

Minutes of the Academic Senate

October 1, 2009

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tom Poundstone at 3:00 p.m. on October 1, 2009. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Tom Poundstone, Vice Chair Steve Cortright, Past Chair Brother Charles Hilken, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Laura Heid, Sam Lind, Keith Ogawa, Phil Perry, Marty Rokeach, Ed Tywoniak, and Parliamentarian David Bird.

Also present were: Dean Roy Allen, Michael Barram, Vice President Michael Beseda, CTO Ed Biglin, Robert Bulman, Joel Burley, Dean Tom Carter, Provost Beth Dobkin, Karen Cowman, Sue Fallis, Monica Fitzgerald, Zach Flanagan, Charles Hamaker, Allan Hansell, Dean Brian Jersky, Deane Lamont, Phylis Martinelli, Susan Marston, Barbara McGraw, Susie Miller-Reid, Dean Frank Murray, Scott Schönfeldt-Aultman, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Elizabeth Smith, Vice President Carole Swain, Mindy Thomas, Ted Tsukahara, Hoang Vu, Roy Wensley, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the September 10, 2009 meeting were approved as amended.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Poundstone explained that in anticipation of Vice President Michael Beseda's report to the faculty on admissions, he solicited questions from the Senators and submitted the questions to Vice President Beseda in advance of the meeting. Athletic Director Mark Orr will report to the Senate at the October 22, 2009 meeting, and he requested that Senators and faculty submit their questions in advance of his visit as well. Chair Poundstone said he will request that, when possible, presentations and reports be submitted to the Senate beforehand to enable the Senate to ask for greater clarification of the issues in advance of the meeting itself. He also explained that the New Business on the agenda, the proposed External Speaker and Public Event Policy, is time sensitive as the Board of Trustees has requested that the Senate submit a draft policy prior to the October Board meeting. We will meet tonight until we have a policy, that or we might need to call a special meeting for next week.

Chair Poundstone said patience, persistence, and self-effacement are additional virtues requisite for a debating society. There is no limit to the amount of good one can do if one doesn't care whether or not they get the credit. Many folks have been patient and diligent in finalizing the draft speaker policy before the Senate. He publicly acknowledged the hard work of the Senators, as well as Provost Dobkin and Dean Woolpert.

Chair Poundstone also noted the announcement of the Campus of Difference Workshops. At the end of 2007-2008 the Senate passed a resolution asking the Provost to provide workshops to increase cultural competence for all faculty, staff, and students, guided by the expertise of professionals in the field. The Senate requested that mandatory workshops be held during the fall 2008. Workshops have been scheduled throughout this academic year, and he encouraged everyone to attend.

4. Vice Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Cortright announced that Susan Marston has been appointed to replace Kaetlyn Lad on the Program Review Committee for the 2009-2010 academic year.

5. Provost's Updates – Provost Dobkin reported that the Campus of Difference Workshop is a day-long program, presented in an interactive (not lecture) format. As a follow-up to the Faculty

Welfare Report, she has requested that Ann Kelly provide a list of everything that faculty are paid in addition to their base salary. There are 218 ranked faculty, a total of nine were discovered to need further investigation when verifying the faculty that did not have a specific time frame or assigned duty for their supplemental pay. She has been working closely with the deans about more specifically identifying duties in the faculty contracts.

6. Graduate and Professional Studies Educational Policies Board (GPSEPC) – Senator Heid reported as the liaison Senator to the GPSEPC. The GPSEPC met jointly with the UEPC to review the sabbatical proposals and make recommendations. All eighteen proposals were found meritorious and forwarded to the Provost for further approval.

7. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Senator Lind reported as the liaison Senator to the UEPC. In addition to the joint meeting held with the GPSEPC to review the sabbatical proposals, the UEPC plans to discuss possible amended procedures for the yearly sabbatical reviews.

8. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) – Senator Tywoniak reported as the liaison Senator to the AARC. The committee met in September and is scheduled to meet once in October. The AARC reviewed a follow-up report to the BOS report, section 1.5, Academic Advising. The Senate will consider the report at its next meeting. The AARC will forward a recommendation to the Senate that Academic Advising be placed under the advisement of the AARC.

On schedule for the AARC is the following: evaluation of the first year advising cohort, advising in general, NCAA visitation including a review of athlete graduation and retention, and review of the first summer school session. Vice President Michael Beseda has been invited to discuss the undergraduate enrollment and to consider a proposal coming forward from the Registrar's office.

9. Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) – Senator Tywoniak reported that the committee recently met. He referred to two reports available online: Technology Infrastructure Report and a 2005-2010 Strategic Plan for Technology. Part of the work of TAC is to review the documents for implementation across campus. A detailed report issued by CTO Ed Biglin is now available which outlines the achievements and accomplishments from last year. An incredible amount of work continues to be done in order to keep up with technology. TAC will look at adoption of new technologies in the classroom, interface with technology infrastructure, etc.

10. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) – Joel Burley reported on the current proceedings regarding the faculty salary policy and differential pay. He distributed a copy of the written response from the FWC to Provost Dobkin regarding the faculty salary policy. (The response is available on-line and on file in the office of the Academic Senate.) Joel Burley reported that the FWC will create a faculty survey to get faculty opinions and preferences on the issue of faculty salaries. The FWC will work with Provost Dobkin to collect salary data, and to develop a good yet reasonably concise faculty salary policy. A detailed transcription of the FWC report is available on-line and through the office of the Academic Senate.

11. Enrollment – Vice President Michael Beseda reported on enrollment. A packet was distributed containing data relative to undergraduate new student enrollment. (The full report is available through the office of the Academic Senate or the office of Admissions.) Fall 2009 new student enrollment was 695, which exceeded the budget target of 680. Freshmen totaled 572, which is 103 students less than last fall. Transfer enrollment was 123, one student fewer than fall 2008.

Females comprise 62.4% of the new first year class, males are 37.6%. Ethnic diversity reached record levels and with the class's average GPA and test scores rising to 3.40 and 1091 respectively. The Pell grant numbers look very different this year due to the huge economic crisis. The federal government has reported a 20% increase in those applying for Pell grants. At SMC we saw a change from 25% to 32%. Vice President Beseda explained that when students are accepted, SMC does not know if they are Pell grant eligible. Therefore, the 32% is not the result of an intentional strategy to recruit more Pell grant students.

Vice President Beseda, responding to a question from Chair Poundstone, explained what "discount rate" means. He said the discount rate reports what proportion of all tuition revenue is given out in the form of institutional aid to students. The Pell grant is a federal grant program that is targeted to the most needy in society. A full transcript of the report is available on-line and through the office of the Academic Senate.

NEW BUSINESS

12. External Speaker and Public Event Policy – Chair Poundstone introduced the proposed External Speaker and Public Event Policy. He summarized that last January a controversial speaker was invited to SMC. At its meeting in late May, our Board of Trustees expressed a strong desire for the college to have a policy clarifying the procedures we go through in inviting speakers to campus. The Board has given the Senate this chance to draft such a policy, which will be considered at its October meeting.

The work on the draft began over the summer. The Senate studied the policies at various institutions, prepared and distributed a draft policy to faculty and administrators, held a faculty forum on September 23, 2009, and continued to amend and revise the document based on campus-wide feedback. He explained that the proposal is being offered, along with several optional versions for each section of the policy. Also offered was a list of possible conditions by which the President might rescind an invitation, to be debated and agreed upon.

Senator Tywoniak stated that he is philosophically opposed to a speaker policy, but understands that the Senate must deliver a policy to the Trustees, as the faculty do not wish the Trustees to craft the policy. The condensed version seems the most ideal, however, what is not clear is whether the policy on external speakers will have an impact on a faculty member's activities in the classroom. He questioned whether the policy needs to clearly define the exclusion of the classroom activities. Chair Poundstone responded that the proposed policy only refers to the public forum, this is not about the classroom situation. Vice Chair Cortright said that as a matter of prudence, he is in favor of making no mention to the classroom. The *Faculty Handbook* delineates the responsibilities of professors in the management of their classrooms.

Chair Poundstone then suggested how the meeting would follow. He suggested that each section of the document be considered and voted on separately. The most controversial sections of the document were towards the end; so the Senate would begin there, then gradually work its way towards the beginning of the document, with the last section to be taken up being the preamble. He then steered the discussion to the following nine proposed Conditions Under Which the President May Rescind an Invitation (below):

<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSED CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE PRESIDENT</p>

MAY RESCIND AN INVITATION

1. *The presentation is egregiously contrary to the College's mission. (THIS PROVISION IS SIMILAR TO WHAT IS FOUND IN GONZAGA UNIVERSITY'S SPEAKER AND EVENTS POLICY: "The speech or event does not constitute a legitimate educational experience or otherwise contribute to the College's mission.")*
 2. *The presentation presents an immediate and unmanageable risk to the physical safety of members of the College community or their guests. (THIS PROVISION IS INCLUDED IN MOST SPEAKER POLICIES. IT WAS NOT IN THE DRAFT PREPARED THIS SUMMER.)*
 3. *The speaker or her/his agent will not agree to the College's expressed policies or contracting terms and in the judgment of the President of the College this creates an unacceptable risk to the College. (THIS PROVISION FROM THIS SUMMER'S DRAFT IS UNIQUE TO SAINT MARY'S.)*
-
4. *The speech or event will cause significant reputational damage to the College with that damage outweighing the reputational damage of canceling the event. (THIS PROVISION IS UNIQUE TO SAINT MARY'S. SOME WHO WERE AT THE BOARD MEETING IN MAY HAVE ARGUED THAT SOMETHING LIKE THIS IS NEEDED TO MOLIFY THE BOARD.)*
 5. *The speech or event will have a significant negative impact on the human and/or financial resources of the College. (THIS PROVISION IS UNIQUE TO SAINT MARY'S. IT WAS IN THE SUMMER PROPOSAL)*
 6. *The speech or event will be grossly obscene or grossly offensive on matters such as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or sexual orientation, thus clearly violating the College's standards of civility. (THIS PROVISION IS FROM GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY'S SPEECH AND EXPRESSION POLICY)*
 7. *The speech or event will be used as a platform to disparage the Catholic identity or mission of the institution. (THIS PROVISION IS FROM LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO'S SPEAKER POLICY)*
 8. *The presentation is an egregious affront to the College's Catholic identity. (THIS PROVISION IS FROM STEVE CORTRIGHT'S PROPOSAL)*
 9. *The presentation is an egregious affront to the College's character as a Lasallian community of learning. (THIS PROVISION IS FROM STEVE CORTRIGHT'S PROPOSAL)*

Chair Poundstone pointed out that the first three statements have already been given significant support in Senate discussions, they are still debatable, but we want to begin our debates today focusing on whether we should include any of the remaining six statements. Vice Chair Cortright stated that he is content to have the language regarding the Lasallian character of our learning

community and the Catholic identity of the College understood implicitly in the reference to Mission in the first condition. (Statement numbers 8 and 9 were then dropped from consideration.)

Senator Gomez-Arias said that statement numbers 4-7 (above) are either included in the statement #1, or they are too difficult to assess. Vice Chair Cortright said that since it is important to insulate the President from pressure, language should be framed in terms of the mission of the college.

Senator Rokeach said that the contents of Bill Ayers' address made at SMC last January did not threaten the mission of the College; it was his actions of decades ago that caused the controversy. He said he is not sure how this policy would prevent a future invitation to Bill Ayers.

Associate Dean Chris Sindt said that it would not be known whether a presentation is egregious until after the President has approved or not approved a speaker. There must be some provision to imply a judgment before the fact. He recommended that the language in the statements be amended to say, "The **proposed** presentation..." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Monica Fitzgerald expressed concern that anyone in the current political spotlight would be unwelcome, which could limit free speech. She referred to statement #4, explaining that in the 1950s Martin Luther King would not be allowed on campus based on the statement.

Zach Flanagan said the only pragmatic reason acceptable is if a speaker would place the college in danger. Senator Rokeach said if he were a Trustee, he would not agree. It does not need to be a question of physical risk to be harmful to the identity of the College. Past Chair Brother Charles suggested that the Senate not craft a document based on how the Trustees might react. Provost Dobkin said the document created over the summer included three conditions: negative impact on human and/or financial resources, the reputation of the College, and an individual who is not willing to agree to the College's policies. The Board of Trustees was satisfied with these three conditions in the summer.

Dean Woolpert asked what is the problem for which this policy is the solution? The real danger is that the Trustees may impose a policy that faculty do not want. Some anticipation as to whether the statement will satisfy the minimum expectations of the Board is a very important one.

Phylis Martinelli said that perhaps the Trustees would see it as a good faith effort on the part of faculty, to include either statement #4 or statement #5.

Senator Tywoniak suggested that statement #4 be included to appease the Trustees, although he would prefer that it not be included.

Robert Bullman argued against including statement #4. The definition of reputational becomes difficult and open to interpretation.

Sue Fallis said the faculty have been given the opportunity by the Board to create a policy and therefore the document ought to be crafted with respect to the Board of Trustees, but not in fear of the Board. It is important that the Board have a good working relationship with administration, but it is also important for the faculty to speak for itself.

Senator Heid said that statements one, two and three are conditions that can be determined prior to the event, however, #4 is stated as, "will cause", which faculty have no way of predicting.

Charlie Hamaker argued against including #4. Statements regarding protecting the reputation of the College are already included in the preamble. Provost Dobkin agreed that she prefers to see it expressed in the preamble.

Mindy Thomas suggested amending #4, adding that it must "significantly" outweigh the reputational damage. Faculty would not want an event cancelled unless it will significantly outweigh the damage caused by canceling.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Cortright, seconded by Senator Gomez-Arias to include statement #4 in the list of Conditions Under Which the President May Rescind an Invitation. The motion failed by a hand vote of 1-9-0. Statements numbers #4 through #9 were eliminated from consideration.

A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Vice Chair Cortright to accept statements one, two and three as Conditions Under Which the President May Rescind an Invitation. The motion carried by a hand vote of 9-1-0.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Cortright and SECONDED by Senator Gomez-Arias to adopt the following section 2 (a thru i), Considerations for Public Presentations.

2. Considerations for Public Presentations

- a. Public presentations must serve the mission of the College, as provided in the Preamble.
- b. All applicable procedures for contracting and scheduling, as provided in the Faculty, Staff or Student Handbook, must be followed.
- c. Public presentations must be ticketed, if seats are limited.
- d. Significant access for SMC students must be assured.
- e. If the presentation involves audience participation (e.g., a question period), SMC students must enjoy priority.
- f. Sponsors' announcements or advertisements will declare that public presenters' views are not necessarily those of Saint Mary's College or the sponsoring collegiate entity.
- g. The Office of College Communications must approve announcements and advertisements.
- h. Sponsors will take reasonable steps to ensure that debate or discussion attending public presentations is conducted in a fashion worthy of a community of learning.
- i. It belongs to the exercise of that deliberate responsibility for the common good which is supposed in the Preamble that sponsors of foreseeably controversial presentations take counsel with the appropriate Dean or other supervisor, who may in turn seek the counsel of the Provost or President.

The motion was approved by a hand vote of 10-0-0.

Chair Poundstone introduced, Item 3. Conditions Under which the President may Preclude, Rescind or Modify Invitations to Public Presenters, beginning with consideration to include the following statement immediately after the list of conditions:

The President is called upon to explain formally a decision to deny or withdraw an invitation.

A MOTION was made by Senator Lind and SECONDED by Senator Gomez-Arias to include a statement, "The President is called upon to explain formally a decision to deny or withdraw an invitation." The statement is to be the last line, after the conditions (as shown above). Several asked to whom the President would address his explanation. Robert Bulman said it would be an exceptional case for the President to withdraw an invitation, which would require an explanation. The statement was amended to read, "The President ~~will is called upon to explain~~ **to the Senate formally** a decision to deny or withdraw an invitation." A vote was taken and the motion passed by a hand vote of 7-2 with one abstention.

Provost Dobkin clarified that Brother Ronald will consider the document forwarded to him by the Senate which he may accept in full or in part. The President will decide what document is forwarded to the Trustees for consideration.

Chair Poundstone then introduced language under "Conditions under which the President may preclude, rescind or modify invitations to public presenters": In extraordinary circumstances...(a-c)..." This section would appear immediately before the approved conditions as follows:

In extraordinary circumstances, the President may deny a requested invitation, reschedule or relocate the presentation, or rescind the invitation if in the President's judgment one of the following conditions apply:

- a. *The presentation presents an immediate and unmanageable risk to the physical safety of members of the College community or their guests.*
- b. The speech or event will cause significant reputational damage to the College with that damage outweighing the reputational damage of canceling the event.
- c. *The presenter(s) or his/her (their) agent's refusal to agree to the College's expressed policies or contracting terms presents an unacceptable risk to the College.*

Chair Poundstone said during discussions Senators were clear that this action would happen only under extraordinary circumstances. A vote was taken and the Senate voted to include the statement by a hand vote of 8-0 with two abstentions.

Chair Poundstone then introduced the following paragraph to precede the above statement:

Occasionally the President will be pressured to deny or rescind a requested invitation. In almost all such situations, the President is called to defend academic freedom and explain the basic educational mission of the College and the unique role of universities as a place for ideas to be exchanged while also making clear to all that invitations do not represent endorsements. The cost to the College is virtually always higher when a presenter is silenced. Ideas, we believe, are better answered with thought and conversation than censorship.

Senator Gomez-Arias spoke against including this statement, explaining that it is not a policy and does not belong in the document. Parliamentarian Bird expressed concern over the use of the term 'academic freedom' due to its overuse. Is it academic freedom or is it censorship? Faculty must be free to invite guests they feel will be useful for the students. Barbara McGraw and Senator

Rokeach argued in favor of the use of the term 'academic freedom'. A vote was taken and the statement was rejected by a hand vote of 5-5-0.

Chair Poundstone introduced B. Policy on Public Presentations, a through c.

B. POLICY ON PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

1. Definitions

- a. "Public presenter" means a person neither attending Saint Mary's College nor otherwise employed by the College who is invited to make a public address or give a public performance.
- b. "Public" qualifies audiences composed in whole or part of persons neither attending nor employed by Saint Mary's College.
- c. "Public" qualifies presentations, including performances or addresses, open to public audiences.

Up for discussion was the addition of:

<p><i>A DISCLAIMER CLAUSE FROM A PRIOR DRAFT -- SHOULD IT BE KEPT OR DISCARDED?</i></p>
--

- | |
|---|
| <p>d. The following guidelines do not apply to faculty members in the teaching of their classes nor to external speakers invited by faculty members to make a presentation that occurs in the closed forum of a scheduled course. Still, as in all forums, prudential judgment and consultation with colleagues and supervisors is always in order before extending a controversial invitation.</p> |
|---|

Barbara McGraw suggested that this not be B.1.(b), but rather #2 under B. She also suggested amending the language to refer to the Faculty Handbook regarding the policy; another statement is not needed. Several suggestions were made to amend language. A vote was taken and the Senate approved the following amended statement by a vote of 7-3-0:

- d. The following guidelines do not apply to faculty members in the teaching of their classes, see *Faculty Handbook* 2.9.1.b.

A vote was then taken on acceptance of section B. Policy on Public Presentations, #1 Definitions, a through d. The section was accepted by the Senate by a hand vote of 10-0-0.

Chair Poundstone introduced the various Preamble options: one, two or three (see below). Option one is the condensed version. Option two is longer with the same opening paragraph, but it also includes a longer paragraph about the Catholic tradition, it refers to Brother Ron's statement to the community, it mentions great books tradition, and it quotes Cardinal Newman. Option three was

submitted by Vice Chair Cortright who explained that the principle intention of this option is to include academic freedom and *Ex corde*, which has been adopted by the Trustees.

A. PREAMBLE

OPTION ONE: THE CONDENSED VERSION

Saint Mary's College of California is a Catholic institution of higher education in the Lasallian tradition where the liberal arts inform, enrich, and shape all areas of learning and where special importance is placed on fostering the intellectual skills, habits of mind, and activities which liberate persons to probe deeply the mystery of existence and live authentically in response to the truths they discover.

Our Catholic tradition challenges us to live up to that ideal, dedicated to the pursuit of truth wherever it can be found, and confident that between faith and reason there can be no fundamental conflict. While we place a very high value on freedom of inquiry and discussion and on the opportunity for intellectual stimulation which can be the product of controversial content, with this freedom also comes fiduciary responsibility. The policy which follows outlines reasonable and prudential restrictions in the scheduling of controversial events which are designed to foster truly authentic dialogue and to protect the reputation of the College so that all students, alumni, staff, and faculty may proudly refer to her as *alma mater*.

OPTION TWO: THE LONG VERSION

(The italicized sections are incorporated in OPTION ONE)

Saint Mary's College of California is a Catholic institution of higher education in the Lasallian tradition where the liberal arts inform, enrich, and shape all areas of learning and where special importance is placed on fostering the intellectual skills, habits of mind, and activities which liberate persons to probe deeply the mystery of existence and live authentically in response to the truths they discover.

Our Catholic tradition, rather than limiting or compromising the ideal of free discourse, challenges us to live up to that ideal, dedicated to the pursuit of truth wherever it can be found, and confident that between faith and reason there can be no fundamental conflict. Fr. Ted Hesburgh, the President Emeritus of Notre Dame, speaks of how a Catholic college must not only strive to be like a lighthouse, standing apart and illuminating issues with the moral and spiritual wisdom of the Catholic tradition, but that it must also serve as a crossroads "where all the intellectual and moral currents of our times meet and are thoughtfully considered," a place where people of many different perspectives, backgrounds, faiths, and cultures are received with charity, are able to speak, be heard, and engage in responsible and reasoned dialogue.

That is also the charge of a university. As our President Brother Ronald Gallagher writes in an open letter to the College community, "Institutions of higher education serve society and their local communities by providing a place for opinions and ideas of all types to be examined, questioned and discussed. It is in these 'academic cities' that the arts of reason and inquiry are brought to bear on the controversial issues of today and of all time. For students, faculty, staff, and the public, the College provides special opportunities to step

away from the often overheated and polarized rhetoric of contemporary culture and examine difficult and controversial issues in the somewhat cooler light of reason.” Brother Ronald continues his letter with an appeal to the educational traditions upon which our College is based: “As a College with a Great Books tradition, we have a responsibility to defend the rights of those with controversial viewpoints to speak. To live up to our great tradition, we must remain an academic community where the free and open discussion of ideas, even those with which we strongly disagree, is possible.”

As part of that Great Books tradition, we are reminded of what Cardinal Newman writes in his *The Idea of a University*: “It is not the way to learn to swim in troubled waters never to have gone into them.” If our students are to be tested in their critical thinking, we do not serve them well by insulating them from controversial views; instead, we are called to expose them to a breadth of viewpoints and experiences and to foster free and open discussion of controversial issues.

While we place a very high value on freedom of inquiry and discussion and on the opportunity for intellectual stimulation which can be the product of controversial content, with this freedom also comes fiduciary responsibility. The policy which follows outlines reasonable and prudential restrictions in the scheduling of controversial events which are designed to foster truly authentic dialogue and to protect the reputation of the College so that all students, alumni, staff, and faculty may proudly refer to her as alma mater.

<p style="text-align: center;">OPTION THREE: AN ALTERNATIVE PREAMBLE PROPOSED BY VICE CHAIR STEVE CORTRIGHT</p>
--

Because Saint Mary’s College is a Catholic institution of higher education, the College “guarantees its members academic freedom” as it preserves “the rights of the individual person and of the community within the confines of the truth and of the common good” (*Ex corde ecclesiae* §12). Because it is, further, organized as a Lasallian community of learning and informed by the traditions of liberal artistry, the College has a special vocation to reasoned, disinterested examination of questions bearing on social justice, human dignity, and authentic human flourishing, even when this vocation entails the airing of “uncomfortable truths which do not please public opinion, but which are necessary to safeguard the authentic good of society” (*Ex corde ecclesiae* §32). Ordinarily, the College’s willingness to entertain controversial opinion or performance publicly will turn neither upon the presenter’s public *persona* nor upon the content of the presentation, but upon the liberal artistry with which the presentation is offered and hence upon the frankness with which it invites reasoned examination and critical evaluation.

Public presentations are undertakings of, or in trust for, the College as such. Regard for the common good at once of the College and of the Church and the political community, entails that public presentations express deliberate fidelity to the College’s mission, for the College serves the Church and the wider community, just as it serves its intrinsic purposes, through fidelity to its mission. Sponsors are duty-bound to give deliberate consideration to the questions whether and how public presentations comport with the mission, to observe in good faith the policy set forth below, and to cooperate with the President, who has final responsibility for the propriety of institutional undertakings and, therefore, judicative authority.

Vice Chair Cortright said that he could live with option one, the condensed version, with some amendments. Senator Heid said this is a preamble to a policy, she and Senator Gomez-Arias suggested adopting Vice Chair Cortright's version, Option three. Senator Tywoniak recommended option one, as the most condensed version, and was open to amendments by Vice Chair Cortright.

Options two and three were removed from the table by Chair Poundstone and Vice Chair Cortright. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Cortright and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to accept Preamble Option One, the Condensed Version, with the following friendly amendments:

Saint Mary's College of California is a Catholic institution of higher education in the Lasallian tradition where the liberal arts inform, enrich, and shape all areas of learning and where special importance is placed on fostering the intellectual skills, habits of mind, and activities which liberate persons to probe deeply the mystery of existence and live authentically in response to the truths they discover.

Our ~~Catholic tradition~~ **mission** challenges us to ~~live up to that ideal, dedicated to the pursuit of~~ **pursue** truth wherever it can be found, ~~and~~ confident that between faith and reason there can be no fundamental conflict. While we place a ~~very~~ high value on freedom of inquiry and discussion, and on the opportunity for intellectual stimulation, which can be the product of controversial content, with this freedom also comes fiduciary responsibility. The policy which follows outlines reasonable **precautions for** ~~and prudential restrictions in~~ the scheduling of controversial events, which are designed to foster ~~truly~~ authentic dialogue and to protect the reputation of the *alma mater* **we all cherish**. ~~College so that all students, alumni, staff, and faculty may proudly refer to her as~~ *alma mater*

A vote was taken on the amended Preamble (option one), approved by hand vote 7-0-0.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator