

**Minutes of the Academic Senate  
December 2, 2010**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 3:00 p.m. on December 2, 2010. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chairperson Steve Cortright, Vice Chairperson Tomas Gomez-Arias, Past Chairperson Tom Poundstone, Keith Ogawa, Michael Barram, Laura Heid, Sam Lind, Joan Peterson, David Bird, William Lee, and Parliamentarian Joseph Zepeda.

Also present were: CTO Ed Biglin, Kara Boatman, Interim Dean Jerry Brunetti, Vidya Chandrasekaran, Provost Beth Dobkin, Zach Flanagan, Cynthia Ganote, Associate Dean Larisa Genin, Robert Henderson, Dean Zhan Li, Sue Marston, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Jim Sauerberg, Ted Tsukahara, Sharon Walters, Interim Dean Roy Wensley, Linda Wobbe, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to approve the Minutes of the November 11, 2010 Senate meeting. The minutes were approved as amended by voice vote with one abstention. Senator Ogawa raised the question of how absences are reported in the minutes. He requested that "absent with notice" be recorded for an excused absence.

## **REPORTS**

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Cortright submitted a detailed written report (see copy attached). He announced that two special general meetings of the Senate have been scheduled for January 11 and January 12, 2011 to discuss final language on the learning outcomes and the shape of the Core Curriculum Committee. Food will be provided, and he encouraged the Senators to promote the meetings to their colleagues.

4. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Chair Cortright reported as the Senate liaison to the UEPC. It is expected that the language for the learning outcomes will be finalized and presented for discussion at the special general meetings in January. The UEPC considered the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) proposal as submitted from the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC). Chair Cortright noted that the structure of the committee was amended by the UEPC (to be discussed under New Business). Further, it was noted by the UEPC that a full description of the proposed Core Curriculum Director was omitted from the documentation forwarded by the CCIC. He explained that should the CCC proposal (Item 6.A. under New Business) be accepted by the Senate, a Resolution would be proposed (Item 6.B. under New Business) to charge the UEPC with the task of drafting a description of the Director position.

5. Provost Updates – Provost Dobkin reported on the status of the Deans' searches: The School of Science dean search has concluded its consideration of the two final, well-qualified and impressive candidates and an announcement will be made shortly. The Dean of the School of Education search committee is vetting candidates for the semi-final round. The search committee for the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics is currently being constituted. The Dean of Academic Resources/Library position has been posted. She encouraged faculty to attend the Campus of Difference Workshops.

Provost Dobkin also added that she will report to the Senate at a later date regarding the breakdown of the Filippi account that she manages. She has asked the Graduate Council to consider developing a process for the support of student scholarship at the graduate level.

Senator Bird noted that the Campus of Difference Workshops are predominately offered on Tuesdays and Thursdays, which make it difficult for faculty teaching on those days to attend the workshop.

6. Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC) – Chair Cortright reported that he is in the process of scheduling a meeting. The instrument has been created for use in the spring.

7. Graduate and Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) – Senator Peterson reported that the GPSEPC is working on a procedure for the issuance of certificates as well as a revision of the fast track guidelines.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

8. Resolution to Amend Senate Action S-01/10-22: Proposal Concerning .25 Courses - Chair Cortright introduced the issue, noting that the resolution is a result of communication between the Registrar, the Vice Provost and the Executive Committee. He reported that Vice Provost Frances Sweeney and Registrar Julia Odom could not be present at the Senate meeting. A MOTION was made by Senator Bird and seconded by Senator Ogawa to postpone the issue to the January 12, 2010 Senate meeting, when Vice Provost Sweeney and/or Registrar Odom could be present. Past Chair Poundstone noted that the action as originally approved by the Senate was flawed, and hastily drawn. He suggested that rather than postpone the issue, the Senate may wish to return the item to the AARC with its concerns; to allow for a full vetting and to obtain the information needed to assess the issue. Senator Peterson asked for clarification for the purpose of the motion, since the Senators have written documents containing the approval of the Resolution by Vice Provost Sweeney and Registrar Odom. Chair Cortright responded that some Senators have reservations regarding the Resolution despite the fact that it is supported by the Vice Provost and the Registrar. The Registrar sees a conflict between some of the language in Senate Action S-09/10-22 and general academic policy. Chair Cortright asked for a vote; the motion to postpone was approved by a hand vote of 7-1-1. According to custom, the Chair voted “Present.”

## **NEW BUSINESS**

9. Core Curriculum Committee Proposal - Chair Cortright introduced the proposal for the creation of a Core Curriculum Committee (CCC). He reported that on November 22, 2010 the UEPC considered the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) proposal submitted by the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (dated November 18, 2010). The proposal outlined the structure of the proposed permanent Core Curriculum Committee at SMC. The UEPC minutes of the November 22 meeting were forwarded to the Senators for their review, along with a revised CCC proposal (dated November 22, 2010). The minutes of the UEPC meeting note that the CCIC's proposal was incomplete, lacking a description of the duties of the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum. The UEPC amended the CCC proposal significantly, including reducing the number of undergraduate faculty necessary to the CCC and its working groups from 35 to 21.

Chair Cortright stipulated that approval, in this case, cannot be considered a final action of the Senate because establishment of this committee must come from proposed Faculty Handbook language. Should the Senate approve the CCC proposal, a second resolution would be introduced, calling for the establishment of an ad hoc committee, to draw and submit Handbook language for Senate approval.

A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Heid to accept the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee Report on the Core Curriculum Committee (full proposal is attached). Section “I. Overall Structure” of the proposal is pasted below, which indicates the amendments proposed by the UEPC, new language in bold and deleted language in ~~strikeout~~.

### **I. Overall Structure**

#### Core Curriculum Committee (CCC)

- 1 Director of the Core Curriculum
  - Will be a **tenured undergraduate** faculty member chosen for a multi-year term ~~to oversee the core, similar to the director model of Seminar and January Term~~
    - The initial director will be selected by a search committee made up of two members each of the Senate, UEPC, and CCIC; this initial director will be appointed for a 5-year term<sup>1</sup>
    - Subsequent directors will serve for 3-year terms **on the recommendation of the CCC, the Senate, and the UEPC** ~~and will be chosen by a process to be determined by the elected members of the CCC~~
  - Will chair the CCC
- 6 **ranked, undergraduate** faculty members
  - **1** ~~2~~ from each SOLA, SOS, and SEBA, each elected by ranked faculty in that school, **and 3 selected from the ranked faculty at-large**
  - Elected for 3-year, staggered terms
- Permanent *ex officio* & non-voting members
  - 1 Vice Provost for **Undergraduate** Academics or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 Vice Provost for Student Life or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 Registrar or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 student chosen by ASSMC, *ex officio* & non-voting
- Temporary (roll-out phase) *ex officio* & non-voting members
  - 1 Dean of Advising or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 Director of Institutional **Research Development** (or Director of Assessment, when hired), or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - **1 representative from the library as designated by the Dean for Academic Resources, ex officio, non-voting**

#### Working Groups

7 working subcommittees, each consisting of a Chair, who is a member of the CCC, and **2** ~~4~~ faculty

- Group HM (Habits of Mind): Goals 1-4
- Group MS (Math and Science): Goal 5
- Group AU (Artistic Understanding): Goal 6
- Group TU (Theological Understanding): Goal 7
- Group HC (Historical/Social/Cultural U.): Goal 8
- Group CG/CE (Comm. Gd./Comm. Eng.): Goals 9, 12
- Group AD/GP (Amer. Div./Global Persp.): Goals 10, 11

The working group chairs are designated by the CCC once elections are completed. In most cases, the Director will chair Group HM, as this area will involve a great deal of collaboration with Collegiate Seminar, Composition, and the majors. The **two** ~~four~~ faculty members on each working group are recommended to the Senate by the CCC, after consultation with the Deans and Departments/Programs, and are to be a mix of disciplinary experts and interested non-experts. Faculty members may self-nominate for consideration for any working group. Immediately after the completion of the regular election process, the CCC will convene to do the selection process for the working groups. The working group members are appointed to 2-year, staggered terms.

Senator Barram noted that the UEPC proposal restructured the CCC proposed membership while keeping the same number of faculty (6), but that it reduced the number of faculty to be assigned to each of the seven working groups (from 4 faculty to 2 faculty). The UEPC vote on the issue was mixed, and he asked for clarification of the issues.

Asbjorn Moseidjord, Chair of the UEPC, explained that the UEPC amendment was motivated by workload issues. The number of faculty positions proposed totaled 35, and the UEPC felt the number was too large. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The CCIC recommends that a call for nominations go forth at the end of January Term and that the search committee conduct the interviews and make a selection during February 2011.

number of available faculty is unequal across schools: very low in SEBA, and very high in SOLA. The UEPC amendment, Professor Moseidjord noted, weighs efficiency against representation and favors efficiency, but it may take years to adjust the organizational model exactly to the committee's tasks. In the meantime, we must consider how valuable faculty time is best spent in pursuit of SMC's educational purposes.

Professor Moseidjord reported that Senators from SEBA and SOS consulted with their colleagues regarding their perception of the need for representation. Senator Lee reported that available SEBA faculty already strain to fulfill all of the requirements for representation on standing committees. His perception is that SEBA faculty do not see a marginal benefit in adding additional representation, and agree with the UEPC proposal for one SEBA representative on the CCC. Senator Ogawa consulted with the SOS faculty, and reported that the SOS faculty regard representation on CCC as extremely important: they are not in favor of the reduction; at the same time, it would be unimaginable to the SOS faculty to have less than equal representation. Hence, SOS faculty are not in favor of at-large representatives whose seats would likely go to SOLA faculty and result in a SOLA majority membership. However, SOS would not be opposed to SEBA giving up a seat on the CCC.

Past Chair Poundstone suggested it is possible to begin with larger committees initially. Other institutions seem to have larger committees, and he asked whether the UEPC amendment reflects study of best practices at other institutions.

Senator Barram said he is concerned that it appears that a small number of faculty do most of the intensive committee workload. Senator Lind agreed, and observed that disparity is supported by an underlying culture that will persist unless we do something intentional to change it. The balance of workload is poor; we need to address the underlying cultural issues that are impacting the ability to get things done.

Senator Bird noted that the proposal does not require faculty to be tenured, while consultative appointment to the working groups offers more opportunity for participation from ranked, untenured faculty. Dean Woolpert said many faculty are looking for ways to contribute, and the election process does not favor junior faculty.

A MOTION was made by Senator Ogawa and SECONDED by Senator Heid (hereafter **Amendment 1**) that the UEPC proposal for the CCC structure; one representative from SOLA, SOS, and SEBA and 3 faculty elected at-large (1+1+1+3) (version dated November 22, 1010) be amended to the original recommendation from the CCIC (version dated November 18, 2010): 6 faculty members, 2 from each SOLA, SOS, and SEBA (2+2+2).

Senator Heid spoke in favor of **Amendment 1**. The School of Education has a small number of faculty, but SOE has always preferred equitable representation, despite the additional burden it places on a relatively small number of faculty.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias said he is less concerned about equal representation than about diversity of opinions on the CCC, that is, variance within the committee. He supported **Amendment 1**, the 2+2+2 structure.

Senator Lee said he does not know where SEBA would get the faculty to fill all positions, and does not see the net benefit in devoting to CCC's work the faculty hours it will require.

Past Chair Poundstone said he was sympathetic to the argument about the lack of sufficient numbers of faculty; if SEBA is willing to drop one of its representatives, the Senate should listen. The core curriculum may not implicate SEBA as fully as SOS or SOLA. The schools concerned with disciplinary areas most relevant to the core might appropriately predominate on the CCC.

Provost Dobkin noted equality and equity are not the same thing. Is it more appropriate to have proportional representation?

Professor Tsukahara said the goal is to establish a common set of educational experiences for all undergraduate students. If the faculty does not have a sense of the whole as to what the experience is, the CCC will not get us there. The debate, he argued, suggests that SMC does not have a culture of collegiality that will lead us to a conclusion of benefit the students. He suggested that perhaps the set of challenges is more ambitious than is needed; we may need to simplify the process to make the work reasonable. He added that the initial committees will have a good deal of work, but that should diminish once established.

Professor Flanagin said the CCIC's goal in establishing a 2x2x2 structure was to insure equal representation. If there is a workload issue, especially with SEBA, there would be no opposition to a reduction of SEBA members. One explicit goal in the amended Model 1 approved by the Senate is to create mechanisms to encourage curricular developments outside narrow departmental fences. There is an opportunity for SEBA, SOS and SOLA to grow in interesting ways. An argument for more representation for SEBA would be to have more of the school's faculty involved in the understanding, creating and promoting ways that the school can grow as part of the core.

A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone (hereafter **Amendment 1.2**) to amend **Amendment 1** so as to compose the CCC of: 2 SOLA representatives, 2 SOS representatives, 1 SEBA representative, and 1 at-large representative (2+2+1 and 1). Senator Lind suggested that in time the schools may wish to revise their representation; the Senate might want the structure to be readily revisable. Senator Barram accepted, as a friendly amendment, the addition of the following phrase: "the structure to be reevaluated on a three-year cycle." Vice Chair Gomez-Arias spoke against **Amendment 1.2**: six faculty members are to participate in deciding issues that will affect all students, insuring that faculty from all schools are represented is vital. A hand vote was taken on **Amendment 1.2**, which was approved by a vote of 5-3-1. According to custom, the Chair voted "Present."

A hand vote was taken on the motion to amend the CCC proposal, Section I. "Overall Structure" according to the language of **Amendment 1.2**. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-3-0. According to custom, the Chair voted "Present."

Chair Cortright asked Senators if they were in agreement with the proposed structure of the "Working Groups" as stipulated in the CCC proposal. A MOTION was made by Past Chair Poundstone and SECONDED by Senator Ogawa (hereafter **Amendment 2**) to amend the Working Groups section of the Core Curriculum Committee proposal to increase the number of appointed faculty on each working group from two to four. Past Chair Poundstone asked members of the CCIC present whether CCIC had studied best practices at other schools. He said he has not found another school with a similar, small ratio of committees being proposed to accomplish this work. He recognized the arguments for keeping the committees small, but he urged larger representation. Professor Boatman of the CCIC responded that the CCIC had benchmarked data from other institutions on the organization of core structures and, as is usual with benchmarking, the resulting proposal reflect more an assessment of common than of (qualitatively) best practices. She encouraged the Senate to think carefully about our own resources and what is best for SMC rather than what other institutions are doing.

Chair Cortright noted that the working groups would not be standing committees, but would be convened as necessary. Some may meet during the summer only. Professor Flanagin said the ad hoc nature of the working groups was considered very seriously by the CCIC. Odds are the working groups will either have an annual or bi-annual schedule in reviewing courses for the catalog; but will meet intensely during this limited time.

CCIC member Professor Ganote noted that the CCC is conceived as being an intensive workload commitment, with the working groups being more sporadic. Diversity of ideas and peer review are the desiderata behind the numbers suggested.

A hand vote was taken on **Amendment 2** to increase the number of faculty representatives on each "Working Group" from 2 to 4. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-3-0. According to custom, the Chair voted "Present."

Chair Cortright called for the vote on the CCC report as amended. If accepted by the Senate, Faculty Handbook language would then be required to execute the CCC proposal. He further noted that the exact duties of the Director of Core Curriculum (the position is stipulated in the CCC report) is an outstanding issue.

Vice Chair Poundstone asked for clarification regarding the position of Director of Institutional Research as proposed under the Core Curriculum Committee structure. Professor Flanagan responded that the CCIC will likely be making this recommendation at a later date. It was agreed to amend the language as follows, "Core Curriculum Committee/Temporary (roll-out phase)... 1 Director of Institutional Research (or Director of Assessment, ~~if when~~ hired), or designee, ..."

A roll call vote was taken on the amended CCC report as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	No	Sam Lind	No
Tom Poundstone	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Keith Ogawa	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	William Lee	No
Laura Heid	Yes		

The motion was approved by a vote of 6-3-0. According to custom, the Chair voted "Present."

10. Resolution to Remand the Report, Core Curriculum Committee, November 22, 2010 - Chair Cortright introduced the following resolution to remand the CCC Report to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC):

**WHEREAS** the Senate has adopted language for that part of the overall proposal to establish a permanent Core Curriculum Committee that is entitled Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010; and

**WHEREAS** the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee will shortly propose a description of the duties appertaining to the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum, which will complete the proposal for establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee; and

**WHEREAS** the final, Senate proposal for establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee must take the form of revision of the *Faculty Handbook*; therefore,

**BE IT RESOLVED**, the Senate:

(1) remands the partial proposal entitled Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010 to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) pending (a) UEPC's addition of language to complete the proposal by way of describing the duties pertaining to the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum and (b) UEPC's assessment and endorsement of the proposal *in toto*;

(2) commissions the Chair of the Senate (or his designee), the Chair of the UEPC (or his designee) and the Chair of the CCIC (or his designee) to cast the whole proposal into the form of a resolution for revision of the *Faculty Handbook*;

(3) directs that, upon agreement by the respective Chairs that the proposal is accurately and adequately embodied in the resolution for revision of the *Faculty Handbook*, the resolution be presented to the Executive Committee for inclusion among the General Meeting Agenda of 12 January, 2011.

A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Barram to accept the resolution. A hand vote was taken on the resolution. The motion passed by a vote of 9-0-0. According to custom, the Chair voted "Present."

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

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky  
Faculty Governance Coordinator

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### **Repeating: 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 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 will 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**

**Soda Center**

Buffet opens at 5:00pm,  
business follows immediately

**Wednesday, January 12, 2011**

**Soda Center**

**General Meeting, 9:00 – 11:00am**

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

## REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 2 DECEMBER, 2010

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

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

As announced, the 22 November, 2010, meeting of the UEPC was devoted to discussion, review and approval of a proposal from the CCIC detailing the structure and charge of the permanent Core Curriculum Committee. The Committee met from its scheduled 3:30pm hour until 6:45pm in order to complete the business at hand and refer it in timely fashion to the Senate. Thanks are owing to the supererogating members. The result of the Committee's deliberations and votes forms the Senate's New Business agenda for 2 December. I treat them in (excruciating) detail below.

UEPC Chair, Asbjorn Moseidjord, has proposed, and the members of the Committee have agreed, to two extraordinary meetings, 6, December, 2010, 12:00–1:00pm and 5 January, 2011, 12:30–1:30pm. The first will be devoted to a proposal from the Center for International Programs for undergraduate studies in Berlin, which would otherwise be delayed, in untimely fashion, by the press of business on the Core Curriculum. The second will be devoted to Core Curriculum learning outcomes, in anticipation of the Senate's Special General meetings (again, scheduled for 11 and 12 January).

#### **D. Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC)**

The Committee will meet on 1 December to adopt the instrument for the Spring, 2011, evaluation of the Provost and to elect a committee chair to preside over that evaluation. I will report verbally on the results.

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

#### **A. Resolution to Amend Senate Action S-09/10-22**

The resolution to amend Senate Action S-09/10-22, the proposal on 0.25 courses adopted at the May, 2010, General Meeting, arises from a finding by the Registrar, seconded by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. The proposal's original language entails an imperative to the Registrar's Office, *viz.*: that degree audits discriminate between 0.25 classes awarded letter grades and 0.25 classes offered on a Pass/Fail basis, permitting the *former only* to cumulate toward the 36-course graduation requirement: “. . . a maximum of . . . twelve .25 credit courses which are awarded a letter grade A through D may count toward a student's graduation requirements . . .” (S-09/10-22, 5-13-10). The Registrar and Vice Provost note that the imperative seems contrary to standing academic regulations, which permit students to offer up to three elective course credits, graded on the satisfactory/pass/fail basis,

among the 36 required for graduation (cf. *2010 – 2011 Undergraduate Catalog of Courses*, p. 37: SATISFACTORY/PASS/FAIL GRADING). The language of S-09/10-22 thus appears to require the Registrar to establish alternative, inconsistent grading structures and credit awarding systems for, respectively, 0.25– and 1.0–credit classes. Standing academic regulations (*Catalog, loc. cit*) already preclude offering *any* S/P/F class to satisfy general education [*sc.* core] requirements, or requirements for the major or minor. The prevalence of 0.25 classes in the major/minor offerings of certain departments—*e.g.*, Performing Arts and Kinesiology—would thus seem to be accounted for by the standing regulations.

The principal intention of S-09/10-22 was, of course, precisely to accommodate the use of 0.25 classes by departments whose curricula demand that students undertake diverse *practicals*—*i.e.*, classes devoted to performance of various kinds: musical, athletic, theatrical. This intention in no way depends upon the language in question; and, again, so far as 0.25 offerings fall among major/minor or collegiate requirements, standing academic regulations provide that students' achievement be evaluated by letter grade.

It should be noted that the inconsistency found by the Registrar and Vice Provost could be eliminated otherwise than by amending S-09/10-22: (1) the satisfactory/pass/fail option provided by the present *Catalog* could be eliminated altogether; (2) departments and programs could be required to offer 0.25 courses on a letter-grade basis only, *etc.*

The Resolution will require a motion and a second from Senators *ad libitum*.

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

The Senators have in hand the UEPC Report, **Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010** (hereafter **CCC22**), which represents the UEPC's revision and approval (as amended) of the CCIC document (also in the Senators' hands), **Core Curriculum Committee, November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010** (hereafter **CCC18**). The UEPC Minutes for 22 November, 2010, detail the votes on each of the substantive and (major) editorial changes approved by the UEPC. (For the convenience of the faculty at large, each of the above-mentioned documents is posted with the Senate Agenda for 2 December, 2010.)

The report raises substantive considerations and a procedural consideration for the Senate. The most telling of the former are noted in the UEPC Minutes for 22 November. These include: (i) **CCC22's** incompleteness (owing to the lack, in **CCC18**, of language describing the duties of the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum); (ii) reduction of reserved School seats on the proposed, permanent Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) from two/School to one/School; (iii) reduction of the Working Groups from five members to three, two of whom would be recruited from without the CCC; (iv) deletion of **CCC18** language expressly subordinating the January Term and Collegiate Seminar to the CCC in all matters falling under CCC's purview.<sup>2</sup>

(ii) tends—against the evident design of **CCC18** (at **I**, p. 1)—to favor a durable SOLA majority on the CCC itself, while (as the UEPC Minutes—**I**, p. 2—stress) the design of **CCC18** provided for equal representation of the Schools at the price of unequal burdens, since the eligible SOS and, especially, SEBA undergraduate faculty are far fewer than the eligible SOLA faculty. (iii) raises the question whether disciplinary expertise will register its due weight in the Working Groups and the CCC at large, in light of Senate Action S-10/11-8, which delegates to the CCC and its apposite Working Groups authority to determine, by course content and instructor's qualifications, which courses shall satisfy the outcomes prescribed for the "Pathways to Knowledge" goals.

In connection with (i), the UEPC Minutes (pp. 1 – 2, under **II. The Composition and Charge . . . etc.**) note "without controversy [*sc.* as the fact, accepted without dissent among the members of the UEPC] that the proposal for the CCC remains incomplete without a specification of the duties of the Director of the Core Curriculum." Accordingly, the UEPC deliberated and voted separately on the operative elements (as the Committee discerned them) of the CCIC's proposal thus far, and took no view of the whole as such (which the Committee may yet elect to do, once it has considered a CCIC report on the Director's duties). Lack of specified Director's duties is a significant *lacuna* in the document, among other reasons, because (as so far envisioned by the CCIC and approved by the UEPC) the Director of the Core Curriculum (DCC) seems *like* the Director of the Collegiate Seminar or the Director of the January Term, in that she presides over an elected faculty body [*sc.* a standing Senate committee] charged with overseeing the development and delivery of curricula, and she serves for an extended term (initially, 5 years; then 3). On the other hand (again, as so far envisioned), the Director of the Core Curriculum *is unlike* either the January Term or Collegiate Seminar Director in that the initial "selection" falls to "a search committee made up of two members each of the Senate, UEPC, and CCIC" (**CCC22** at **I**, p. 1), while subsequent appointments rest "on the recommendation of the CCC, the Senate, and the UEPC" (**CCC22 loc. cit.**)<sup>3</sup> The appointment of the first DCC seems to be the sole responsibility of a search committee composed of members of the Senate and members of Senate

<sup>2</sup> *Cp.* **CCC18** at **III**. (p. 3) to **CCC22** at **III**. (p. 3).

<sup>3</sup> The Directors of the Collegiate Seminar and January Term are appointed by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, evidently on the analogy of Deans' appointments of the chairs of undergraduate departments/ directors of programs in their respective schools (inasmuch as the Collegiate Seminar and January term Directors report to the VP UA; Handbook 1.4.2.3.2, 1.4.2.3.3; cf. 1.5.2.1).

committees, prompting the question: to whom does the “recommendation” for appointment of subsequent DCCs go, if not to the Senate? (Noteworthy: CCC18 provided that subsequent DCC’s “be chosen by a process to be determined by the elected members of the CCC” [I., p. 1].)

The latter question (like others one might pose, *e.g.*: do CCC resignations or vacancies fall under the appointment power of the Senate Chair? does the recommendation “to the Senate” of members of CCC Working Groups evoke the Chair’s appointment power? a process of Senate confirmation?) is, so to speak, a Handbook question. For example, simply placing the description of the DCC and her duties—whatever their content—under Handbook 1.6.1.2.3, rather than under Handbook 1.4.2.3, would go a long way toward answering the question “Recommends to whom?” in favor of “The Senate.” Similarly, simply placing the description under Handbook 1.4.2.3 would go a long way toward the answer, “The Provost or the Provost’s designee.”

The 22 November UEPC Minutes report (under **II. The Composition and Charge . . . etc.**) that the “Committee reviewed the entire report and is passing the approved, amended version on to the Senate for final action,” then notes that “the proposal for the CCC remains incomplete” (*loc. cit.*). In view of the proposal’s incompleteness, and in view of the fact that final Senate action proposing establishment of the CCC must be expressed as a revision of the Handbook, the “final action” foreseen by UEPC means that the Senate settle the language of the proposal thus far, pending addition of the DCC’s duties and pending Handbook language.

Accordingly, at the 2 December General Meeting, the Chair will entertain:

**A. Motion to Approve the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee Report, Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010**

A motion and second *ad libidum* from among the Senators will be required. If moved and passed, such a motion will register the Senate’s agreement (1) that the language thus far proposed adequately outlines the structure and charge of the proposed CCC, and the Senate’s agreement (2) that UEPC will complete the proposal for the CCC by forwarding to the Senate further language, specifying the duties of the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum.

In the course of such a motion, the Chair will, according to regular order, entertain amendments to the UEPC Report. If passed, such amendments will supersede the UEPC’s language and be incorporated without further review into the ultimate proposal for the CCC, which will, nevertheless, yet stand incomplete, pending further language from the UEPC specifying the duties of the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum.

Now, in view of the fact that *final* Senate action proposing the establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee, chaired by a Director of the Core Curriculum, must (a) specify the duties of the Director and (b) propose corresponding revision of the Handbook, at the 2 December General Meeting the Chair will next entertain a motion to adopt the following resolution:

**B. Resolution to remand the report, Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010, to the Undergraduate Policies Committee (UEPC).**

**WHEREAS** the Senate has adopted language for that part of the overall proposal to establish a permanent Core Curriculum Committee that is entitled **Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010**; and

**WHEREAS** the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee will shortly propose a description of the duties appertaining to the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum, which will complete the proposal for establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee; and

**WHEREAS** the final, Senate proposal for establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee must take the form of revision of the *Faculty Handbook*; therefore,

**BE IT RESOLVED**, the Senate:

(1) remands the partial proposal entitled **Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010** to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) pending (a) UEPC’s addition of language to complete the proposal by way of describing the duties pertaining to the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum and (b) UEPC’s assessment and endorsement of the proposal *in toto*;

(2) commissions the Chair of the Senate (or his designee), the Chair of the UEPC (or his designee) and the Chair of the CCIC (or his designee) to cast the whole proposal into the form of a resolution for revision of the *Faculty Handbook*;

(3) directs that, upon agreement by the respective Chairs that the proposal is accurately and adequately embodied in the resolution for revision of the *Faculty Handbook*, the resolution be presented to the Executive Committee for inclusion among the General Meeting Agenda of 12 January, 2011.

This resolution will require a motion and a second *ad libidum* from among the Senators.

With apologies for the prolixity of the Report,

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair  
Academic Senate

# Core Curriculum Committee November 22nd, 2010

## I. Overall Structure

### Core Curriculum Committee (CCC)

- 1 Director of the Core Curriculum
  - Will be a tenured, undergraduate faculty member chosen for a multi-year term
    - The initial director will be selected by a search committee made up of two members each of the Senate, UEPC, and CCIC; this initial director will be appointed for a 5-year term<sup>4</sup>
  - Subsequent directors will serve for 3-year terms on the recommendation of the CCC, the Senate, and the UEPC
  - Will chair the CCC
- 6 ranked, undergraduate faculty members
  - 1 from each SOLA, SOS, and SEBA, each elected by ranked faculty in that school, and 3 selected from ranked faculty at large
  - Elected for 3-year, staggered terms
- Permanent *ex officio* & non-voting members
  - 1 Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 Vice Provost for Student Life or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 Registrar or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 student chosen by ASSMC, *ex officio* & non-voting
- Temporary (roll-out phase) *ex officio* & non-voting members
  - 1 Dean of Advising or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 Director of Institutional Research (or Director of Assessment, when hired), or designee, *ex officio* & non-voting
  - 1 representative from the library as designated by the Dean for Academic Resources, *ex officio*, non-voting.

### Working Groups Convened as Needed

7 working subcommittees, each consisting of a Chair, who is a member of the CCC, and 2 faculty

- Group HM (Habits of Mind): Goals 1-4
- Group MS (Math and Science): Goal 5
- Group AU (Artistic Understanding): Goal 6
- Group TU (Theological Understanding): Goal 7
- Group HC (Historical/Social/Cultural U.): Goal 8
- Group CG/CE (Comm. Gd./Comm. Eng.): Goals 9, 12
- Group AD/GP (Amer. Div./Global Persp.): Goals 10, 11

The working group chairs are designated by the CCC once elections are completed. In most cases, the Director will chair Group HM, as this area will involve a great deal of collaboration with Collegiate Seminar, Composition, and the majors. The two faculty members on each working group are recommended to the Senate by the CCC, after consultation with the Deans and Departments/Programs, and are to be a mix of disciplinary experts and interested non-experts. Faculty members may self-nominate for consideration for any working group. Immediately after the completion of the regular election process, the CCC will convene to do the selection process for the working groups. The working group members are appointed to 2-year, staggered terms.

## II. Duties:

---

<sup>4</sup> The CCIC recommends that a call for nominations go forth at the end of January Term and that the search committee conduct the interviews and make a selection during February 2011.

\*\*The Core Curriculum is defined as the foundational and essential learning expected of all students at Saint Mary's College (as articulated in the learning goals and outcomes) and the processes by which students achieve that learning (i.e., approved courses and other experiences.)

### Of the Core Curriculum Committee

- To address any and all policy issues regarding the Core Curriculum and its Learning Goals and outcomes
- To establish seven working groups, based on the Learning Goals for the Core, for the purpose of receiving and reviewing course proposals<sup>5</sup> for the meeting of specific Learning Goals and recommending courses to the CCC for inclusion in the College's Core Curriculum
- To develop general guidelines that govern the work of the seven CCC working groups for the course review and approval process
- To review the recommendations of the seven CCC working groups concerning the approval of courses as meeting Core Goals and the removal of courses that no longer meet the requirements as set by the CCC, and to respond to faculty per those recommendations
- To be responsible for catalog language for the core and to publish a yearly listing of the courses that satisfy the learning goals
- To develop policies for student issues and petitions regarding the meeting of Core Goals
- To evaluate the policies, overall structure, and specific components of the Core, including Learning Goals, Outcomes and Rationales, on a rotating schedule, and to make recommendations to the Senate for any needed changes, based on assessment measures and evaluations supervised by the CCC
- To stay informed of general education trends and best practices, as regards goals, outcomes, structure, and assessment
- To assist faculty in understanding the CCC guidelines for course approval and to facilitate the submission of course proposals by working with appropriate Deans, Department/Program Chairs and Directors, and individual faculty

### Of the CCC Working groups

- To perform the initial review of courses proposed to meet the learning goals of the Core Curriculum and to recommend approval/disapproval of those courses to the CCC
- To review previously approved Core Curriculum courses on the five-year anniversary of their previous approval and to recommend re-approval/disapproval of those courses to the CCC

The working groups of the CCC assist the CCC in carrying out its responsibilities regarding courses serving the Core Curriculum; as such, their work is guided by and subject to the authority of the CCC. Guidelines for the approval and review process are determined by the CCC, with input from the working groups as appropriate. The working groups make recommendations to the CCC, which has the final authority to approve those recommendations or to send them back to the working group for further consideration.

### **III. Relationship to other faculty committees:**

The CCC is an independent committee that operates under the Academic Senate's larger responsibility for the college's academic program. All CCC recommendations regarding the process by which the CCC operates will be forwarded to the Senate for approval. Decisions regarding approval or disapproval of individual courses (or student petitions) pertaining to the learning goals fall within the purview of the CCC and are not reviewed elsewhere. The CCC will issue an annual report to the Senate of its work and decisions. Where there are potential conflicts or overlapping of responsibilities between the UEPC, AARC, and CCC, the Senate will define the appropriate parameters of each group's authority and responsibility.

### **IV. Workload considerations and Administrative Support**

---

<sup>5</sup> The language of reviewing, approving, etc., "course proposals" (in this bullet and elsewhere) is understood broadly to include all curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular proposals for the meeting of learning outcomes. All such proposals will undergo the same process of review by the working groups and the CCC.

The Director of the Core Curriculum will have a three-course reassignment of his/her teaching duties. There will also be a full-time administrative assistant to support the Director, the CCC, and the 7 working groups. (A job description for the administrative support will be drafted in spring, 2011.)

Due to the exceptional workload anticipated during the initial period of implementation of the new Core, the initial members of the CCC will receive a course release in each year of CCC service; once the Core has been fully implemented, the Director of CCC, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, and the Provost will meet to determine if the level of service expected of a member of the CCC demands continued compensation.

Support for the initial members of the working groups will be through direct stipends, to be determined in consultation with the Provost; once the Core has been fully implemented, the Director of CCC, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Vice Provost for Academics, and the Provost will meet to determine the appropriate level of support for faculty members from that point forward.

## **V. Course Approval Process and Assessment**

The CCIC will be forwarding to the UEPC a second set of recommendations concerning the process of course approval and the issues of assessment. For now, we simply note that the CCC as proposed will oversee assessment in terms of policy and evaluation of data, but will not be actually conducting assessment procedures itself. We will likely be recommending the creation of an “assessment position/office” at the College for all the operational aspects of this part of the process, but we have not finalized those recommendations.