

## Minutes of the Academic Senate

November 11, 2010

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 3:00 p.m. on November 11, 2010. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Steve Cortright, Vice Chair Tomas Gomez-Arias, Past Chair Tom Poundstone, Michael Barram, Laura Heid, Sam Lind, Joan Peterson, David Bird, William Lee, and Parliamentarian Joseph Zepeda. Keith Ogawa was out of town on school-related business and unable to attend.

Also present were: Sam Agronow, Kara Boatman, Interim Dean Jerry Brunetti, Dick Courtney, Provost Beth Dobkin, Laurie Edwards, Zach Flanagan, Cynthia Ganote, Associate Dean Larisa Genin, Charles Hamaker, Chris Jones, Ann Kelly, Dean Zhan Li, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Deepak Sawhney, Jim Sauerberg, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Mindy Thomas, Dean Russ Tiberii, Ted Tsukahara, Cynthia Van Gilder, Sarah Vital, Sharon Walters, Elise Wong, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the October 21, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved as submitted, by voice vote.

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Cortright submitted a full written report (see attached). Two special general meetings have been scheduled regarding the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee's proposals on the core curriculum: learning goals and administration under a permanent Core Curriculum Committee. A light dinner will be served with the meeting on Tuesday, January 11, 2011 from 5-8 p.m. A lunch will be served with the meeting on Wednesday, January 12, 2011, from 11:30-1:30 p.m, immediately following the Senate meeting, from 9:00-11:00 a.m. Both meetings will be held in Claeys Lounge at the Soda Center.

4. Provost Updates – Provost Dobkin reported on the status of the current searches: Finalists are being interviewed for the School of Science Dean position. The semi-finalist list will soon be determined for the School of Education Dean position. The position description is being finalized for the Dean of Academic Resources position. The Provost announced that she consulted with the Senate Executive Board regarding the position of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics.. She has opted to conduct an expedited national search and is hopeful interviews can be conducted in the spring. She encouraged internal candidates to apply.

5. The Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Chair Cortright reported that the UEPC will be dealing with core curriculum matters for the foreseeable future. The UEPC may need to schedule additional meetings in January.

6. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) – Senator Bird reported that the AARC is currently conducting conversations between the AARC and the Dean of Advising regarding AARC's new role in oversight of advising services.

7. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) – Senator Barram introduced FWC Chair Chris Jones to report for the FWC. Professor Jones reported that the FWC resolution brought forward and approved by the Senate to restore the pension benefits to 8.25% has been approved by the Board of Trustees, effective January 1, 2011. The plan is to increase the amount to 10% by 2015-2016. Health care premiums have increased for 2011; the College has responded with a 10% increase in the College contribution to the pool, assuring that out-of-pocket expenses to individual faculty will be no more than proportionate to the

increase. The FWC continues to address the faculty salary policy and will report to faculty early in the spring.

## OLD BUSINESS

8. Resolution re: Senate Action S-10/11-1: Proposal from the GPSEPC to Create a Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies Position – Laurie Edwards, Chair of the GPSEPC, introduced the following proposal, authored by the ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate.

**WHEREAS** the Senate acknowledges that Saint Mary’s College ought to provide appropriate support services for graduate and professional programs of the College; and

**WHEREAS** the Senate acknowledges that the College ought to adjust its administrative structure so as to respond to growth in the size and number of the College’s graduate and professional programs; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Senate Action S-10/11-1 (9 September, 2010), the *ad hoc* Committee to review the proposal of the Graduate and Professional Educational Policies Committee—*viz.*: that the position, Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies, be inaugurated—has completed items (1) and (2) of its charge:

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, pursuant to Senate Action S-10/11-1 at (3), the *Faculty Handbook* shall be amended (fully amended Faculty Handbook language on file in the office of the Academic Senate).

Professor Edwards explained that the Vice Provost position would serve the needs of all graduate and professional programs. There are many issues affecting graduate and professional students across programs: creation of a Handbook for graduate students, coordination of commencement, standards for dissertations and theses. Similarly, various graduate programs are affected by a range of shared issues distinct from those directly affecting their individual academic integrity or format: strategy for raising funds for graduate and professional students, enrollment management, management of a common website; etc. Much of the work related to these shared matters is currently being done by the Chair of the Graduate Council. Three of the College’s schools have graduate programs. Currently there are 24 masters programs, a doctoral program, five credential programs, five certificate programs, and two baccalaureate programs for professionals. Graduate and professional studies comprise approximately one-third of the college. Graduate and professional students have a right to expect the college to be supportive of their needs.

A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Senator Heid to adopt the resolution. Chair Cortright added that if adopted, the position will be created and the proposed amended Handbook language would be accepted to establish the position’s job description and organizational status. Senators Barram and Lee questioned whether the position need have the status “vice provost.” Professor Edwards responded that the title of Vice Provost signals a “voice” for graduate and professional programs comparable to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, with access (for example) to the College and Academic Affairs Budget Committees. Senator Peterson observed that it is important that graduate and professional programs be represented as a unit.

Senator Barram suggested that an administrative review might be beneficial, not so much with the particular position at issue, but the larger culture of the growth of administration without faculty voice. Past Chair Poundstone said that he sees the necessity of the proposed position, but given that the Vice

Provost for Undergraduate Academics position is presently open, now may be a very good time to review the status of administrative positions.

Addressing several points, Provost Dobkin noted: first, that there has been a net reduction in the number of administrative positions; second, that while there exists a structure at the college that exclusively attends to the undergraduate experience, currently the institutional structure does not contain a position charged with attending to the needs of a third of SMC students; third, that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is working on an administrative program review process which will provide an on-going mechanism to assess the adequacy of staffing levels.

Interim Dean Brunetti strongly supported the resolution to create the position of a Vice Provost of Graduate and Professional Studies: it is necessary to have a position to project the importance of and the continued development of graduate studies at SMC. He noted that throughout his tenure at the College he has been involved in both undergraduate and graduate programs and can attest that bias does exist on the campus towards undergraduate programs. He argued against the Senate not approving a much needed position in order to send a message regarding the excessive numbers of administrators. He urged the undergraduate faculty to vote for the position.

Professor Sauerberg questioned whether the new position would provide the single voice of graduate and professional programs, given that it has no authority over hiring of faculty or the deans of the programs. An administrative review is long overdue, he suggested, and should take place before the addition of a new position; even though the position proposed seems warranted.

Vice Provost Gomez-Arias said the College's organizational behavior is misaligned with what we want. One way to align is through structure. There is no guarantee that all issues will be solved by the creation of the proposed position, but it will move SMC in the right direction. He spoke in favor of the vice provost position, while recommending that a thorough administrative review take place.

Past Chair Poundstone, while supporting the resolution, noted that sooner or later the questions must be raised regarding administrative review. He asked if an organization chart is available. Chair Cortright responded that an organization chart under the Handbook 1.5 is not required, since no academic unit of the College will report to the proposed position.

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

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Sam Lind	Yes
Tom Poundstone	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes	William Lee	Yes

According to custom, the Chair voted "Present."

The motion was approved unanimously by a vote of 8-0-0.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

9. Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) Proposal to Amend Model 1 - Zach Flanagin, Chair of the CCIC, introduced the proposal. He explained that there are many outstanding issues with

the core curriculum, but the proposal is offered specifically to address the relationship between area requirements in Model 1 and the learning goals as stated in Model 1. The CCIC has been struggling with the issue and recommends that Model 1 be amended. The new core curriculum takes a step in moving the campus toward placing articulated and intentional learning goals at the heart of the SMC education. However, one issue was not settled by the language of Model 1: Model 1 both maintains the area requirements as departmentally-defined course requirements and at the same time stipulates that students meet the twelve learning goals, #5-8 of which basically shadow the area requirements. But Model 1 offers no statement of how the two sets of student requirements are to be correlated, though neither can stand separately.

In order to resolve the problem, the CCIC offered two options to amend Model 1. In summary, the first option keeps the departmentally defined areas, but in order to meet an area requirement, the course will have to meet the corresponding learning goals. Option 2 would eliminate department area requirements entirely, and replace them with disciplinary-based fulfillment of the learning goals. Professor Flanagin advanced the CCIC's unanimous view that Option 2 would create freedom for students to fulfill creatively both the new core and their major requirements. The CCIC, therefore, recommended Option 2.

A MOTION was made by Senator Bird and SECONDED by Senator Heid to accept Option 2. Senator Bird explained that he strongly supported Option 2. Option 1 is very similar to what we have now. He supported the freedom and flexible schedule offered students with Option 2.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias asked whether the UEPC had any concerns with the options offered. UEPC Chair Asbjorn Mosiedjord answered that the UEPC has been kept informed and that the members do not object to the Senate making the decision.

Charlie Hamaker, Director of the Collegiate Seminar Program, asked whether Option 2 involves a net increase in students' requirements regarding artistic understanding? Chair Cortright answered that the prescribed number of Artistic Understanding courses will be increased. Professor Cynthia Ganote of the CCIC observed that no learning goals had been written around the classical humanities in the original drafting of Model 1. She added that the CCIC is struggling with a structural problem, namely, lack of any humanities-focused learning goal. Professor Flanagin added that Option 2 eliminates the department fence and replaces it with a discipline fence.

Past Chair Poundstone asked whether the problem lies with the learning outcomes proposed under Artistic Understanding: does the goal itself have to be changed or can the outcomes be expanded? The first would require that the Senate amend Model 1; the second could be addressed by the CCIC at its discretion. Professor Flanagin responded that Model 1 requires that students take a humanities course, but doesn't give a reason why. Professor Ganote added: it is difficult to write outcomes around the particular language given under area requirements in Model 1.

Professor Ted Tsukahara, a past member of the Core Curriculum Task Force, said it was his understanding that what was being asked of the CCIC was to find a method by which some courses in a major will be considered viable to meet the intent of the curriculum reform being proposed. The Core Curriculum Task Force (CCTF) language provided that by graduation students will have attained certain learning outcomes. The intent was to establish guidance in identifying the composition of the outcomes. The CCTF tried to be clear that the Task Force did not intend to identify outcomes with specific courses, but intended to encourage ways that students could "double dip," by addressing multiple outcomes through single courses. Vice Provost Sweeney commented that the 12 goals promote accountability for

students' learning while the current area requirements do not; the latter have the character of a "check-off" list. Senator Peterson asked if Option 2 could mean the demise or a lowered enrollment for some courses. Professor Flanagin responded that no courses that meet learning outcomes will be affected.

Chair Cortright observed that, in sum, Option 2 makes two substantive changes to Model 1: the change from a course requirement to an artistic understanding requirement; a doubling of the number of artistic understanding courses that students would be expected to take. Professor Sauerberg responded that Area A currently asks students to take two courses. CCIC's intent is that the transmutation of the Area A course requirement into an Artistic Understanding requirement will involve two courses. Nevertheless, the learning outcomes proposed under the Artistic Understanding goal may broaden or narrow what now transpires under Area A, but that is true for all areas. His personal intent is not to prejudge what the learning goals may provide or promote.

The question was called. A roll call vote was taken on the motion to accept Option 2 as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Sam Lind	Yes
Tom Poundstone	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes	William Lee	Yes

According to custom, the Chair voted, "Present."

The motion was approved unanimously by a vote of 8-0-0.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky  
Faculty Governance Coordinator

Chair's Report  
Academic Senate General Meeting  
Thursday, 11 November, 2010

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**On-line Access to the Senate/Faculty Governance Pages**

Hitherto, the Senate and related web pages devoted to faculty governance have been accessible by following links from the College's public site. With the advent of the new portal, these pages are accessed, after log-in to "My Saint Mary's," by clicking on "Academic Senate" or "Faculty Governance" from the left-hand menu.

**Special General Meetings of the Senate**

Contiguous Special General Meetings of the Senate are scheduled for Tuesday evening, January 11, 2011 and Wednesday, January 12, 2011, the latter immediately following the regularly scheduled General Meeting of that date. Both will be devoted to faculty discussion of the proposed Learning Goals for the new Core Curriculum and of that curriculum's (proposed) overall shape and administration. All available members of the Senate, UEPC and CCIC will be in attendance—above all, to listen and to respond to undergraduate faculty. The meetings will precede final Senate action on the Core learning goals, which should commence with the General Meeting of 10 February, 2011. The meetings will be live-streamed over the internet and so also captured for later reprise and review. A buffet dinner will be served Tuesday evening, a lunch on Wednesday, for the convenience of attendees. Please save one or both of these dates and hours:

**Special General Meetings on the  
CCIC-UEPC Core Curriculum Proposals**

**Tuesday, January 11, 2011, 5:00 – 8:00pm**

**Soda Center, Claeyes Lounge**

Buffet opens at 5:00pm,  
business follows immediately

**Wednesday, January 12, 2011, 11:30am – 1:00pm**

**Soda Center, Claeyes Lounge**

General Meeting, 9:00 – 11:00am  
Buffet opens at 11:30am,  
Special General Meeting follows immediately

**Evaluation of an Academic Administrator**

For AY 2010 – 11, the regular cycle for evaluation of academic administrators dictates that college-wide evaluation of the Provost should occur during the Spring semester, 2011. The Chair convened the Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC) on 5 October, 2010: the ordinary procedures were outlined and the evaluation instrument was distributed for review. AAEC is scheduled to meet 1 December, 2010 to approve the instrument and to elect a Committee Chair, responsible for scheduling the evaluation and presentation of the (confidential) report of results to the Provost and President.

**REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 11 NOVEMBER, 2009**

***In re:* 4. REPORTS**

**C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)**

At its meeting of 1 November, 2010, UEPC unanimously approved revision of the Art History Major in the Department of Art and Art History; the revision appears as the Senate's 11 November Consent Agendum. At the same meeting, UEPC began review of the CCIC's proposed Core Curriculum Learning Goals: preliminary approval—*i.e.*, approval pending final review of the Learning Goals language *in toto*—was voted for amended language under the goals of **Critical Thinking** and **Shared Inquiry**.

The regular UEPC meeting of 22 November, 2010, is scheduled for consideration of a single Agendum, *viz.*: the CCIC proposal concerning the make-up and charge of the permanent Core Curriculum Committee. If concluded, UEPC action on the matter will constitute a report to the Senate for action at the 2 December General Meeting. In light of the Agendum proposed to the Senate under New Business for 11 November, the composition and charge of the permanent Core Curriculum Committee may acquire—if possible—increased import (please see the discussion below, under **New Business**). As Senate-UEPC liaison, I shall issue, for the Senators, a careful review of the UEPC's action and all the arguments incident to it (and I shall ask for critical comment on my report from the UEPC's Chair and Vice Chair), but I would nevertheless urge the Senators to consider this matter one of those exceptional cases in which each should act as her own liaison, by attending the UEPC proceedings.

## ***In re*: 5. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Resolution in re: Senate Action S-10/11-1**

Senators are in receipt of the Resolution determined by Senate Action S-10/11-1 in the matter of the recommendation from the Graduate and Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) that the College inaugurate the position, Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies (VPGPS). The full text is also posted under the Agenda for 11 November on the Senate page (see above, under ANNOUNCEMENTS). The *ad hoc* committee (*cf.* Minutes, 9 September, 2010, 7. under **Old Business**)—Tom Poundstone, Past Chair, Academic Senate; Bethami Dobkin, Provost; Laurie Edwards, Chair, GPSEPC; Keith Ogawa, Senator, School of Science; and the Academic Senate Chair—have proposed amendments to the Handbook which, if adopted, would inaugurate the position, define it, and situate its incumbent according to Handbook criteria on faculty status. Some points of potentially special interest (in no particular order):

- the description of the position (proposed: Handbook 1.4.2.2. Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies) is—with minor editorial revision—the same as the Provost's June 2010 draft (which was appended to the Chair's Report for the General Meeting of 9 September, 2010).
- no addition to Handbook 1.5 (ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS) is proposed, since no collegiate unit's administrator will report to the VPGPS;
- VPGPS is expressly included under Handbook 2.1.4. (ADMINISTRATORS WITH FACULTY RETREAT RIGHTS) among those positions whose bearing on the academic enterprise demand that they be “normally filled via national searches resulting in multi-year appointments . . . *etc.*”
- VPGPS is expressly included under Handbook 2.6.3 (ADVANCEMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS) at 1., as a position carrying faculty rank, and at 5., as a position whose incumbent “will be reviewed [*sc.* for tenure or academic promotion, as necessary] by the Rank and Tenure Committee,” which shall “use its discretion in finding means to conduct the fullest possible evaluation . . . *etc.*”
- with the expressed, prior consent of the President, Handbook 1.6.1.2.2 (Responsibilities of the Academic Senate and Relationship to the Campus Community) at 4. is altered to “The actual appointment of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, and of the Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies, are made by the Provost in consultation with the President . . .”

The resolution will be introduced by GPSEPC Chair, Laurie Edwards. Thereafter, it will require a motion and second from Senators *ad libitum*.

## ***In re:* 6. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) Proposal to Amend Model 1**

(i) The Senators are in receipt of three documents concerning CCIC's proposal to amend Model 1: "CCIC to Academic Senate: Options 1 & 2," "CCIC Proposal to the Senate: Regarding the New Core's Integration of Area Requirements and Learning Goals," and "CCIC to Academic Senate: The Disciplinary Expertise requirement for Core Curriculum courses." These same three documents are posted on the Senate web page with the Agenda for 11 November.

Of these three documents, the first-named, "CCIC to Academic Senate: Options 1 & 2," is the action item under New Business for 11 November. The Chair will entertain an initial motion from any Senator to remand the document to the UEPC for consideration and a recommendation to the Senate [see below at (iii)], or a motion to adopt Option 1, or a motion to adopt Option 2, by way of immediately amending Model 1 (Senate Action S-08/09-17). Of the remaining two documents, "CCIC Proposal to the Senate . . . *etc.*" outlines the CCIC's reasons for seeking an amendment of Model 1, discusses the advantages and disadvantages accompanying two modes or Options for amending Model 1, and identifies the second mode, Option 2, as the option preferred unanimously by the CCIC membership. This document is not an action item for 11 November: it may inform, but it will not be the subject of, deliberation. The document "CCIC to Academic Senate: The Disciplinary Expertise requirement . . . *etc.*" is also not an action item, but is intended to aid deliberation over Option 2 by indicating how the CCIC will propose that the permanent Core Curriculum Committee "operationalize" the notion of "disciplinary expertise" that is indispensable to (and regulative of) Option 2. Again, this document may inform deliberations, especially over Option 2, but will not be the object of debate. It may later constitute a part of the CCIC's proposal to UEPC on the permanent Core Curriculum Committee's charge and function, should the Senate amend its Model 1 charge to CCIC and UEPC in the way of Option 2.

(ii) The proposal will be introduced by CCIC Chair, Zach Flanagin, seconded by his Vice Chair, Jim Sauerberg. I will not, here, anticipate Professor Flanagin's explication of the reasons for amending Model 1 so as to harmonize *structurally* the "sides" of students' two-fold task under the new core, namely: to fulfill, simultaneously, a set of distribution requirements and an extensive set of learning outcomes, and that under the constraint of the 4 – 1 – 4 format. Rather, I first wish to comment on the procedure by which this business has reached the Senate Agenda—in this case, with the unanimous agreement of the Executive Committee. At the "Planning Day" joint, full meeting of the Senate, UEPC, and CCIC, consensus—without dissent—was reached on a protocol for handling substantive questions over the implementation of Model 1. The Chairs respectively, of the Senate, UEPC and CCIC would confer to determine, first, whether the matter in question were of trivial moment and thus susceptible of informal resolution by agreement of the Chairs. If there were dissent on the first question, or agreement that a substantial—non-trivial—point were involved, the Chairs would agree to which body the question should be referred. This protocol was explicitly calculated to avoid moving *every* point, among the indefinite number that might come into question, through "full dress" referral *up* through CCIC, UEPC to the Senate, then *down* from the Senate to the UEPC or CCIC.

In this instance the Chairs were agreed that the matter should be referred directly to the Senate, precisely because it involves substantial amendment of Model 1, which is a charge from the Senate to the UEPC and to the CCIC. The question is not one of procedure: the flow of business among the CCIC, UEPC and

Senate will continue unaltered. Nor is it a question of interpreting Model 1 or of interpreting the Senate's resolution on implementing Model 1. Rather, CCIC unanimously judge that implementation of Model 1 is infeasible—that CCIC cannot fulfill the Senate's charge creditably—unless Model 1 is amended; that the Senate must alter its charge if it would see its charge fulfilled. This, if anything, seems a matter for the Senate, first and last.

(iii) Second, I wish to thank the six Senators who, with the Executive Committee, attended the Executive Meeting of 2 November and attended to CCIC representatives, Jim Sauerberg and Zach Flanagan, as they laid out the Implementation Committee's reasoning and responded to Senators' questions. And I wish to acknowledge that the Senators present did not find the account given above, for moving the CCIC's proposals directly to the Senate Agenda, uniformly persuasive; cogent arguments were offered for the view that the proposal could properly come before the Senate only *via* the UEPC.

I would call to the attention of the Senators that the jurisdictional question, if still alive at the General Meeting, need cloud neither deliberation nor a vote on the merits. While the Chair thinks it unnecessary (and inadvisable), nevertheless a motion to remand the CCIC proposals to the UEPC for consideration and a subsequent recommendation to the Senate would be in order, and the Chair would rule that a motion to remand must take precedence over a motion to adopt either proposal. Should the Senate majority deny a motion to remand, the minority might then feel free to consider, and to vote strictly on, the merits. I am certain all Senators will agree that the matter is of such import as demands a transparent vote on the merits.

(iv) Finally, as to import: (1) a strong case can be made (and the Senate and faculty at large will hear it made on November 11) that coherent implementation of the new core curriculum—that is, elaboration of requirements our students can grasp readily and meet efficiently through a well-planned, 4 – 1 – 4, 36 course curriculum—depends upon amending Model 1; (2) *if* amended according to CCIC's unanimous recommendation, the “new” Model 1 will multiply the scope and the weight of the curricular authority to be vested in a permanent Core Curriculum Committee, the subject of planned Senate action at the 2 December General Meeting. We are now well into a season of consequential curricular decisions with which this undergraduate community of learning must learn to live for the foreseeable future. Members of the faculty at large, consider: the season—like the future—belongs to those who show up.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair  
Academic Senate