

Minutes of the Academic Senate

October 22, 2009

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tom Poundstone at 3:00 p.m. on October 22, 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: Associate Dean Shawny Anderson, Michael Barram, Carla Bossard, Jerry Brunetti, CTO Ed Biglin, Theo Carlile, Dean Tom Carter, Thomas Cooney, Constanza de Dios, Janice Doane, Provost Beth Dobkin, Sue Fallis, Monica Fitzgerald, Peter Freund, Maria Angelica Garcia, Rosemary Graham, Sandra Grayson, Allan Hansell, Dana Herrera, Craig Johnson, John Knight, Christa Kell, Lin Larson, Yung-Jae Lee, Jimmy Li, Lidia Luquet, Susan Marston, Phylis Martinelli, Mary McCall, Barbara McGraw, Lynn Meisch, Molly Metherd, Susie Miller-Reid, Athletic Director Mark Orr, Charles Rocka, Lorien Romito, Mary-Anne Rosario, Nushi Safinya, Paola Sensi-Isolani, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Katie Smith, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, James Temple, Dean Russ Tiberii, Ted Tsukahara, Hoang Vu, Roy Wensley, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

REPORTS

2. Chairperson's Report – Chair Poundstone reported that the formation of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee still remains a priority. A second request was sent out asking for volunteers and/or recommendations for candidates. Keith Brandt of Development will report at the November Senate meeting.

3. Vice Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Cortright reported that he has accepted the resignation of Laurie Edwards as the chair of the Graduate & Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee. Chair Poundstone will appoint a replacement.

4. Provost Updates – Provost Dobkin reported that WASC will arrive on campus Thursday, October 29, 2009 for an interim visit. A public exit interview will be held on Friday at 10:30 a.m.

The Board of Trustees unanimously approved the Public Speaker and Event Policy as submitted by the Academic Senate.

5. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Hoang Vu, UEPC Chair, reported that the UEPC met with Dean Woolpert and Past Chair Brother Charles on October 12, 2009 regarding Dean Woolpert's proposal to reorganize the Program of Studies for International and Multilingual Students (SIMS). The UEPC was not asked for a recommendation regarding whether or not the program should be continued. Dean Woolpert merely asked for input on the process and implementation of his proposal. Brother Charles has since submitted a faculty petition (on the agenda under New Business) to have the proposal be treated along the lines of a proposal for the discontinuance of a program as outlined in the *Handbook*. The UEPC deliberated with much uncertainty as to its role and the interpretation of the *Handbook* that Dean Woolpert was using. Were they to consider the two adjunct faculty involved in the program or focus only on the strengths and weaknesses of Dean Woolpert's proposal as it affects students, in particular, the international students? Were appropriate steps taken by Dean Woolpert? The UEPC was guided in its charge by the Faculty *Handbook*, but hoped for clarification on that role from the Senate.

Although the vote was reached with some uncertainty, the members supported the proposal put forward by Dean Woolpert by a vote of 7-2 with one abstention and forwarded the results of the deliberation to the Senate.

6. Graduate & Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) – Senator Heid reported the GPSEPC met. Under discussion was the resignation of chair Laurie Edwards. The committee will await the appointment of a chair by Chair Poundstone. Also under discussion was the thesis and project guidelines.

7. Program Review Committee (PRC) – Yung-Jae Lee reported that the PRC has completed the review of the Studies for International and Multilingual Students (SIMS), which was originally submitted last spring. The PRC did not have time to complete its review in spring 2009, and the new membership of the PRC completed the review this fall. The PRC has also completed the Business Administration review. The Integral program and the Multiple Subject Credential program reviews have recently been received.

8. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) – Senator Tywoniak reported that the AARC is scheduled to meet next Wednesday. The Registrar's office will present a proposal to the AARC.

9. Report of the Academic Advising Task Force, Building on Strengths Strategic Plan BOS Section 1.5 – Senator Tywoniak said the work began in 2007 with the Building on Strengths Strategic Plan tasking the Vice Provost for Academics, the Dean for Academic Advising and Achievement, the Provost and the AARC to look into: advising load equity among faculty in various departments, faculty advisor training, and the overall effectiveness of the advising program. A detailed report is now available. The task force gathered information and made nine recommendations. A result of the report is the proposal for the AARC to set up a permanent subcommittee known as the Academic Advising Subcommittee (to be introduced under New Business).

In brief summary, it was found that there is considerable inequity in advising loads, both in first year advising and advising within the major. A new first year advising cohort came into play, which grew out of the committee. Continued assessment by the AARC of the first year advising cohort is recommended. Discussion for the PRC and UEPC to take a leadership role regarding equity within and across departments. There was mixed reaction regarding the effectiveness of the current advising structure. What is the defined role of faculty in the process of advising? Advising is defined in the *Handbook* as being part of the assessment for Rank and Tenure. The full report is available through the office of the Academic Senate or on SMCnet under Faculty Governance.

Senator Tywoniak explained that the proposal to be considered under New Business is somewhat controversial. There is some question regarding whether the AARC is the appropriate committee for the task. It is a rank and tenure issue and an assessment issue. Would it be more appropriate under the UEPC?

Chair Poundstone suggested that the proposal to be discussed under New Business be postponed in order to allow time for a full discussion. There was no objection.

10. Athletics - Mark Orr reported that SMC is currently going through NCAA accreditation, which occurs every ten years. SMC recently completed a comprehensive self-study of its athletic

program. He presented comparative data regarding West Coast Conference missed class time as well as comparative data on academic progress for WCC sports. SMC ranked as the lowest missed class time in the WCC for last year.

Five years ago the Division I Board developed academic reform of NCAA division institutions. The Academic Progress Rate (APR) was developed as a more real-time assessment of teams' academic performance than the six-year graduation rate calculation. The APR awards 2 points per team to student-athletes whom meet academic eligibility standards and who remain at the institution the following term. A teams' APR is the total points earned by the team in a given academic year divided by the total points possible in that year. The Division I Board set the cut APR score of 925 (out of 1000), 60%. The Graduation Success Rate was developed in response to college and university presidents who wanted graduation data to more accurately reflect the mobility among college students today by measuring graduation rates at Division I institutions and includes students transferring into and out of the institutions. It also allows institutions to subtract student-athletes who leave their institutions prior to graduation as long as they were academically eligible had they remained. SMC rates do reflect the athletes that did not graduate due to the cancellation of the football program this year and next year as well.

SMC all student federal graduation rate is 67%; student-athlete 4 year graduation rate is 68%. SMC is currently third in the WCC for its Academic Progress Rate. Graduation success rate is 79%. Student athletes overall have a cumulative grade point average of 2.96. There is room for improvement. The implementation of summer school has been helpful.

There was a short discussion about the club sport versus division I sports and the Athletic department notification to faculty regarding the athletic travel schedule. Mark Orr said that if any faculty are having difficulty with student athletes, please allow his office to assist them.

NEW BUSINESS

11. Faculty Petition regarding the Studies for International and Multilingual Students (SIMS) – Chair Poundstone introduced a proposal from Dean Woolpert to restructure the SIMS program. Also introduced was the petition and proposal from Past Chair Brother Charles, which stated concern about the SIMS closure and the faculty involved. He explained that the proposal asks the Senate to send Dean Woolpert's proposal back to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee for evaluation under the Process for Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program (Faculty *Handbook* 2.8.5.2.2). Past Chair Brother Charles formally submitted the faculty petition for consideration, which was accepted by the Senate without objection (see petition below). Past Chair Brother Charles noted that faculty signatures continue to be received, and he added Elaina Rose Lovejoy and John Ely to the list. Bro. Charles also reported that 56 students of the SIMS program have signed the petition. He said the he students highlighted several points of the petition (as indicated in bold below):

A Community Concern:

The Closing of the Program of Studies for International and Multilingual Students (SIMS)

The Dean of the School of Liberal Arts has recently communicated his decision to close the program by means of an internal memorandum to various parties. No respectful letter was addressed to the principal faculty members affected by the decision. No mention of their names is included in the memo save for notice of copies sent. No discussion took place with the principal stakeholders, the claims of the dean to the contrary. **He made the decision without prior consultation with the faculty Senate, the Program Review Committee, or the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee.** In short, the manner in

which the decision was made and announced is a breach of community ideals and ethics. It is also a breach of good judgment. In place of SIMS, programs for international students will now be spread out to the Better Writing Program, the Anthropology Department, the Office of International Studies, and the general services of student advising. International students will no longer have a central academic place to call their home; **they will no longer have dedicated advisers or teachers solely given to their needs; and they will no longer have the services of two individuals who have given their expertise in this field for a combined sixty-four years.** This constitutes the removal of a program that on its merits we should be jealously guarding and its replacement by a diffuse and amorphous attempt to try to deliver everything that the students presently receive. What the closure cannot do is replace the dedication and quality of service that the present faculty delivers, a service that is truly a vocational apostolate.

The decision to close SIMS becomes a concern on two points for our community and by extension for external agencies in dialogue with us—namely, WASC and the AAUP. It is also a concern for those striving to build a campus of inclusive excellence. The first point is that the closing of the program adversely affects the professional work and livelihood of two of the more accomplished members of our faculty who are vulnerable to arbitrary dismissal because they are not tenured. This is a good example of **what the WASC committee tried to report to us of a lack of civility.** It is also a matter that would and should raise the concerns of the AAUP. **The closure of the SIMS program should be subject to the *Handbook* rules for the process for the Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program (*Faculty Handbook 2.8.5.2.2.*)** as a courtesy to the long years and the monument of two professional lives that have been primarily responsible for its success. To close the program without this courtesy because of a contestable interpretation of the *Handbook* language tears at the fabric of our faculty community and does so at the expense of some of its more vulnerable members. **Note the egregious lack of consideration in circulating the memo of closure a week before one of the faculty members was to receive recognition at the opening faculty dinner, and warm and glowing recognition at that, for his thirty years of service.** The insensitive manner in which this decision was conveyed makes the college unrecognizable to those who cherish communitarian ideals here.

Secondly, **the closing of SIMS would set back the college's recent endeavors to rededicate itself to inclusive excellence.** We would be decentralizing the educational service that we provide to international students. Furthermore we would be replacing a program of which we all can be justly proud with something that barely replaces in a fragmented way what our international students have enjoyed in one form or another for a generation of life here at the college. **What the new plan cannot replace is the sense of community and undivided attention that SIMS provides.** To have made this decision without the prior consultation of the primary faculty stakeholders and the appropriate academic committees and without a senate hearing is a glaring breach of shared governance.

We urge the dean of the School of Liberal Arts (SOLA) or his superiors to reverse this decision and to take steps to bolster the present SIMS program and to give needed support to its director and faculty so that they might be encouraged in the work that they do, a work that gives so many of us the confidence of our convictions as a mission-driven college with an international outreach. Furthermore, if the Dean of SOLA does not reverse the decision for closure that he has already made, we request the senate to ask for the implementation of the process for the Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (section 2.8.5.2.2-3):

2. Proposals for discontinuing a department or program are to be submitted in writing to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) or Graduate & Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) during the academic year but no later than March 1st. Once a proposal is received, the committee will meet with (1) the Provost, or the Vice Provost for that program, (2) the Dean of the department's or program's school, (3) the department chair or program director, (4) the department/program faculty, and (5) a Program Review Committee representative. The committee chair will then bring forward to the Academic Senate either a) a recommendation for discontinuance or b) recommendation against discontinuance.

3. The Senate will consider and take action on the recommendation of the UEPC or GPSEPC.

Chair Poundstone said there is a difference of opinion regarding the interpretation of the *Faculty Handbook* language, and he suggested the Senate would need to come to consensus on three

questions before it is prepared to entertain Bro. Charles's first proposal. The first question concerns Dean Woolpert's assertion that because SIMS does not have tenured or tenure track faculty, the process outlined in *FH 2.8.5.2.2* does not apply. The second concerns whether SIMS meets the standard of being an academic program. The third focuses on whether Dean Woolpert's proposal should be classified as a program closure or an administrative reorganization. Chair Poundstone noted that this debate about interpreting the Handbook is not about the merits of Dean Woolpert's proposal but about the process for how his proposal should be reviewed.

Past Chair Brother Charles requested to speak first, then yielded his time to Professor John Knight. Professor Knight spoke passionately about his and Professor Nushi Safinya's long-term association with the SIMS program and their dedication to the students and the mission of the college. He proclaimed that their voices have not been heard, procedures have not been followed, and details have been omitted, of which he proceeded to list several.

Chair Poundstone then asked the Senate to return to the discussion directly at hand and to begin to address the first of three *Handbook* questions. The first question is whether only academic programs with ranked faculty are eligible to go through the process for discontinuance outlined in *FH 2.8.5.2.2*. In the memo attached to his proposal, Dean Woolpert quotes part of *FH 2.8.5.2* which has this important sentence: "The decision to discontinue an academic program or a department where there are tenured or tenure-track faculty not covered by a state of financial exigency shall be based on educational considerations." Dean Woolpert then writes, "There are no tenured or tenure-track faculty in SIMS; therefore it not a 'program' within the meaning of this section." In short, Dean Woolpert treats that line as a controlling definition of a program for the subordinate paragraph of *FH 2.8.5.2.2*, thus making the involvement of ranked faculty a necessary condition for consideration. According to that interpretation, academic programs without ranked faculty can be discontinued by an administrative decision without requiring a thorough examination of the evidence by the UEPC and approval by the Senate.

Chair Poundstone noted that those who contest Dean Woolpert's reading of the *Handbook* argue that the reference to the presence of ranked faculty in that quoted sentence is not part of an attempt to supply a definition of "program." Instead, that reference to tenured and tenure-track faculty serves to introduce the primary concern of *FH 2.8.5.2*: what accommodations need to be made for ranked faculty who serve in a program which is being discontinued. After all, we are tenured to the College, not to a department or program. The Senate, he said, would need to decide between those two rival interpretations.

Dean Woolpert explained that he not only considered the written statements of the *Handbook* language, but also where it is located in the *Handbook*, 2.8.5.2, under 2.8.5 "Termination of An Appointment by the College." The description covers "Termination of an appointment with continuous tenure or of a probationary or temporary appointment before the end of a specified term..." Dean Woolpert explained that the two adjunct faculty lines of the SIMS program are not being terminated early. There are provisions in the *Handbook* that clearly cover the continuation of adjunct appointments. The section of the *Handbook* describing the discontinuance procedures refers to programs where there are tenured or tenure-track faculty. It is his determination that the meaning of the *Handbook* is that for purposes of this section, what happens when a program is to be closed, refers to programs where there are tenured or tenure-track faculty.

Vice Chair Cortright argued that while Dean Woolpert's reading of the *Handbook* is possible, he suggested that it does not adequately take account of *Handbook* topography of which the five instances in which the three classes of appointments would be terminated are underscored and the

sections in which the rules for applying procedures to those instances are left un-underscoring. He also felt the *Handbook* was clear, but his interpretation does not agree with Dean Woolpert.

Senator Rokeach stated that the theater program is part of a larger department of Performing Arts. It is administered by two non tenure-track faculty. The language as interpreted by Dean Woolpert is not an accurate depiction of what constitutes a program. It is not civil to close a program based on a fine line interpretation. Whatever happens to the SIMS program, he would prefer a process that is thorough and fully vetted.

Past Chair Brother Charles said that John Knight has explained that SIMS has been referred to as a program by administration in the report to WASC and it has been reviewed by the Program Review Committee, it is de facto a program. Does a program need ranked faculty? No, we don't operate that way. He agreed with Vice Chair Cortright's interpretation of the *Handbook*, 1.6.1: Shared Governance, "The ideal process for decision-making at the College relies on the foundational principles of Catholic Social Teaching that base all actions on a shared respect for all persons and a mutual commitment to the Common Good."

Senator Gomez-Arias said the consequences of the two interpretations being considered would be that Seminar would no longer be considered a program or any major would stop being a program if it is taught by adjuncts; alternately, if a tenured or tenure-track faculty teach anything it becomes a program, it is not reasonable.

Chair Poundstone noted that many of the above comments by Senators were sliding into the next distinct question before the Senate, whether SIMS is an "academic program" as that term is understood in *FH 2.8.5.2.2*. Chair Poundstone noted that he had searched the *Handbook*, but that he found no formal definition of an academic program. The operational definition being used by Dean Woolpert (on p. 4 in his proposal) is that an academic program entails either being degree granting (like a department in the sense of administering an authorized major or minor) or having oversight of a graduation requirement (like Jan Term, Seminar, and English Composition). That would exclude what are now being called "academic support units" which are designed to support the overall success of our students like the High Potential Program, the Honors Program, the Center for International Programs, First Year Advising, and perhaps even CILSA -- all of which could hypothetically be reorganized or discontinued via this same kind of administrative decision making without following the procedures for the discontinuance of an academic program as outlined in the *Handbook*. The staffing and structure of such academic support units are determined by the administrators to whom these programs report.

Chair Poundstone noted that the alternative understanding of an academic program finds its *Handbook* foundation in the role of the Program Review Committee (PRC) which is charged with reviewing all degree and non-degree programs. From this perspective, if it is reviewed by the Program Review Committee, it meets the *Handbook's* understanding of what constitutes an academic program. It should be noted that SIMS has been reviewed twice by the PRC.

Senator Tywoniak said there are three related elements: the definition of the program, question of the issue of discontinuance, ethical treatment of colleagues. Regarding the definition of a program; Seminar is chaired by a ranked faculty member, and ranked faculty do also teach Seminar. He questions whether the hiring and firing of adjunct faculty and/or staff is the purview of the Senate. Faculty own the curriculum and the hiring and firing of ranked faculty, all else is the purview of other elements of the institution.

Senator Heid said she looks at the particular *Handbook* statement in relation to the former School of Extended Education. At the time it was important to distinguish between tenure/tenure-track and adjunct faculty; what would happen to them when the school was closed. Her recollection of the phrase was to protect the tenured/tenure-track faculty because they were tenured to the College. It did not protect the adjuncts. It was not a way of defining a program, only to distinguish what would happen to faculty when a school is closed. In the School of Education several programs are run completely by adjunct faculty. Those programs all go through the Program Review process. She encouraged the Senate to not make the decision based on various possible interpretations of *Handbook* language. The decision is important enough to see it vetted through the Discontinuance process.

Vice Chair Cortright, responding to the comments of Senator Tywoniak, acknowledged that if the Dean had opted to not renew the contracts of the SIMS faculty, the Dean's action would be an administrative decision under the purview of the Dean. His objection is the discontinuation of the program. The continuance or discontinuance of the program and continuation of the existing faculty with the program are two distinct questions. Whatever conflicts are in his heart, he would vote on the distinct question. He did not agree with Dean Woolpert's interpretation of the *Handbook*. He argued that the higher norm of the *Handbook* is to treat one another according to the principles of Catholic Social Thought. It is wrong for important decisions to hang on the parsing of *Handbook* language. In the tradition of Catholic Social Thought, one does not oppose the Common Good of the institution as if it were some artifact to be perfected on its own. He encouraged the Senate to vote for due consideration.

Vice Chair Cortright explained that the argument is that the question does not hang solely on the language of *FH* section 2.8.5.2, the argument is that the language of *FH* 2.8.5.2 does not control the reading of the sequel paragraph 2.8.5.2.2, which lays out a procedure for discontinuation of programs without the reference to the presence of tenured or tenure-track faculty.

Past Chair Brother Charles acknowledged that the adoption of the language in the *Handbook* is tied to the closure of the School of Extended Education. What ensued was the creation of policy for the closure of a program. At the end of the history, we now have this process. He cannot justify not putting SIMS through the process.

Chair Poundstone said he also disagreed with Dean Woolpert's interpretation of the *Handbook*. It is his determination that the opening language simply introduces the process, but he does not consider that paragraph controlling the guidelines for discontinuance. It is in the spirit of shared governance to ensure this issue is dealt with fairly and adequately.

The following MOTION was made by Past Chair Brother Charles and SECONDED by Vice Chair Cortright:

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate request the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts (SOLA) rescind his decision of 1 September to close the Studies for International and Multilingual Students (SIMS) program until such time as his proposal has had a thorough vetting according to the process for the Discontinuance of an Academic Department or Program as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* (section 2.8.5.2.2-3):

2. Proposals for discontinuing a department or program are to be submitted in writing to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) or the Graduate & Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC)

during the academic year but no later than March 1st. Once a proposal is received, the committee will meet with (1) the Provost, or the Vice Provost for that program, (2) the Dean of the department's or program's school, (3) the department chair or program director, (4) the department/program faculty, and (5) a Program Review Committee representative. The committee chair will then bring forward to the Academic Senate either a) a recommendation for discontinuance or b) recommendation against discontinuance.

3. The Senate will consider and take action on the recommendation of the UEPC or GPSEPC.

Senator Gomez-Arias asked Dean Woolpert whether his letter describes a decision or a plan. Dean Woolpert answered that the difficulty is in separating the personnel aspects of the plan with the reorganizational aspects. A motion to rescind pending a more formal review can be understood to cover the issues over which the Senate has authority. Parts of the plan are not subject to Senate review, which he explained places him in a difficult position. He said that when he reached the determination that this was not a program within the meaning of the section of the *Handbook* referred to, he went to the *Handbook* on shared governance, 1.6.1, which said "faculty administrators recognize that even where faculty roles in the decision making process is advisory, the practice of good governance requires timely consultation with the faculty within a committee system." He said that he has not intended to circumvent or exclude faculty consultation; but rather determine the proper way in which that conversation takes place. He has notified the Program Review Committee and consulted with the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee. The personnel aspects of the plan will go forward without a more formal review, he cannot comment on appointment issues publically. Other parts of the plan could be suspended pending a more formal review.

Dean Woolpert continued to explain that the *Handbook* requires that he make a recommendation to the Provost about whether to continue adjunct appointments on a three-year cycle based on the necessity of those appointments. The faculty involved are to be notified by December 1st. This element of the plan cannot be suspended by Senate action.

Past Chair Brother Charles addressed a question to Dean Woolpert: Is the scenario being described such that if the motion is passed and the faculty recommend strongly that SIMS be kept whole for all the work that it does, that you could conceive of replacing the present faculty with new faculty to operate the same program? And would that open the College up to a lawsuit that they would lose? Dean Woolpert replied he could not comment on specific issues of performance. He will approach this matter in the same way he has approached every other adjunct review completed since he became the dean: he will follow the *Handbook*. If he treats these faculty differently, he is sure he will be exposing the College to a legal challenge.

Past Chair Brother Charles said one of the things the proposal does is give voice to the senior faculty of this program whose voice has been muted. Theirs is an expertise that the college needs to hear. It is impossible to have the conversation while circumventing the question of the faculty being talked about. He argued to restore the voices of the senior faculty of the program.

Christa Kell expressed her concern that program issues are connected with personnel issues. John Knight's remarks showed his passion about the program. She also understands that Dean Woolpert has done the best he could with the language of the *Handbook*. It seems possible that Dean Woolpert is willing to have the program issues reviewed, but he must keep the personnel issues separate.

John Knight said that it would be a disservice to the institution and all involved if a thorough vetting is not conducted.

Barbara McGraw suggested considering what precedent is being set. She urged the Senate to come to clarity about the language of the *Handbook*. It is important that John Knight and Nushi Safinya be present for a conversation with the UEPC. She urged an open process for all UEPC meetings.

Theo Carlile said something is terribly wrong when a program that has been part of our academic community for decades and, she does not care whether the colleagues are tenured, the faculty have been long-term members of the institution for over 30 years each. She asked what horrible things have they done to cause this? She said the decision will cause a wound to extract such a program and its faculty. Something needs to be done to heal the wounds that have already incurred. It is appalling and hurtful to us all.

Chair Poundstone outlined that he agrees with the Senators that SIMS is a program as understood in *FH 2.8.5.2.2* and that the process for a discontinuance should be followed. He added that Dean Woolpert's term of "academic support units" is not a *Handbook* term. There is an additional question of whether Dean Woolpert's proposal should be classified as the reorganization of the activities of SIMS or as the discontinuance of SIMS. In the title of his proposal, Dean Woolpert characterizes this as a "reorganization" since, as he notes, none of SIMS' activities are being discontinued, just reassigned; however, in his proposal he also refers to the "discontinuance of SIMS as a separate program" (p. 5). Are reorganizations in which all the current functions of a program are reallocated rather than eliminated subject to Senate review? The question need not be an either/or, but this action in relation to SIMS must be seen as a discontinuance to trigger the process outlined in *FH 2.8.5.2.2*. Chair Poundstone said he thought this was both a reorganization and a discontinuance, and if it is a discontinuance, it should be dealt with according to the process for discontinuance. If it is not a discontinuance, he said a much stronger argument needs to be submitted as to why not.

Senator Lind said the question of discontinuance or reorganization needs to be clear. If it is a reorganization, he is not sure the Senate has authority of this. He agreed with Barbara McGraw, that the Senate must be careful about setting precedents and overstepping its authority.

The question was called, seconded and approved by a vote of 9-0-1.

A hand vote was taken on the resolution, which was approved by a vote of 7-2 with one abstention.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Cathe Michalosky