

**Minutes of the Academic Senate**  
**April 22, 2010**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tom Poundstone at 3:00 p.m. on April 22, 2010. 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, Keith Ogawa, Phil Perry, Marty Rokeach, Ed Tywoniak and Parliamentarian David Bird. Absent was Sam Lind.

Also present were: Andrew Aguilar, Shawny Anderson, Jamie Baldwin, Michael Barram, CTO Ed Biglin, Jerry Brunetti, Robert Bulman, William Calderon, Jackelynn Campos, Dean Tom Carter, Samantha Columbus, Cathy Davalos, Provost Beth Dobkin, Laurie Edwards, Sue Fallis, Monica Fitzgerald, Cynthia Ganote, Interim Dean Larisa Genin, Magaly Gonzalez, Rosemary Graham, Colin Green, Charles Hamaker, Robert Henderson, Malena Hernandez, Jennifer Heung, Sue Hooks, Tim Huey, Richard Jara, Kaitlin Krueger, Sue Marston, Alma Martinez, Mary McCall, Barbara McGraw, Randy Menjivar, Stefany Menjivar, Irene Moon, Jeffrey Morgan, Registrar Julia Odom, Briana Ohene, Adolfo Pando, Robert Rivera, Michael Rodriguez, Liz Roland, Alyssa Sandoval, Deepak Sawhney, Scott Schoenfeldt-Aultman, Freddie Silveria, Rob Slaughter, Alyssa Sonksen, Remy Smith-Lewis, Carole Swain, Camelia Taylor, Carl Thelen, Mindy Thomas, Russ Tiberii, Steven Velasquez, Susie Weissman, Dean Steve Woolpert, and E. J. Youngblood.

**REPORTS**

2. Chairperson's Report – Chair Poundstone reported that the Academic Administrator's Evaluation Committee will conduct an evaluation of Dean Nancy Sorensen in the School of Education starting next week.

3. Vice-Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Cortright reported that the nomination round of the faculty elections has been completed and the final ballots have been distributed. The participation rate of faculty participating in the elections was 42.2%.

Senator Ogawa asked about percentages of voter participation by school for the nominating ballot. That information was not available at the time, but shortly after the meeting Cathe Michalosky reported to us the following participation rates: Liberal Arts, 42%; Science, 55%; Economics & Business, 42%; Education, 36%.

4. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Chair Poundstone reported for Senator Lind. At its last meeting the UEPC received a report from the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) and selected the recipient of the De La Salle award and forwarded the name to the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics.

5. Graduate and Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) – Senator Heid reported that the GPSEPC item recommending a Vice Provost for Professional and Graduate Programs will be discussed under New Business. The GPSEPC approved a Certificate in Sports Film Analysis on the fast-track. The Master of Arts in Teaching Leadership proposal is scheduled to be sent to the Senate for the May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.

6. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) – Senator Tywoniak reported that the AARC met last week and finalized its work for the year. A formal report on the evaluation of the first year advising cohort experience will be given at the May 13 Senate meeting. He reported on the summer school assessment: the academic goal of summer school was to help students satisfy their requirements for graduation. It was determined that the summer school did satisfy this goal. There is

no designated office for the summer session, and no student evaluations were built into the experience. Revenue from 2009 session was \$100,000. The upcoming summer session course offerings have been expanded. There is no student aid available for student athletes; there are 40 housing spaces available. Consideration moving forward should be given to whether a four, six or eight week session would work best. A built in evaluation process is recommended.

The AARC has submitted a proposal regarding .25 credit courses, under New Business on the agenda.

7. Academic Blueprint Task Force – Senator Gomez-Arias reported that in September, 2010, the Academic Blueprint Task Force (ABTF) was convened and charged the Provost with completing 2.5 of the Building on Strengths Strategic Plan, the submission of “a five-year academic plan – graduate and undergraduate – including program expansion, projected enrollments, needed staffing and space, and projected costs and revenues.”

The “Academic Blueprint” document constitutes that academic plan, with actions and indicators of progress to achieve within a five-year time-span, while at the same time laying a foundation for an academic identity and distinction that is likely to live for years beyond the plan.

The task force started with the mission, the strategic plan, conducted a slope analysis of the schools. In 2008-09 each school performed a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats). Three major directions for its work have been identified to improve student satisfaction and success:

1. Prepare Students for Ethical and Effective Engagement in a Diverse and Global Environment
2. Promote Learning and Teaching for Innovation, Creativity, Collaboration
3. Build Leadership that Advances Social Justice

Provost Dobkin said the task force is currently drafting a preliminary overview of the vision for the Academic Blueprint and are reaching out to faculty groups collecting tactics. They have contacted approximately one-half of the faculty and she thanked faculty for their participation. The suggestions about tactics will be reviewed for trends, clusters, or patterns and ways in which to prioritize. In the fall strategies for implementation will be discussed. There is some confusion about the relationship of the Blueprint to the core curriculum and other documents. The directions come from the work done over the past five or ten years as far as where we should be headed. It is not meant to say that other things are not important. It does draw on the work of the Core Curriculum Task Force, this is about teaching and learning across the institution. It does try to provide a structure for particular directions that are strategic as expressed by the community. It is intended to be expressive of our mission, and supportive of the things we care about the most.

Copies of the preliminary vision statement and goals and tactics were distributed and Senator Gomez-Arias encouraged faculty to review the documents and forward any comments or suggestions.

8. Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) – Senator Tywoniak reported that the TAC covers many issues related to technology on campus. The College will convert to gmail for student’s primary email server. The College is moving into the implementation phase of the new web portal process, consolidating web services into a unified portal entree that will include content management and materials as well as an update of our website. The College will purchase software that will help with accreditation reporting. A Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunity and Threats (SWOT) analysis has been performed; a variety of issues were identified, one being the cell phone reception on campus, which will be addressed in the near future. The College is beginning implementation of a two-year phase-in for a new learning management system, Moodle, which will eventually replace Blackboard. (See New Business for the resolution concerning online learning systems and disaster preparedness.)

9. Provost's Updates – Provost Dobkin reported that an institutional proposal is due to WASC in the spring 2011. That is an important time to set out the direction for the next two WASC reviews. The work being done now on the Academic Blueprint will help to inform that. The current Committee on Strategic Planning Review and Assessment (CSPRA) will become a WASC committee.

*Budget* – She has completed the budget reduction/reallocation/restructuring, which will preserve enough funding for faculty step and promotions. She has also set aside \$100,000 for staff promotion and reclassification. The cabinet has approved a separation package for adjunct faculty with 25+ years of service that have lost the adjunct status over the past two years, to equal one-half of their yearly salary. There are four adjunct faculty affected. Accepting the package will not preclude them from continuing as lecturers. (This announcement was greeted with a round of applause.)

10. Campus Committee on Inclusive Excellence (CCIE) – Provost Dobkin reported that on March 17, 2010 a group of students presented a list of ten demands (Call 2 Action) to the President's office. She has met with student representatives several times to discuss their demands. They discussed the points of agreement, provided contextual information about what is in motion and the gaps between what the students are asking for and what we already do, and what specific actions might be taken. She suggested that the students avoid a hunger strike, and she challenged them to try to break the pattern of having to conduct a hunger strike in order to foster change. The Call 2 Action is an affirming effort to create a more inclusive process. There are two overriding issues behind the Call: the personal pain experienced by many of the students and a longer-term issue of institutional processes and whether they are constructed in a way that discourages nontraditional, nonexpected voices from becoming part of every day interaction. The students have shown an increased understanding of the complexity of the institutional processes and are willing to engage with the institutional processes in order to make it better.

Provost Dobkin explained that several ground rules were articulated:

- Demonstrate appreciation for their dedication, energy and productivity.
- Assuming good will on the part of all.
- Acknowledging the shared values, principles and goals
- Respecting institutional context and personnel and embracing mutual accountability without blame. -
- Public forums are not the place for performance or personnel issues.

The following list was distributed by students at the meeting, though no reference was made to it:

*Protocol-Acts of Intolerance for Professors: Hold professors accountable for actions of discrimination and racism perpetrated unto all students. There needs to be a process that can ensure that students do not have to go to a class or withdraw from a class because of fear of being graded unjustly or humiliated by the professors.*

*Seminar curriculum be completely revised: The seminar curriculum needs to be revised to include all people. Meaning that, it has to promote inclusion and validation of the struggles and successes of all people.*

*Adding of Majors: Women & Gender, Queer, African, Chicano, Asian: These majors are important in providing knowledge and insight to the diverse group of students that are on our campus. Many of these majors help to address the root problems that go unchecked in the greater community. They do not just provide a solution but an in-depth analysis of the system that we live in.*

*More hiring of professors of color: The hiring of more professors of color is of extreme urgency! Many of us need role models, mentors, and professors that understand our experiences. We appreciate the efforts of diversity training but it does not solve the racism that exist.*

Provost Dobkin briefly reviewed several of the students' demands.

*Student representation on campus committees.* She said there are many committees with student representation. She referred specifically to the student demand to change Collegiate Seminar. The Senate recently considered a proposal to create a Collegiate Seminar Task Force. The proposal was voted down by the Senate. She asked the Senate to consider that there are a significant number of students that feel our current processes on the Governing Board do not allow them an opportunity to voice their concerns with the program. If there is a way in which can make sure we include some of the voices we are not accustomed to hearing from in the review of Seminar this coming year, that would be a positive development.

*Diversity in the Curriculum.* The students' call for more professors of color and more majors that provide knowledge and insight to diverse groups. She explained to the students that faculty have control of the curriculum. She committed to funding a student initiated Jan Term course. The course will have to go through the normal course approval process.

*Funding a student diversity leadership award.* She further committed to work with the student representatives of Our Struggle to devise a fair process and to devote resources to the recognition of student leadership in diversity.

*Student voices in the hiring processes.* SMC has a proactive hiring process and she asked that the efforts be expanded to include student voices in the hiring processes. She said the College does not do everything it could in terms of holding each other accountable for acts of discrimination and tolerance.

*Develop mechanisms for enforcement of the Senate's resolution for mandatory cultural competency workshops.* Provost Dobkin said the Campus of Difference workshops offered throughout the year have not been well attended by faculty. She asked the Senate for feedback in how to enforce the Senate resolution two years ago asking for mandatory training.

The following is the statement Provost Dobkin issued to the students in response to their demands and the follow-up discussions:

I have read your "Call 2 Action" with admiration for your commitment and passion, as well as appreciation for your dedication to additional work together. Thank you also for meeting with the College Committee on Inclusive Excellence (CCIE) last Friday. At that meeting, I affirmed our shared support for the principles and values that underlie the changes you wish to make, including greater safety for all students, more educational experiences consistent with inclusive excellence, increased participation in and respect for diverse voices in student governance, more places for student artistic expression on campus, affordable education and financial security for students, recognition of student leadership, and commitment to inclusive excellence and the College mission when recruiting staff and faculty. I and other Committee members gained greater understanding of the urgency driving you, your experiences, and the depth of your commitment to seeing the College make greater demonstrable progress toward achieving inclusive excellence.

I also acknowledge the frustration and stress created by working together and tirelessly for

changes that are seemingly not that difficult. In many ways, the College is moving in a supportive direction, but our efforts are not always well known, and more needs to be done. Your actions have spotlighted some of the areas in most urgent need of attention. As we move forward together, we agreed that our actions will be respectful of individuals, particularly staff charged with responsibility for the areas mentioned by you, and demonstrations will be conducted with respect toward the needs and activities of others. Your actions have thus far have reflected thoughtfulness and respect, for which I commend you.

I have provided you with detailed contextual information about the types of progress that might be made given our unique institutional circumstances and existing policies, and I have pledged to take action consistent with my position and scope of responsibility. However, I understand that more assurance of concrete action is requested. We have agreed that I will meet immediately and regularly with four representatives of Our Struggle to work on these areas of mutual concern, and that these four representatives will be the foundational members in a new, standing Student Advisory Group to the CCIE.

The demands presented by the group underscore what I think is the greatest demand of all: to be treated with respect, and to be fully included in the life of the College because your ideas can and should make a difference. Although many of us may say “well, of course,” we don't always know how to demonstrate this form of respect nor how to work co-intentionally with students. As we work through the areas you have identified, the most important piece will take longer: moving us closer to our aspiration of becoming a model of inclusion. I look forward to the progress we will achieve by working together.

Provost Dobkin encouraged faculty to stop by to speak with the students on the Chapel lawn and discuss the issues with them directly.

Robert Bulman, co-chair of the CCIE, thanked the students. There has been a very honest and open dialogue and he voiced his appreciation of the students' willingness to engage in the dialogue. Even though the institution is currently doing something, it is not necessarily being done in a way that addresses deep-seeded concerns that many students have. He urged the CCIE and the Senate to find ways to take student voices into consideration when making decisions that will have a direct impact on students' lives at SMC. The CCIE is to create a Student Advisory Subcommittee. The students often have perspectives that are not fully understood.

Chair Poundstone thanked Provost Dobkin and Robert Bulman. They have spent many hours with the students to address the issues. The model of dialogue between students, faculty and administration is helpful in finding the common values.

Past Chair Hilken responded to Provost Dobkin's request to the Senate for feedback in how to enforce the earlier Senate resolution for mandatory diversity training. The Senate resolution approved in May of 2008 asked for mandatory workshops. Senators voiced their continued support of mandatory workshops, suggesting that the Provost is guided by the Handbook to enforce this through faculty contracts. Senator Rokeach said using the word “mandatory” will promote larger attendance from faculty. Vice Chair Cortright said the Faculty Handbook is a codicil to faculty contracts. Senator Gomez-Arias said it is mandatory and therefore a condition of one's employment with the institution. Senator Rokeach questioned the Provost's resistance to using the word “mandatory”. Chair Poundstone said that the Senate took the issue seriously when it deliberated and approved the resolution to make attendance in the workshops mandatory and the Senate is committed to carrying it out.

Vice Chair Cortright suggested that College Counsel be consulted followed by a discussion about the range of possibilities faculty are prepared to live with. Provost Dobkin said she accepts the Senate's advice. The implementation of mandatory attendance is not simple. She is fully prepared to work with the Legal Counsel, Senate, and Faculty Welfare Committee to develop a procedure. She explained that the energy of the students has motivated her and brought it back to her attention at this time and raises it as an issue of priority. She will consult with College Counsel and bring the issue back to the Senate.

Mary McCall pointed out that only three Senators have attended the workshop. Several Senators noted the length of the workshop, as it is too difficult to schedule a full day workshop without skipping other meetings or cancelling class. Mary McCall offered to arrange a weekend workshop. The Provost added that it is currently under consideration to include the diversity training with the yearly mandatory sexual harassment workshops.

The following are statements issued by students in attendance:

-- Remy Smith-Lewis, ASU treasurer, said that faculty that do not attend the workshop send the message that they do not care about how students are treated in the classroom.

-- Tim Huey – requested that the Senators commit to attending the workshop next year.

-- Kaitlin Krueger – the conversation seems to imply that the word 'mandatory' has a negative connotation. It is such a positive thing we are trying to instill that will make dialogue between professors and students so much more fluid. Professors will be able to relate and connect to their students on a much more individual level. It is unacceptable that students would be ignored. It should not only be students asking for this training, we are trying to build a coalition. She said if it is a financial concern, the students would volunteer to conduct a cultural competency training session for staff, faculty and students.

-- Jamie Baldwin – voiced a heavy concern that so few of the Senators have attended the workshop, although the Senate asked that it be mandatory. Yet, the Senators deliberate issues that directly impact the lives of the students. Most Senators are white, so she asked how they understand the things affecting the students of color.

-- Alma Martinez – by not attending the workshops, the faculty are abandoning their students.

Robert Bulman explained that the Senate unanimously passed a resolution two years ago making diversity training mandatory. The CCIE took the charge very seriously, but also wanted to be very deliberate in order to deliver a program that would be meaningful and helpful for the campus. For much of the first year the committee investigated various programs. The Campus of Difference Workshops were implemented this year. The CCIE made the decision to assess the workshops after the first year before enforcement would be considered. It is now time to consider how to enforce the mandatory expectation for attendance.

Chair Poundstone commented that he has only heard the highest praise from those that have attended the workshops, and he thanked Robert Bulman and Mary McCall for their work in developing and promoting the workshops. He also noted that, though the Senate resolution creating the workshops called for mandatory attendance, they have not yet been presented as mandatory to the faculty. [The record shows that in introducing the workshops in an e-mail to all faculty and staff on September 17th, Brother President Gallagher did not mention the workshops as being mandatory; rather, he invited all faculty and staff to new, campus-wide opportunity for learning, reflection and sharing.”]

Senator Heid said that sometimes you have to mandate to legislate, to eventually get to the type of changes you want on a broader institutional level.

Provost Dobkin said she has heard the message from the Senate and she will conduct mandatory Campus of Difference Workshops.

Ed Biglin suggested that a joint announcement from the CCIE, Chair of the Academic Senate, and the Provost be issued explaining to faculty that this is a mandatory workshop.

11. Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) – Cynthia Ganote reported for CCIC chair, Zach Flanagin. The CCIC is working on developing learning outcomes for four of the learning goals that were approved by the Senate: 1) shared inquiry, 2) critical thinking, 3) global perspectives, and 4) historical, social and cultural understanding. A subcommittee has been formed for each of the four learning goals to create a list of learning outcomes.

The Shared Inquiry group has brought their draft of learning outcomes to the CCIC for discussion. Once all subcommittees have vetted their drafts with the CCIC, the learning outcomes will then go to interested departments/programs, followed by a meeting with UEPC, and perhaps offering lunch drop in meetings as well, in order to fully vet the drafts. It is under consideration when the CCIC will bring the proposed learning outcomes to the Senate for a vote; they may wait until all 12 goals have been considered. The CCIC will work through the summer to consider the following:

- the transfer policy incorporating California's new standards and how Model 1 will affect transfer students
- conceptual mapping of model 1 distribution requirements with the learning goals to see if students will have a number of pathways open to satisfy the learning outcomes
- research on core curriculum assessment
- decide which four of the remaining learning goals will be next and form the subcommittees
- discuss with the Provost the possibility to use part of the in-service day in August to conduct core curriculum implementation work
- consider the concept of a faculty planning day to provide training for faculty that may be needed for faculty to transform current courses into the learning outcome model

Cynthia Ganote added that Zach Flanagin gave this report to the UEPC and there were no changes suggested by the UEPC members.

Senator Rokeach suggested that the CCIC plan on presenting the learning outcomes for the first four learning goals to the Senate early in the fall. Open for discussion is whether the Senate would prefer to wait until all of 12 goals have been completed.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

12. Resolution Concerning Online Learning Systems and Disaster Preparedness – Senator Tywoniak introduced the following motion on behalf of the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Teaching, Learning and Technology Committee.

Whereas, the College has been implementing a Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity Plan since 2007 to enable a rapid recovery of the technical infrastructure, and

Whereas, critical to the Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity Plan is the ability to provide courses online in the event that a catastrophe renders the College's physical plant inoperable for a significant period of time;

Be it resolved, that commencing in the Fall 2010 semester all undergraduate and graduate courses be required to have a minimal online learning management component in place, chosen from several available models and systems, and updated each semester.

The motion is a result of monitoring the disaster recovery efforts for higher-ed institutions affected by Hurricane Katrina. A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and SECONDED by Past Chair Hilken to approve the resolution.

Senator Perry said it is an extraordinarily difficult task to convert an existing class taught in the classroom to an online class. Senator Tywoniak responded that the goal is to have a syllabi and curricula in place. Senator Ogawa said he is in favor of the concept, but concerned with the pragmatics in light of the various issues with the campus server system. Vice Chair Cortright asked if the purpose of this was for data protection. Senator Heid asked if faculty need to prepare to conduct a course online or just have the syllabi online. Senator Tywoniak explained that it is a depository of data, which could be converted through the same system into something more robust. Senator Gomez-Arias asked that the TAC develop guidelines for what is expected of the faculty. Senator Tywoniak said the request is as simple as putting a syllabus online, however, faculty can expand that if they wish.

The vote was taken, the motion to approve failed by a hand vote of 3-5 with 1 abstention. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Cortright the proposal be sent back to the TAC asking for a clear timeline of phased implementation. The motion was approved unanimously.

13. .25 Credit Proposal – Chair Poundstone introduced the proposal from the Admissions and Academic Regulation Committee (AARC). The proposal recommends that .25 credit classes no longer be part of the tuition structure of the College, students to be free to take as many classes as they would like, but no more than three credits may be applied towards graduation. A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and SECONDED by Vice Chair Cortright to accept the proposed changes suggested by the AARC.

Vice Chair Cortright stated that he understands that the proposal would be enable students to take as many .25 courses as they desire, tuition free. Students would be allowed to designate up to 12 of those .25 courses for graduation credit. He questioned how and when students would designate such courses. He said he would prefer allowing students to designate when the degree candidacy comes up. Senator Rokeach said that any required .25 courses should automatically be counted.

Sue Hooks said there is a significant fiscal impact to the proposal as written. In order to resolve the fiscal impact issue, the College will need to go from a 9.5 course allotment per student, to a 9 course allotment. The 9.5 course allotment was built to be nine solids and two .25 courses. If we no longer charge for .25 credit classes but leave the 9.5 tuition standard in place, we are effectively granting all students a half-tuition discount for an extra course.

MOTION was made by Vice Chair Cortright and SECONDED by Senator Gomez-Arias to table the proposal and that it be placed on the next agenda. The motion to table was approved by a hand vote of 6-1 with two abstentions.

The Senate stipulated the following issues to be addressed regarding the proposal:

- When students designate courses for graduation purposes?
- Financial impact?
- Distinction between academic and activity courses?

14. Recommendation to create a Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Programs position – Senator Heid introduced the recommendation from the Graduate and Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC). Professional and graduate programs cover the School of Education, School of Liberal Arts, and School of Economics and Business Administration. The position would be comparable to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. The graduate and professional programs are viewed by the College as areas to continue to have growth and increase revenues to the College. The GPSEPC agrees that a strong voice for the graduate and professional programs is needed, one that equals the integrity and status of the position of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. The proposed vice provost position would act as chair of the Graduate Council and the Graduate Professional Chairs and Directors Group, providing the voice of graduate programs. Additional responsibilities would include Student Services for graduate and adult students. Some of the graduate programs have master theses projects, or dissertations. A central coordination for these bodies of work is desired. The GPSEPC feels the proposal will also address prior concerns noted by WASC regarding the need for more inclusiveness of the graduate programs.

Motion made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to approve the proposal.

Senator Heid read a letter from GPSEPC Chair Kris Chase:

“...It is critical that the College act to support staff and faculty who are engaged in providing programs that are expected to grow as a percentage of the College’s mission. These programs need to be recognized administratively and equal to the undergraduate programs; we have moved past the days where graduate and professional programs are just a “side-show” to the traditional undergraduate programs.”

Vice Chair Cortright asked if the GPSEPC gave consideration to expanding the role of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics? Is an administrative structure already in place, without adding personnel? Senator Heid responded that the GPSEPC did not consider that, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics seems to have responsibility for more than enough functions currently.

Senator Rokeach did not support the proposal. The creation of more positions will also require support staff, as it is not appropriate to consider adding function without adding personnel, especially in this climate.

Several faculty mentioned that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic's position was created by fiat. Provost Dobkin stated that she does not want to repeat past processes, the proposal has been submitted for Senate consideration. The Chair of the Graduate Council currently carries out many of the functions that would be part of the responsibility of the Vice Provost of Graduate Studies. It is not sustainable in its current configuration. (graduate commencements, graduate handbooks, student policies, housing, any support service that covers more than one school). The Chair of the Graduate Council is currently also Associate Dean, which is no longer sustainable. It may be termed as a reclassification rather than a new position. There would be budget implications, and she could not guarantee that she could find a way to fund it. She is interested to know whether the Senate would support the creation of this position.

Senator Ogawa said many faculty in the School of Science are concerned about the budgetary implications given the current economic situation. Other questions: what are the responsibilities of the position, graduate programs do not have the need for cohesion and coordination equal to the undergraduate programs. He also cited his previous experience on the Senate and noted that it took 12-18 months to create an agreed upon job description for the current Vice Provost. There are too many questions to rush the discussion.

Senator Tywoniak asked if this is a reclassification of the Associate Dean of the School of Liberal Arts for Graduate Programs, will the responsibilities of this position be included in the Vice Provost position, or will there be an Associate Dean and a Vice Provost position?

Senator Heid explained that even though the current chair of the Graduate Council is the Associate Dean of Liberal Arts for Graduate Programs, their consideration was the need for a Vice Provost of Graduate Programs.

Rosemary Graham expressed concern about the additional of an administrative position, as many other support positions are being reduced. She also questioned the reason the position required a 'Vice Provost', as there are many levels between Associate Dean and Vice Provost.

A MOTION was made by Senator Tywoniak and SECONDED by Senator Ogawa to table the issue until the May meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

15. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky  
Faculty Governance Coordinator