chair Brother Charles reported that the Core Curriculum Task Force has submitted final documents to the Senate for consideration: The Final Report, Model 1, Model 2 Overview, Model 2 Full, Core Curriculum Implementation Committee, Implementation Costs, and Possible Learning Outcomes. (Copies of all documents on file in the office of the Academic Senate.)

Chair Brother Charles also reported that a faculty survey was offered online regarding the Core Curriculum models submitted by the CCTF; 58 faculty responded. The survey indicated a

majority preference of “strongly support” and “somewhat support” for Model 1 over Model 2, with many written comments being offered.

Chair Brother Charles asked for a motion to acknowledge receipt of the final documents submitted by the Core Curriculum Task Force (CCTF), as contained in the CCTF document list dated April 16, 2009. A MOTION was made by Senator Flanagin and SECONDED by Senator Rokeach to acknowledge receipt of the documents. Chair Brother Charles said the motion formally relieves the members of the CCTF of their three-year task to review the core curriculum. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Bossard and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to adopt one of the core curriculum models presented by the CCTF. Chair Brother Charles said that 20 minutes would be designated for the discussion prior to taking the secret ballot vote.

Chair Brother Charles said the Senate agreed at its meeting on April 4, 2009 to prepare a ballot containing the models presented by the CCTF and that each Senator would vote for one of the models presented. A secret ballot has been prepared for the vote. The Senate had also also agreed that the method of voting would require a majority of votes, and that the Senators had agreed to stay as long as it would take to obtain a majority vote on a model. Parliamentarian Burke explained that the Senators will select Model 1 or Model 2. If a Senator chooses to abstain, it is no vote; the majority of the votes cast will determine which model is implemented.

Senator Capriulo disagreed, stating that he recalls the Senate agreeing to vote up or down on each model, or that rejecting all of the models was a possibility. He said he would hope the Senate would continue to “tweak” one of the models in order to gain Senate votes. He acknowledged that the Senate had agreed that goals will drive the curriculum but that the Senate had not agreed to the learning goals. He said he could vote for either Model if he knew that Pathways of Knowledge included philosophical understanding. A motion was made by Senator Rokeach and seconded by Senator Capriulo to add a third category of "neither" to the ballot for the Senate vote.

Senator Alvarez argued against the motion to amend, stating that if the floor were open to voting against both models, the Senate will then be in a position to begin to construct a new model. Senator Alvarez said that by allowing "tweaking" the conversation may continue throughout the meeting, that Senator Capriulo would not be the only individual suggesting changes. The models presented by the CCTF is a result of three years of work and conversations.

A vote was taken on the motion to amend, the motion failed by a vote of 3-7-0.

The following are questions, suggestions, or comments about the models:

Vice Chair Poundstone asked about the idea of sending accompanying “notes” along with the model chosen. Chair Brother Charles said the idea is that a Senate subcommittee will prepare official notes to be passed on as the Senate’s contribution to administration and/or the implementation committee.

Vice Provost Sweeney reminded faculty that there were two goals when the process began; to conduct a review and make recommendations and to establish a process for ongoing discussions and review of the core curriculum. Whatever model is chosen, the core will have a regular cycle of review and evaluation.

Senator Flanagin - After reading the comments from the faculty survey and speaking with faculty, it appears that faculty interpret Model 1 in two distinctive ways. Some faculty view Model 1 as the least change from the current system, and they don't wish to change. Others feel Model 1 is a way to open a door to more change in the future. He said he is not comfortable voting for Model 1 because it is the most similar to the current core, but rather as an opportunity to look to improve.

Vice Chair Poundstone - Model 1 is designed to bring integration to the core, without an integration element. He saw difficulties in implementing the learning goals.

Ted Tsukahara - A major step in the process with any of the models is a recognition that whatever is advanced requires consistency with learning goals. There is the integration with the core; not the type of integration in disciplinary or multi-disciplinary fashion, but integration with a set of learning goals that we believe represents a foundational education for all SMC undergraduates.

Senator Tywoniak - Model 1 provides a framework which allows the capacity to continue to improve in the future. We have come a long way in three years collectively as a community in the conversation of what it means to educate our students. He said that the conversation will continue.

Senator Flanagin - Would like an explicit decision to change. He wants the Model to be a framework for moving forward and not a place to stay the same. Vice Chair Poundstone said the newly revised Model 1 has much more flexibility for growth, providing the room to continue the discussions.

Robert Bulman - Either model represents significant change. One appears more familiar than the other because it maintains somewhat the same structure of distribution requirements. Model 2 is more innovative because it tackles what distribution requirements are meant to do through the linked themed courses. Future change to seminar is a necessary discussion and could potentially be accommodated in Model 2 as easily as it could in Model 1. A great deal of decisions will still need to be made with the implementation of either model. Whatever model is chosen, the implementation committee will continue to monitor and enhance the direction of the core curriculum.

Provost Dobkin noted the CCTF's recommendation that a task form be created, supported by the Provost, to continue the discussion of Collegiate Seminar. The Provost did encourage and support the CCTF recommendation and offered her assistance should the Senate accept it.

Wayne Harter asked if further discussion would extend to the learning goals? Learning goals are to be the point from which the intelligibility of the models are given. He raised the question as to whether the goals are adequate? He said he has challenged the learning goals without response. Senator Rokeach acknowledged that he had seen two responses to the question of philosophy as a learning goal and Chair Brother Charles read the CCTF responses. Wayne Harter did not agree that the responses answered his concern.

Senator Tywoniak responded that the CCTF recommends ongoing evaluation of the core curriculum, which would include the learning goals. Any model chosen would incorporate the phase two implementation.

Senator Capriulo - Do we really believe that it doesn't matter, that philosophical understanding is not one of the core ways of knowledge? If we believe that we are out of touch with liberal arts in America. We are moving away from liberal arts by not naming it.

Provost Dobkin said she would like to suggest to faculty to be as engaged in the implementation phase as possible to ensure the integrity of their discipline.

Vice Chair Poundstone moved the question, seconded by Senator Tywoniak. A vote was taken and the motion was approved 9-0 with 1 abstention. A secret ballot vote was taken on the motion to approve either Model 1 or Model 2 as submitted by the CCTF. The secret ballot was counted and Model 1 received 9 votes, Model 2 received zero votes, and there was one abstention. Chair Hilken said Model 1 will be forwarded to the Provost for approval.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

7. Amended Faculty Handbook Language re: Six Course Teaching Load - Jim Sauerberg introduced the proposal to revise the Faculty Handbook language (various sections) regarding the six course teaching load. The Faculty Welfare Committee has reviewed the Provost's proposal to eliminate the "rebalance" language currently in the Handbook, to implement a six-course load for tenure and tenure-track faculty. The proposal addressed various sections throughout the Handbook. Although the policy is not changing, it does change reduced services and sabbaticals. Currently faculty on sabbaticals teach three courses and are paid for four courses. Under the six course load, faculty will teach three courses and get paid for three courses. This could affect faculty making a decision to take a full year sabbatical as faculty will receive a reduced salary. Alternately, faculty on reduced services will be paid 4/6, resulting in a slight increase in salary.

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Bossard and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to approve the proposed amended language to the Faculty Handbook. Vice Chair Poundstone said the new policy may effectively discourage full year sabbaticals for some faculty. Is that what we want to do? Senator Capriulo said that faculty usually look for outside funding to support a full year sabbatical.

Jim Sauerberg said he would encourage, and the FWC would probably endorse, the Senate taking up the issue of full year sabbaticals in the future, but he did encourage approval of the revisions proposed.

Provost Dobkin said in order to remove "imbalance" from the language she has skirted the issue of fragments. The FWC is taking an additional step in explicitly defining the numbers. She said she does support the proposal, but cannot guarantee that it will be supported going forward because of the financial implications. She cannot guarantee when the new policy would take effect, perhaps with the July 1<sup>st</sup> Handbook changes, and thus would affect next year's contracts. Some faculty (reduced services) will receive more money under the proposal, the money comes from the faculty pool. The faculty pool amount itself has been a matter of much discussion over the last year because of budget cuts. Whether that increase is enough to affect the ability to maintain the step system she cannot say. She thanked Jim Sauerberg and the FWC.

Senator Brunetti said should the policy take effect July 1, it would be unfair for faculty who have planned a full year sabbatical for next year based on a 4/7 salary. A full year sabbatical is a FWC issue, but it is a separate issue. He said he will recuse himself from voting because he is going on reduced services next year.

It was noted that very few faculty take a full year sabbatical. Vice Chair Poundstone said that this policy will make it likely that even fewer faculty will be able to take a full year. He suggested that the community should support scholarship and create a way to make it more possible for faculty to take full year sabbaticals, he would like to see it kept as a value.

Dean Murray explained that any changes to the Handbook go before the Handbook Committee, which consists of the President, Provost, legal counsel, Chair of Senate and Dean Murray. The President may wish to forward the item to the Board of Trustees. There is no way to know if this issue would be fully approved. He did add that faculty currently receive 4/7 for a half year sabbatical, and a faculty taking a full year sabbatical receive 4/7. Under the proposed policy faculty taking a half year receive 3/6 and faculty taking a full year receive 3/6; it maintains the policy; no differential between half year and whole year. One suggestion would be that an incentive be proposed for faculty to take a full year sabbatical in the form of a stipend. Some consideration should be given for those already approved for a sabbatical next year.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion as follows:

Chair Brother Charles	Yes	Jerry Brunetti	Abstain
Vice Chair Poundstone	Yes	Gerry Capriulo	Yes
Past Chair Bossard	Yes	Zach Flanagan	Yes
David Alvarez	Yes	Marty Rokeach	Yes
David Bowen	Yes	Ed Tywoniak	Yes

The motion passed by a vote of 9-0 with one abstention.

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

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathe Michalosky  
Faculty Governance Coordinator