

Minutes of the General Meeting Of the Academic Senate

May 14, 2009

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Brother Charles Hilken at 3:00 p.m. on May 14, 2009. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chairperson Brother Charles Hilken, Vice Chairperson Tom Poundstone, Past Chairperson Carla Bossard, David Alvarez, David Bowen, Jerry Brunetti, Gerry Capriulo, Zach Flanagan, Marty Rokeach, Ed Tywoniak, and Parliamentarian Valerie Burke.

Also present were: Vice President Michael Beseda, Robert Bulman, Joel Burley, Dean Tom Carter, Scott Covich, Provost Beth Dobkin, Laurie Edwards, Tomas Gomez, Rosemary Graham, Wayne Harter, Laura Heid, Christa Kell, Sue Marston, Steve Miller, Dean Frank Murray, Jim Sauerberg, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Mary True, Ted Tsukahara, Hoang Vu, Roy Wensley, Dean Steve Woolpert, and Paul Zarnoth.

2. Minutes of the April 23, 2009 meeting were unanimously approved as submitted.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Brother Charles reported that the executive committee received a proposal regarding January Term Committee membership. The proposal was assigned to the Committee on Committees for consideration in the fall. The Provost has responded to and accepted all outstanding Senate actions.

Chair Brother Charles read a letter addressed to the Academic Senate from Gery Short, which expressed his thanks for the Commendation awarded him by the Senate.

Consent Agenda

The following items from the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee and the Graduate & Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee were approved on the consent agenda:

Kinesiology Proposal to Allow Three Kinesiology Courses to Count as Area C courses:

The department of Kinesiology proposed that non-majors receive Area C credit for taking any of the following three courses: Kines 111 (History of Health, Sport & Exercise), Kines 112 (Sport and Exercise Psychology), and Kines 114 (Sociology of Sport and Physical Activity).

The Kinesiology department argued that these three courses are social science courses and that students should receive appropriate credit for completing them.

Fast Track Guidelines – The Fast Track Guidelines were revised to reflect the new committee structure, removing the “Educational Policies Board” throughout the document and replacing it with the “GPSEPC.”

Graduate Student Handbook – A Graduate Student Handbook was created which contains all graduate policies and procedures.

Proquest Recommendation – the GPSEPC recommends the use of Proquest for all masters theses and doctoral dissertations.

Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program – The GPSEPC followed the Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program for the discontinuance of the Graduate Liberal Studies Program. After going through the process, the GPSEPC made several recommendations for procedural changes and amended the document to reflect the added criteria

4. Graduate and Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) Report - Senator Brunetti reported that in addition to the consent agenda items, the GPSEPC also reviewed the BOSS 2.4 recommendations. The GPSEPC approved of the exploration of a vice provost position for graduate studies. It was noted that there was lack of specificity of how the duties and responsibilities of the GPSEPC and the Graduate Council are shared. The committee recommended that in 2009-2010 the GPSEPC make recommendations to clarify the duties and responsibilities. He thanked Steve Miller for his leadership and Chris Sindt for his work on the Graduate Student Handbook.

5. Vice Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Poundstone reported that the faculty elections are complete and the results have been published. Steve Cortright was elected as Vice Chair of the Academic Senate and the newly elected Senators are: Phil Perry, Keith Ogawa, Laura Heid, Sam Lind, and Tomas Gomez-Arias.

6. Provost Updates - Provost Dobkin announced that the faculty year-end dinner is scheduled for May 15th. The WASC report draft will be posted shortly.

7. Enrollment – Vice President Michael Beseda reported that undergraduate student enrollment is on target for the fall; 636 deposits had been received. The class represents the neediest, most diverse and academically talented in SMC history. There is a higher number of students appealing their financial aid awards or asking for an extension. The target for the fall was 680 students, last year the target was 750 students.

8. College Committee on Inclusive Excellence (CCIE) – Robert Bulman, co-chair of the CCIE, reported that the committee has completed its first year. The CCIE is a reorganization of the Celebrating Diversity Committee and the membership is drawn from leaders across campus. He announced that the CCIE has a website and he encouraged faculty to visit the link. Two public meetings have been held this year in order to share the work of the committee. Several tasks completed this year were the creation of a vision statement and an education case statement (why SMC supports the work of the CCIE). While much of the work might be seen as having been motivated by external sources such as the WASC Notice of Concern, the work of the CCIE is consistent and even required by the mission of the College. There have been a variety of workshops on diversity attended by members of the CCIE. Acts of Intolerance Protocols were developed and are in place for students. A subcommittee continues to work on the protocols for faculty or staff due to concerns raised regarding academic freedom. The CCIE had a budget of \$40,000, which was spent on 13 different proposals. Robert Bulman encouraged faculty to apply for funds. Mandatory workshops (as moved by the Academic Senate in the spring of 2008) will be made available next year. (The full CCIE report is on file in the office of the Academic Senate.)

9. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) – Jim Sauerberg reported on the Faculty Salary Policy. The FWC provides a yearly report on the college's standings with respect to the goals in its faculty salary policy. Due to the economic turndown, the usual compilation of numbers has lost any predictive value. Brother Ronald has also corresponded with the FWC indicating that Goal 1 (the

average SMC assistant salary should be above the Pac IIA average) is no longer a goal that we strive to meet and he also has stated that it is time to remove Goal 2 (median assistant salaries should match the WCC+1 average) or replace it with a new policy which reflects the realities at SMC.

The FWC discovered that a small number of assistant professors are being paid significantly above scale salaries. The FWC recommended that the Academic Senate request that administration formally and completely respond to the following questions:

- a. How was it determined that the college would be paying differential salaries? Who authorized this, and why was the faculty not consulted?
- b. Do we have criteria for paying differential salaries? If so, what are they and how are they determined? Is there a list of hard-to-hire disciplines? Will all faculty in those disciplines be receiving non-scale salaries? By whom and with what process will these decisions be made?
- c. How are the current differential salaries affecting the salary pool? How will they effect the determination of the pool during next year's budget cycle?
- d. How does the administration intend to inform and involve the faculty in general salary decisions and in the determination of a new salary policy and an effective salary scale?

It was noted that by acceptance of the FWC report, the above requests will formally be passed on to the administration.

Jim Sauerberg said the larger issue is one of trust; when can parties opt out of mutual agreements? He further reported that Provost Dobkin has been very open and transparent in her dealings with the FWC.

Provost Dobkin said the issue of differential salaries is very complicated. In her written response (email) to the FWC report, she said she "welcomed conversations and recommendations from the FWC and will contribute in whatever manner the FWC sees most useful."

NEW BUSINESS

10. The Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) – Chair Brother Charles explained that the document was received from the Core Curriculum Task Force at the April 23, 2009 Senate meeting. The proposal was referred to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) for consideration. Paul Zarnoth (UEPC Chair) reported that the UEPC met twice to discuss the proposal. Nine revisions were made to the document, which was approved by the UEPC by a vote of 8-1-1 on May 11, 2009. (A copy of the proposal is attached.)

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Bossard and SECONDED by Senator Bowen to approve the proposal. Senator Flanagin said it is unclear from the proposal which body has the final authority and he urged that the authority be made clear. He also suggested that the dates should be more of a guideline. Prior faculty conversations regarding Collegiate Seminar indicated an agreement to have further conversations in the summer or fall, and he asked how the issue of Collegiate Seminar will fit in with the proposal? Senator Brunetti agreed that members of the Senate and many faculty were interested in a thematic approach to Collegiate Seminar. Paul Zarnoth responded that the

UEPC did not address the issue, the UEPC was under the assumption that a separate committee would be investigating the role of seminar.

Past Chair Bossard expressed concern about the subcommittee structure in the proposal. Two years were spent to revise the governance structure to reduce the number of faculty commitments. She said that between new committees that were formed this year and the CCIC proposal, 20+ faculty commitments are being added.

Vice Chair Poundstone said that too often the object is completing a project and not necessarily completing it well. He agreed with Senator Flanagin and is also concerned with timeline of the proposal. He said he shares Past Chair Bossard's concern about the number of committee memberships on campus. He has studied other colleges that have a dynamic core, and they have massive sized core curriculum committees, with numerous subcommittees. In order to succeed, SMC will need a significant change of the culture of service on campus.

Wayne Harter suggested the following amendment to a sentence on page 2 of the document, "Implementation Process between Spring 2009 and Fall 2011...c) Fall 2009: Core Curriculum Implementation Committee begins to identify areas of development following approved learning goals..." He explained that the language as proposed implies that the learning goals that were adopted are not themselves a work in progress. The learning goals were approved under the premise that they could yet be altered. Senator Flanagin responded that the learning goals were approved, as they were part of the proposal for Model 1 accepted by the Senate. Senator Capriulo agreed with Wayne Harter.

Provost Dobkin explained that in her response to the Senate, she approved the learning goals and the model, as well as endorsed the recommendation of implementation currently being discussed. It was her interpretation was that we were going to proceed to implement the learning goals and the model, the next step being how the learning goals are assessed. She said in the future, we would want to revisit the learning goals, but she sees that as coming after the current process (implementation), which has to start on the premise that the goals have been approved and the model has been approved. Her interpretation to the Senate Actions she responded to was to move forward with the goals of the model approved.

Chair Brother Charles also disagreed with Wayne Harter, agreeing that approving Model 1 also approved the learning goals that were attached to the model.

Chris Sindt suggested that now may be the time to decide when the models or goals will be reviewed in the future, i.e. five years, six years?

Senator Capriulo said the most crucial question at this time is what Seminar will look like. The answer to that question will dramatically impact the implementation efforts. He suggested that the seminar question must be answered before moving forward.

Vice Provost Frances Sweeney said the original document contained more specific items for a long-term permanent structure regarding the cycle of review of the learning goals. The implementation group will be transforming what the permanent structure will be, but the cycle of review of the goals and the core has always been a part of the plan, much like the program review cycle. She said she has suggested three subcommittees; one for each of the areas, to consult with the appropriate disciplines as necessary but to have three subcommittees of the core with membership of the core to address Habits of Mind, Pathways to Knowledge, and Engaging the World. She suggested that the

Seminar conversation be formally tied in to the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee and the UEPC rather than separate.

Vice Chair Poundstone said the Seminar question is so large and dynamic. The CCIC has so much to do; he suggested an ad hoc group be formed to address the Seminar question separately.

Senator Tywoniak said it is important to have serious conversations about Seminar parallel to the Implementation Committee.

Past Chair Bossard said it is important to immediately begin the conversation of Seminar, to be examined thoroughly. She believes the Implementation Committee could begin to identify benchmarks before the issue of Seminar is resolved, she said some the Implementation Committee should not wait for the Seminar discussion to get started.

Provost Dobkin suggested that the Senate identify three individuals to join three current members of the Collegiate Seminar Board, and possibly two additional at-large faculty, to begin the discussion over the summer. The summer group could determine the issues to be resolved, referring back to the issues raised from the online discussion earlier this spring.

Senator Brunetti said it is difficult to get his mind around the proposal as there are so many issues. He thinks it is optimistic to think that faculty will be willing to take this on. He argued against a separate Seminar subcommittee, suggesting it be integrated into the CCIC.

Senator Capriulo said the tasks need to be sequential, with Seminar being addressed first. He also recommended that the Senate arrange an additional meeting to continue the conversation of the CCIC proposal.

A MOTION was made by Senator Flanagin and SECONDED by Senator Capriulo to schedule an additional meeting the following week to continue the discussion of the CCIC proposal. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

A MOTION was made by Senator Flanagin and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to postpone the conversation on the CCIC proposal to the additional meeting, the date to be determined. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

11. Chair Brother Charles thanked the members of the Core Curriculum Task Force for their three years of service on the CCTF. He presented a plaque to each member.

Chair Brother Charles then passed the gavel on to Vice Chair Poundstone. Vice Chair Poundstone thanked Brother Chair Brother Charles for his service as Chair of the Academic Senate and presented him with a gift on behalf of the Senators. He thanked the exiting Senators: Carla Bossard, Gerry Capriulo, Jerry Brunetti, David Alvarez, David Bowen, Zach Flanagin and Parliamentarian Valerie Burke.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator

**Proposal for the
Core Curriculum Implementation Committee
Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee
(Developed from an earlier draft by the Core Curriculum Task Force)
May 11, 2009**

Rationale

During our 10-year re-accreditation review through WASC, we also participated in 2002-03 in an assessment of liberal arts education through the ACTC's "Trends in Liberal Education." A primary finding in this assessment was that we have no body that regularly reviews the core curriculum/general education requirements. Although our Program Review process is considered a very good one to assess capacity and educational effectiveness of each program, we were lacking in that we have no faculty body to organize review of either the body or the pieces of the core, to stay informed of best practices in liberal education and Catholic higher education, to provide forums for discussion on the core, and other topics such as the relationship between the core and the disciplines. Thus, our core curriculum review began with the awareness that we needed to consider some form of oversight committee.

At this time, the Core Curriculum Task Force is proposing a Core Curriculum Implementation Committee, which will function as a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee, in order to allow the UEPC to fulfill its role as the primary body responsible for undergraduate curriculum. This implementation committee will work with the UEPC to determine what is the best structure for a permanent core curriculum committee once a new model has been developed and implemented.

Responsibilities

The charge of the committee will be given by the UEPC, though the responsibilities of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee are the following:

- 1) To establish benchmarks for each of the learning goals.
- 2) To facilitate the development of new courses or the modification of existing courses to meet the learning goals, and to determine what other, if any, means will be appropriate for satisfying learning goals.
- 3) To facilitate implementation of assessment plans for each learning goal.
- 4) To plan a review/assessment schedule for the core curriculum.
- 5) To regularly report to the UEPC.

Membership and meetings of the Committee

The Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will be a faculty committee under the auspice of the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee and as such under the Academic Senate.

It will have 13 members, as follows:

- a) Seven faculty (including at least one from each school) chosen by the UEPC Chair and Vice-Chair, Senate Executive Committee (Chair, Current Vice-Chair, Chair Elect) from a pool of volunteers and nominated individuals. Each volunteer will write a brief statement of interest for the selection committee, and anyone nominating another faculty member will write a brief statement of support.
- b) Two students, ideally one lower division and one upper division (non-voting)
- c) The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (ex officio, non-voting)
- d) The Vice Provost for Student Life (ex officio, non-voting)
- e) The Registrar (ex officio, non-voting)

- f) The Dean of Advising and Academic Achievement (ex officio, non-voting)

The chair will be selected from the voting committee in the spring prior to service by the committee, and will sit on the UEPC, as a non-voting member. On or before February 1, current voting members of the committee meet to select the chair for the following academic year. All voting members of the committee must be present to select the chair.

The Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will meet twice a month at a time determined by the committee that does not conflict with the Senate or the UEPC.

Reporting structure of the Committee

The Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will be a recognized committee of the UEPC. During the development and implementation period, the UEPC will work to develop a permanent core curriculum committee.

Administrative support for the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will be through the Office of the Academic Senate.

Implementation Process between Spring 2009 and Fall 2011

Among the first actions of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will be the implementation of any proposed changes to the current core, as of Spring 2009. The following procedures are a means to develop the implementation plan:

- a) Finalization of responsibilities of and compensation for CCIC members.
- b) September 2009: Selection of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee members.
- c) Fall 2009: Core Curriculum Implementation Committee begins to identify areas of development following approved learning goals and approved model of the core. As needed, the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will create subcommittees for implementation (See part C).
- d) Fall 2009: Each subcommittee will be formed from faculty experts in the areas who will be invited to join, with the approval of the Chair of the UEPC. The subcommittees will have 2-4 members, with one representative of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee and at least one member with a disciplinary background *not* directly related to the learning goal. Each subcommittee may include a staff member with expertise in the area of the learning goal.
- e) Fall 2009 through Summer 2010: each subcommittee will
 1. identify or develop benchmarks to evaluate courses that might satisfy the learning goals within the new model (Subcommittees may utilize benchmarks already established by other College committees.),
 2. identify ways to assist programs and faculty in developing or adapting courses to satisfy the learning goals in the new model,
 3. identify other means of satisfying the learning goals (e.g., independent study, other projects),
 4. identify assessment methods for measuring the achievement of the learning goals, and
 5. report back to the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee on their progress, including resource needs.

- f) Fall 2010: Core Curriculum Implementation Committee actively engages faculty on catalog changes through campus meetings.
- g) November 2010: Final changes made for new catalog, in which must be the model, benchmarks, and learning goals so that Saint Mary's can communicate any/all new graduation requirements to external bodies (e.g., community colleges, high school counselors) in order to meet admissions deadlines.
- h) Fall 2011: course development, faculty development, and new advising model development.
- i) Fall 2012: Entering students begin new curriculum.
- j) Academic year 2011/2012: UEPC will structure the permanent Core Curriculum Committee to take over in the fall of 2012 (as transition issues continue, there is expected to be some overlap of the implementation and permanent committees).
- k) Fall 2013: Sophomore transfer students enter in new curriculum.
- l) June 30, 2013: The Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will end its term.
- m) Fall 2013: Junior transfers students enter in new curriculum.
- n) May 2015: Last class graduates under old core.
- o) Sept 2015: Full implementation.