

**Minutes of the  
Academic Senate  
September 10, 2009**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tom Poundstone at 3:00 p.m. on September 10, 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, Carla Bossard, Robert Bulman, Valerie Burke, Joel Burley, Dean Tom Carter, Martin Cohen, Provost Beth Dobkin, Monica Fitzgerald, Zach Flanagan, Charles Hamaker, Allan Hansell, Dean Brian Jersky, Christa Kell, Lidia Luquet, Claude Mallary, Susan Marston, Phylis Martinelli, Mary McCall, Dean Frank Murray, Rebecca Proehl, Mari-Anne Rosario, Nushi Safinya, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Elena Songster, Dean Nancy Sorenson, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Ted Tsukahara, Sarah Vital, Hoang Vu, Roy Wensley, Dean Steve Woolpert, Paul Zarnoth, and Joseph Zepeda.

2. Minutes of the May 14, 2009, May 19, 2009 and August 25, 2009 meetings were unanimously approved as submitted.

## **REPORTS**

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Poundstone welcomed the new Senators: Laura Heid, Phil Perry, Keith Ogawa, Sam Lind, Tomas Gomez, and Steve Cortright. In his opening remarks, he spoke of the role of the Senate and noted that shared governance requires both vigilance and preparation. He proposed the model of a debating society in which Senators are asked to give close scrutiny to the proposals before them, revising them, refining them, and occasionally rejecting them. This debating society model, he said, was dependent on at least these four things: a spirit of civility, hard work, humility, and profound mutual respect. Chair Poundstone then outlined some of the important issues coming before the Senate. The first order of business for the Senate is the consideration of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee proposal and the Collegiate Seminar Task Force proposal, which are carried over from the prior year. At the October 1, 2009 meeting, the Senate will discuss the proposed speaker policy. An open forum will be held on Wednesday, September 23 on the speaker policy. Drafts of the policy will be sent to faculty along with sample policies at other institutions.

Several upcoming agenda items for September and October are: differential pay from the Faculty Welfare Committee, advising issues from the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee, and training sessions offered by the Committee on Inclusive Excellence.

4. Vice Chairperson's Report - Vice Chair Cortright has completed a survey of ranked faculty who are not presently serving on a committee dedicated to some aspect of college-wide government. His assessment was that there are more than enough faculty available to fill the anticipated seats in newly created committees such as the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee and the Collegiate Seminar Task Force.

5. Provost Updates - Provost Dobkin announced that she will be appointing faculty to the Academic Blueprint Task Force.

6. Graduate & Professional Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) - Senator Heid reported as the liaison Senator. The committee will meet jointly with the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee to review sabbatical proposals. The GPSEPC is working with Associate Dean Chris Sindt who is developing a Graduate & Professional Studies website. The committee will continue its work to

implement Proquest, an online source for dissertation and masters projects and theses. Proquest guidelines will be integrated into the current graduate program guidelines. The long-term issue before the GPSEPC is to review the graduate and professional studies issues from BOS 2.4 to determine what has been accomplished and making plans for what yet needs to be done.

7. Program Review Committee (PRC) - Senator Rokeach reported as the liaison Senator. Fourteen departments and programs are scheduled for review this year. The number is too great for the committee to take on, however, there are often requests for extensions. There are currently two openings on the committee. The PRC has been encouraged to be more proactive than it has acted in the past. Senator Tywoniak asked what type of guidance is provided to departments. Senator Rokeach said he will bring that question to the PRC.

8. Faculty Welfare Committee - Joel Burley reported on the faculty salary policy and differential salaries. Questions regarding differential salaries were forwarded to the Provost last spring from the Faculty Welfare Committee, and her response was shared with the faculty. Professor Burley thanked the Provost for her diligence in responding to the FWC questions. Professor Burley reported that last fall Brother Ronald acknowledged that it is no longer possible to meet the second goal of the salary policy (comparison to WCC schools plus Manhattan College) that the policy is no longer consistent with the mission or financial resources of the College. It was also discovered by the FWC last year that many faculty are being paid differential salaries. The Provost has requested that the FWC and the Senate provide recommendations for a revised or new faculty salary policy by October of 2010. In order to accomplish this task, the FWC have identified two necessities:

1) FWC to inform and survey faculty on the situation: do faculty want to fight for goal II? Why did the current policy fail? What are the appropriate comparison institutions? What do faculty think of differential salaries? Should the institution move to a merit based system? A comprehensive and unbiased assessment of faculty opinions will be necessary for the FWC to complete this task.

2) FWC to obtain accurate, detailed data on current salaries campus-wide. Plan to create a confidential database, including additional funding, course release information, etc. This can be accomplished while safeguarding faculty identity. Without the database, the FWC cannot make informed decisions.

The FWC plan to begin this work immediately in order to meet the fall 2010 deadline. Senator Rokeach expressed concern about the excessive bureaucratic obstacles, which will make it difficult for the members of the FWC to obtain the information necessary in order complete their work.

Professor Burley said that faculty have legitimate concerns. Faculty have been negotiating in good faith since 2000. The problems that have risen are complicated and not the result of negligence by the faculty. President Brother Ronald and Provost Dobkin inherited the problems, and they are part of the solution rather than part of the problem. Their participation is essential. Professor Burley said that faculty at SMC do not have collective bargaining, and they will need to be very clear about what they want. The Trustees will never pass a salary policy where they must commit to binding targets given the financial realities. The college does not adjust the budget to the academic priorities, but rather change or manipulate the academic priorities in order to fit the approved budget.

Professor Burley explained that Goal I compares the average paid salaries at SMC at assistant, associate, and full professor to the average salaries paid by the Pacific IIA institutions, dominated primarily by the Cal State system. Under the current salary policy, Goal I was considered the floor. The differential salaries changed the average salaries for comparison purposes, making the comparisons unreliable.

Provost Dobkin added that President Brother Ronald has approved the hiring of a Budget and Personnel Analyst in the Provost's office. This will allow access to the information Joel Burley explained the FWC will need in order to develop a new salary policy. There are various reasons as to why the salaries can differ from the salary scale: reduced faculty load, additional faculty load, medical leave, endowed supplements, course releases, etc. Senator Rokeach expressed his concern that the college would add an additional staff position, given the numerous layoffs across the campus. Provost Dobkin said she would be very willing to have a qualified faculty member take on the task.

Dean Brian Jersky said that budget decisions at universities are either made by the CFO or by the Provost. The SMC model is that budget decisions are made by the CFO rather than a business manager for academic affairs.

Professor Burley said the FWC will move forward to inform the faculty and conduct the faculty survey.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

9. Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) Proposal - Chair Poundstone explained that the first four sections of the Core Curriculum Task Force proposal were adopted in May, 2009. A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Rokeach to accept the CCIC proposal beginning at "Implementation Process" up to "Collegiate Seminar Task Force" as shown below. A MOTION was made by Senator Lind and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to consider the issue informally, which was not challenged

### *Implementation Process*

*Among the first actions of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will be the implementation of the proposed changes to the current core. The following procedures are a means to develop the implementation plan and are meant more as initial guidelines and recommendations from the UEPC and the Senate than as steps which must be followed:*

*1) September 2009: Selection of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee members.*

*2) Fall 2009, the CCIS will:*

- A. Invite all departments to develop benchmarks of assessment graduated over four years for the learning goals related to their disciplines.*
- B. Invite all departments to assess what learning goals they see their classes as currently meeting, ways they see their courses could be adapted to more fully meet the learning goals, and note courses which they might develop to meet the learning goals.*
- C. Develop a process for review and approval of major CCIC action with substantive interchange taking place when reviewed by the UEPC and up-or-down votes when presented to the Senate.*
- D. Identify and report on the best practices for the structure and procedures of core curriculum implementation committees at other universities.*
- E. Prepare the descriptions of the learning goals for catalog publication.*
- F. As needed, the CCIC may create subcommittees to compile and assess the foundational works supplied by the above mentioned departmental reports and to develop the benchmarks corresponding to each of the learning goals.*
  - 1. We recommend one subcommittee for learning goals 1-4, one subcommittee each for learning goals 5-8, and one subcommittee for learning goals 9-12.*
  - 2. Each subcommittee will be formed from faculty experts in the areas who will be invited to join, with the approval of the Chair and Vice Chair of the UEPC.*
  - 3. The subcommittees will be composed of four or more members, ideally with one representative of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee on the subcommittee and definitely with at least one member with a disciplinary background not directly related to the learning goal.*

4. *Each subcommittee may include a staff member with expertise in the area of the learning goal.*
- 3) *Fall 2009 through Summer 2010: each subcommittee will*
  - A. *Identify or develop benchmarks to evaluate courses that might satisfy the approved learning goals.*
  - B. *Develop procedures by which the benchmarks will be applied to the classes in which syllabi are submitted for approval. The CCIC will hear appeals if a faculty member's course has been judged by one of the subcommittees as not meeting the learning goals.*
  - C. *Identify ways to assist programs and faculty in developing or adapting courses to satisfy the learning goals.*
  - D. *Encourage innovative ways to meet these goals such as proposals for inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary courses as well as by encouraging the exploration of innovative approaches to teaching.*
  - E. *Identify other means of satisfying the learning goals (e.g., independent study, other projects),*
  - F. *Identify assessment methods for measuring the achievement of the learning goals,*
  - G. *Develop guidelines for assessing how classes taken at other institutions or in study abroad might fulfill the college's learning goals.*
  - H. *Report back to the CCIC on their progress, including resource needs.*
- 4) *Fall 2010:*
  - A. *CCIC actively engages faculty on catalog changes through campus meetings.*
  - B. *Present sample syllabi of approved courses*
  - C. *Establish a cycle of review for approved courses every three years*
- 5) *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.*
- 6) *Fall 2011: course development, faculty development, and new advising model development.*
- 7) *Fall 2012: Entering students begin new curriculum.*
- 8) *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).*
- 9) *Fall 2013: Sophomore transfer students enter in new curriculum.*
- 10) *June 30, 2013: The Core Curriculum Implementation Committee will end its term.*
- 11) *Fall 2013: Junior transfers students enter in new curriculum.*
- 12) *May 2015: Last class graduates under old core.*
- 13) *Sept 2015: Full implementation.*

Senator Heid explained that in consultation with Christa Kell and Brother Charles, she had proposed amended language as indicated in bold under number 2 above. The added language, she said, will allow the implementation process to be focused on the departments first and the CCIC second; suggesting that decisions about which courses meet which benchmarks and which discipline should be identified with which learning goals should be done at the department level. The draft focuses on the CCIC being the facilitator of the departments and a resource for departments. Christa Kell said that is the intent of the amended language that the development of benchmarks begin at the department level for the purpose of engaging experts in the disciplines and involving the community. The CCIC will then process the departmental data. It may be beneficial for the CCIC to form subcommittees to oversee the learning goals and the academic maps, but it will be at the discretion of the CCIC.

A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and SECONDED by Senator Lind to close the informal debate, which was approved by voice vote. A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and SECONDED by Senator Heid to amend language in number 3 as follows: "Fall 2009 through Summer 2010: ~~each subcommittee will~~ **the CCIC will facilitate departments to:**"

Paul Zarnoth questioned the necessity of the language, given the language in 2) F. which outlines the creation of subcommittees. Dean Murray argued against the amended language, which directs the departments to do the work outlined in section three. The work described in section three cannot be done by departments. Senator Tywoniak said the learning goals are not departmental learning goals. The subcommittee structure may provide a larger vision to look at objectives, rather than being departmentally based.

Past Chair Brother Charles said in order to give as much flexibility to the CCIC as possible, he suggested the amendment to read, "3) Fall 2009 through Summer 2010: ~~each subcommittee will~~ **The CCIC will:**" Senator Tywoniak accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Ted Tsukahara said the Core Curriculum Task Force (CCTF) was very careful in investigating best practices elsewhere to guide its work. The CCTF went to departments for advice early in its process, but did not receive much response. The learning goals should guide the CCIC.

A vote on the amendment was called, and the amendment passed by hand vote. The question was then called, and approved. A roll call vote was taken on the amended proposal from "Implementation Process" up to "Collegiate Seminar Task Force" as follows:

Tom Poundstone	Yes	Sam Lind	Yes
Steve Cortright	Yes	Keith Ogawa	No
Brother Charles Hilken	Yes	Phil Perry	Yes
Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Marty Rokeach	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes		

Senator Tywoniak was absent for the vote. The motion passed 8-1-0.

10. Collegiate Seminar Task Force Proposal - A MOTION was made by Senator Lind and SECONDED by Senator Perry to accept the following Collegiate Seminar Task Force and the Membership of the Collegiate Seminar Task Force proposal.

#### ***Collegiate Seminar Task Force***

*In the Academic Senate's extra meeting on May 19, the Senate decided that the Collegiate Seminar Task Force (CSTF) recommended by the Core Curriculum Task Force (CCTF) should be incorporated as an ad hoc subcommittee of the CCIC rather than be a free-standing committee.*

*The CSTF's charge is limited in time and scope. The task force's charge expires this academic year after its report is given to the CCIC, UEPC, the Senate, and the Provost. Its task will be focused on the challenge presented in Model 3 of how Seminar might best be organized to serve as the "core of the core" as well as respond to what the CCTF described as "an urgent call to improve [Seminar] for the benefit of our students." As Senator Alvarez suggested, the driving question should be "How can Seminar best move us forward to fulfill the newly established learning goals?" Likewise, the CCTF suggested the following dimensions of Seminar might be considered by the task force: "[t]he length of the reading lists, the best way to begin the Seminar, the advantages and disadvantages of the chronological vs. thematic organization, the inclusion of voices not heard in the conversation, the student experience of Seminar, the evaluation of instructors and use of instructors who are particularly effective with the first course." (See the appendix to this proposal for the full text of the recommendation from the CCTF.)*

#### ***Membership of the Collegiate Seminar Task Force***

*Though this task force will function as a subcommittee of the CCIC, its membership will be appointed in the same fashion as CCIC, with an invitation sent to the faculty for nominations. The CSTF will be comprised of seven faculty members and two students. All faculty members on the committee will*

*have taught at least two Collegiate Seminar courses, and no more than three of the faculty members will have served on the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board. Three of the faculty members will serve as ex officio voting members: the Director of Collegiate Seminar, Collegiate Seminar's Director of Assessment, and the author of Model Three. Once established, the task force will chose a chair from among its membership.*

Past Chair Brother Charles argued against including the author of Model Three (Zach Flanagan) on the Collegiate Seminar Task Force as stated in the proposal. The Board is evaluative, and this would place the faculty member in the position of evaluating and advocating simultaneously. He suggested that Zach Flanagan be used as a resource. Past Chair Brother Charles made a motion, seconded by Senator Gomez-Arias to remove "...and the author of Model Three.." from the last sentence under Membership of the Collegiate Seminar Task Force. Dean Murray questioned why the author of Model Three would be more of an advocate than the Collegiate Seminar Director. He advocated for both being present, but if the argument for removing the author of Model Three is the presumption of bias, how can a presumption of bias be ignored for the Director of Collegiate Seminar? Past Chair Brother Charles responded that he does not presume that the Director of Collegiate Seminar is for the status quo, but it is clear that the advocate of Model Three is in favor of Model 3. Chair Poundstone added that the proposal for Model Three inspired the entire question and thus the proposed formation of the task force. Christa Kell said the goal is to make a well balance, informed group to evaluate Seminar. The question was called on the amendment to strike, "...the author of Model Three" from The Membership of the Collegiate Seminar Task Force proposal. The amendment failed by hand vote.

Charles Hamaker asked how the students will be selected to the CCIC. Vice Chair Cortright expressed his opposition to the proposal. Senator Rokeach asked how a definitive conclusion can be ensured by the CSTF. The question was called due to time; the vote to close debate failed. A MOTION was made by Senator Rokeach and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to table the Collegiate Seminar Task Force Proposal until a future Senate meeting so that the Senate could proceed to the introduction of new faculty. The motion was approved by hand vote. Senator Rokeach was asked to work on revising the proposal before it is taken up again.

11. Introduction of new faculty: Dean Steve Woolpert introduced four new faculty to the School of Liberal Arts: Monica Fitzgerald - Liberal and Civic Studies, Aaron Sachs - Communication, Elena Songster - History, and Joseph Zepeda - Integral.

Dean Roy Allen introduced four new faculty to the School of Economics and Business Administration: Wares Karim - Graduate Business Accounting, Andrew Wilson - Graduate Business Marketing, Michael Wagner - Graduate Business Operations Management, and Arnav Sheth - Graduate Business Finance.

Dean Brian Jersky introduced three new faculty to the School of Science: Rebecca Jabbour - Biology, Weiwei Pan - Mathematics, and Alice Stevens - Mathematics.

Vice Provost Frances Sweeney introduced Susie Miller-Reid as the Director for the Center for International Programs, replacing Maureen Little who retired after 30 years of service to the College.

12. The meeting was adjourned for a reception in honor of the new faculty.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathe Michalosky  
Faculty Governance Coordinator