

**Minutes of the Academic Senate
August 24, 2010**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 9:05 a.m. on August 24, 2010. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Steve Cortright, Vice Chair Tomas Gomez-Arias, Past Chair Tom Poundstone, Michael Barram, David Bird, Laura Heid, Sam Lind, Joan Peterson, and Parliamentarian Joseph Zepeda. Absent was Keith Ogawa.

Also present were: Sam Agronow, Steve Bachofer, Interim Dean Jerry Brunetti, Dean Tom Carter, Provost Beth Dobkin, Dean Elias, Zach Flanagan, Rosemary Graham, Robert Henderson, Christa Kell, Lidia Luquet, Sue Marston, Ellen Rigsby, Vice President Carol Swain, Linda Wobbe, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

Minutes of the May 13, 2010 meeting were approved as amended, with two abstentions.

2. Chairperson's Report – Chair Cortright submitted a written report to the Senators prior to the meeting (report attached). Chair Cortright reported that the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) and the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) will be working very closely this year to work through the implementation process. Items will come forward to the Senate as they are approved by the UEPC; such material coming to the Senate from the UEPC and the CCIC throughout the year will be placed first under New Business on the agenda. Chair Cortright is planning to schedule two special meetings during the year to address faculty salary issues.

NEW BUSINESS

3. Senate Rules of Procedure - Chair Cortright reported that the Senate Rules of Procedure is an internal document, which was reviewed and updated in June by the 2009-10 Senate. *Faculty Handbook* section 1.6.1.2.14 states, "These Rules of Procedure shall be approved at the first General Meeting of each Senate year." A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to approve the document. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

Chair Cortright	Abstain	David Bird	Yes
Vice Chair Gomez-Arias	Yes	Laura Heid	Yes
Past Chair Tom Poundstone	Yes	Sam Lind	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes

The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0-1. The document is filed in the office of the Academic Senate.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator

Chair's Report
Academic Senate
General Meeting of Tuesday, 24 August, 2010
Academic Planning Day

Senate Membership

I am happy to report that Joseph Zepeda, Assistant Professor and Tutor in the Integral Curriculum, has agreed to serve as Parliamentarian during the 2010 – 11 academic year; he is herewith appointed to that post.

In late May—first *viva voce*, then in writing; and in consultation with then Senate Chair, Tom Poundstone—I invited Larisa Genin to assume the SEBA Senate seat vacated owing to Phil Perry's retirement. On 1 June, 2010, Professor Genin replied that her preoccupation with the transition to Zhan Li's administration of SEBA counseled that she reserve judgment on the matter until late August. I have (this Sunday instant) heard from her, to my regret, that her continuing work on SEBA's administrative transition must preclude acceptance of the seat. I engage to have filled the SEBA seat prior to the scheduled General Meeting of 9 September, 2010.

Committee Memberships

Asbjorn Moseidjord, newly elected at large to the UEPC, has accepted appointment as that committee's AY 2010 – 11 Chair, replacing Cynthia Van Gilder (whose enhanced administrative responsibilities preclude the Chair).

Myrna Santiago (runner-up in the Spring 2010 election) will assume the SOLA seat on the Program Review Committee (2010 – 12).

Among Senators returning in 2010 – 11, Laura Heid and Sam Lind have been distinguished for assiduous service as liaisons, respectively, to the Graduate and Undergraduate Educational Policies Committees. The liaison system presumes regular rotation of liaison duties among the Senators and presumes, *de jure*, Senators' willingness to serve. Subject to their demurral (for serious cause), I am nominating the following liaisons to Senate committees for AY 2010 – 11:

Faculty Welfare Committee, Michael Barram;
Graduate Educational Policies Committee, Joan Peterson;
Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee, David Bird;
Program Review Committee, Keith Ogawa.

I am reserving the liaison appointment to UEPC until the Senate's SEBA seat has been filled.

AY 2010 – 11: Chair's Prospecction

The Senate's deliberations through the present academic year must touch upon three matters of genuinely existential import for Saint Mary's College. That is, these matters cannot but determine whether the College will tend to community in thought and action—that is, to a community of learning shaped by faculty and by their deliberate reflection on the education of persons; or whether the College will tend toward a different mode of institutional life (a mode which constitutes, perhaps, the stronger pole in the present universe styled “higher education”), namely: the college as a common address at which mutually respectful, but essentially independent, educational enterprises are managed under the vision of an administrative team.

I.

What I may call the “faculty stipend”—that is, salary, insurances, and TIAA-CREF contributions—now constitutes, in multiple dimensions, an “existential question” for Saint Mary's College. As to salary policy, nothing need be added to the Faculty Welfare Committee's trenchant, comprehensive report of 13 May, last. Now a BOS/presidentially mandated Faculty Salary Task Force is meeting in the wake of the President's unilateral withdrawal of the policy agreed to (or re-agreed to) in 2005 by that same President and the present Board of Trustees. It is well that two members of the Board—Trustees Russ Harrison and Steven Smith—are participants. It remains to be seen whether the Task Force's work will reinvigorate the practices of shared governance appropriate to a community of learning or whether—as it may—the Task Force's work will consolidate the practices of the

“managerial” spirit that evoked it. This open question is—in the sense I have proposed—an existential question, and the Senate will confront it when (as anticipated) proposals come forth from the Task Force this Spring.

As to TIAA-CREF contributions: assuming no more than a 3% annual yield, over the course of a thirty-five year career, each \$100 denied to present pension represents a loss slightly in excess of \$280 at year 35, slightly in excess of \$270 at year 34 and of \$265 at year 33, and so on. These baleful effects are, of course, enhanced at higher yields. This simple reflection sufficiently establishes that *present College policy* on TIAA-CREF contributions *makes a Saint Mary’s career into an uneconomic proposition for junior faculty*, even as it bids senior, higher-earning faculty, “Better hang on a few years longer.” The College is sending this message (now attenuated by a rise from the risible 2% to the wretched 3% contribution) for the third consecutive year; the administrative team manifests no public sense of urgency over the matter; no program for restoration of TIAA-CREF contributions to the (actuarially inadequate) 8.25% level is in view. This state of affairs raises existential questions. For one: is the College still in the business of cultivating a faculty, of raising up John Correas, Alan Hansells, Joseph Lanigans . . .? This question and its like cannot but color consideration of the Task Force’s proposals.

When the senators come to the point of decision on matters of salary, their decision must benefit from the deliberate sense of their colleagues. As the Task Force’s deliberations ripen, I will move for a Special General Meeting of the Senate devoted to explorative conversation among the faculty at large. If and when the Task Force proposes an integrated policy, I shall move a Special General Meeting with the policy proposal as the sole agenda.

II

Once implemented, the revised Core Curriculum will constitute the most concrete expression of the undergraduate College’s community of life and action. So far, then, choosing among its potential shapes is *the* existential question facing the undergraduate College.

- (A) The Core Curriculum Implementation Committee has advanced a detailed timeline (which is in the hands of the Senators) for work during the Fall, 2010. Since Senate action hangs upon prior action by the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (of which the CCIC is a subcommittee), the appropriate disposition of the Senate is this: the Executive Committee will add Core Curriculum proposals from the UEPC to the Senate agenda promptly. The Chair will propose to the Executive Committee that UEPC referrals on the core curriculum be placed, routinely, first in the order of New Business.
- (B) CCIC has reported jointly to the Senate and UEPC¹ on Model 1’s impact on undergraduates’ common education and opportunities for elective and minor studies and has offered to the same bodies, again jointly, a proposal on steps toward the implementation of Model 1. As the Chair reads these documents, the CCIC proposes substantive changes to the Model 1 language adopted by the Senate 23 April, 2009, by both deletion and addition. These proposals thus represent changes in the Senate’s charge to CCIC *and* its “parent” body, UEPC. Subject to due consultation with the Executive Committee, I am inclined to include “Report on 1” and “Implementing” as an action item under New Business for 9 September, 2010 General Meeting.
- (C) While arranging discussion of core implementation—of issues, *e.g.*, concerning the role of January Term or of Collegiate Seminar in providing students opportunities to meet the core learning goals—among the academic community is principally the province of the UEPC, I stand ready to use the device of the Special General Meeting or other Senate resources (as may seem opportune to the UEPC or its leadership) to promote that discussion. The Senate, of course, must be well-represented at all such occasions.

III

“Building on Strengths,” 2.8, calls for Provost-led “assessment of the Program Review process.” Since PRC is a Senate committee, it is appropriate that the Senate look to the order of its “house”, so to speak, as a part of ordinary oversight.

Presently, program and departmental reviews are in arrears, while the implementation of the new core curriculum will, in the near term, intensify the pace and enlarge the scope of academic review at the College. One need hardly say (in the present climate) that the College’s ability to account in a regular and orderly fashion for the quality of departments and programs is an existential issue.

¹ See “CCIC – Report to the UEPC and Senate regarding Model 1,” undated [hereafter “Report on 1”], and “Implementing Model 1,” undated [hereafter “Implementing”], both in Senators’ hands.

Over the summer, a very conscientious Program Review Committee completed a revision of the Committee's Guidelines (attached for the Senators' information). I will initiate conversation with the Chair, Catherine Banbury, *in re*: How might the Senate (perhaps through revised Handbook language) aid the PRC in reducing the present backlog and in expediting future reviews? The immediate purpose of this conversation will be to develop an appropriate charge for the Committee on Committees

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright
Chair