

Minutes of the Academic Senate
March 25, 2010

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tom Poundstone at 3:00 p.m. on March 25, 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, Sam Lind, Marty Rokeach, Ed Tywoniak, and Parliamentarian David Bird. Absent were Keith Ogawa and Phil Perry.

Also present were: Sam Agronow, Ron Ahnen, David Alvarez, Roque Amorim Neto FSC, Shawny Anderson, Jamie Baldwin, Norm Bedford, Vice President Michael Beseda, CTO Ed Biglin, Tom Brown, Joel Burley, Theo Carlile, Sharon Chandiramani, Cathy Davalos, David DeRose, Provost Beth Dobkin, Zach Flanagin, Peter Freund, Interim Dean Larisa Genin, Carl Guarneri, Charles Hamaker, Dana Herrera, Roy Huang, Christa Kell, Ann Kelly, John Knight, Jimmy Li, Maureen Little, Claude Malary, Lynn Meisch, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Thuy Phan, Susie Miller-Reid, Miguel Rodriguez, Magdalena Rodriguez, Nushi Safinya, Shelby Solomon, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Mindy Thomas, Dean Russ Tiberii, Tiffany Trinh, Ted Tsukahara, Cynthia Van Gilder, Anna Viale, Hoang Vu, Dean Steve Woolpert, Shermond Wong, and Paul Zarnoth.

REPORTS

2. Chairperson's Report – Chair Poundstone reported that the Senate previously approved a forum on faculty/staff relationships. The forum will take place on Monday, April 12, 2010. He encouraged faculty to attend.

3. Vice Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Steve Cortright reported that the nominating ballot for the faculty elections will be distributed immediately after the Easter recess.

4. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Senator Lind reported that the UEPC approved a request from the Math Department to renumber one of its courses, experimental Math 2 Mathematics Readiness, into two separate courses, Math 2 and Math 12.

A request from Barbara McGraw to change the name of an already approved, but not yet taught experimental course (due to low enrollment numbers) in order to attract more students for the fall, was considered: Current title: "Ethics, Interfaith Leadership, and Organizational Development." Proposed new title: "Business Ethics, Interfaith Understanding, and Global Leadership." There is a possible conflict with a current course, proposal was returned to the department for further discussion.

The UEPC approved a request from the Psychology Department for a small change in the name of its course Psych 106 "Experimental Laboratory Research" to "Experimental Research."

The UEPC discussed a proposal from the Environmental Science Studies Program (ESS) to make changes to its existing BS and BA majors as well the creation of a new BS and BA in Earth Science. ESS presented additional information on the degreed program modifications, and discussion is to be continued to the next UEPC meeting.

Zach Flanagin reported on the activities of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC).

5. Graduate & Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) – Senator Heid reported on the agenda items of the GPSEPC. 1) Ongoing is the initial review of the Master of Arts in Teaching Leadership (MATL) after being taught on an experimental basis. 2) Approved and sent forward a request to the Senate for a position of Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Programs.

3) Investigating Proquest, an online program for masters and doctoral degree students to enter their master project theses and dissertation.

6. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) – Senator Tywoniak reported that the AARC is considering the following four items: 1) assessment of summer school program, 2) assessment of first year advising program, 3) proposed catalog changes for .25 credit courses, and 4) reviewed audit of Registrar’s office document storage procedures. All issues are ongoing. Full reports or recommendations are expected before the end of the academic year.

7. Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) – Senator Tywoniak reported that the next meeting is scheduled for April 15, 2010.

8. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) – Joel Burley updated the Senate on the FWC’s work regarding the faculty salary policy. The FWC has developed a power point presentation intended to inform the faculty on salary policy issues. Members of the FWC are currently meeting with each of the academic departments in an effort to inform all faculty. The presentation is also posted on the web. Once the presentations are complete, a follow-up survey will be distributed online through the office of Institutional Research. The analysis of the data will be shared with the Senate and with the Faculty Salary Task Force being created by Provost Dobkin.

Joe Burley explained that last year the salary policy implementation was reviewed by the FWC, a memo was sent to Br. Ron regarding the status of “Goal II.” Br. Ron responded that based on academic, admission, and economic realities the College should reformulate Goal II. The FWC distributed a survey requesting faculty input on: how to respond to Br. Ron, what peer institutions are appropriate comparisons, what do faculty think about differential salary scales, and annual merit or performance reviews rather than step increases. The FWC will analyze the faculty responses to guide the direction of the response to Br. Ron.

9. Provost’s Updates – Provost Dobkin thanked the FWC for their efforts in undertaking a long-term process connected to the Building on Strengths Strategic Plan regarding review of the faculty salary policy. The information provided by the faculty surveys distributed by the FWC will inform the next 12-18 month process to look at a compensation philosophy for the future.

The Academic Blueprint Task Force is progressing in its plan to further strategic goals. She encouraged faculty to visit her website. Input is welcome and the meetings are open.

Deans Searches – Interviews have been completed and deliberations will follow.

10. Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) – Zach Flanagan reported that he met with the UEPC to begin the discussion of procedures for vetting of the future CCIC subcommittee proposals. Currently four subcommittees are meeting to create learning outcomes for the following goals: Shared Inquiry, Critical Thinking, Global Perspective, and Historical, Social, and Cultural Understanding. Individual and department input is essential.

NEW BUSINESS

11. Commendation for Brother Gabriel Carlos Gomez-Restrepo, FSC – Past Chair Brother Charles Hilken introduced the following resolution:

Academic Senate Commendation of Brother Carlos Gabriel Gómez-Restrepo, FSC,
on the occasion of the April 28, 2010, College Convocation.

Whereas Brother Carlos, before beginning his tenure as Rector of Universidad de La Salle, Bogotá, Colombia, in 2008, taught and served in both secular and private institutions of higher learning for twenty-five years.

Whereas in that time Brother Carlos has become a leading theorist on the relationship of higher education to politics and the potential of Lasallian higher education to help shape secular ethics, and was thereby honored by being named to the Order of Democracy by the Congress of Colombia in 2004.

Whereas Brother has emerged as a leader in the new movement of dialogue between all Lasallian universities and colleges as the vice-president of the International Association of Lasallian Universities since 2009.

Whereas Brother Carlos tirelessly promoted the regional coordination of Lasallian education in South America as the Executive Secretary of the Region Latinoamericana Lasallista (RELAL) for five years.

Whereas Brother Carlos has served the greater worldwide Lasallian family as a member of several international commissions in Rome, including the Mission Éducative Lasallienne (MEL) committee and the Lasallian Association for Mission committee, and was the coordinator of the preparatory committee for the 44th General Chapter of the Brothers of the Christian Schools in 2005-2007.

We the Members of the Academic Senate of Saint Mary's College do hereby unanimously commend Brother Carlos for his decades of faith-filled ministry which have served to strengthen the educational vision of Saint John Baptist de La Salle in his native Colombia and worldwide.

In recognition thereof we have affixed our signatures this day, the Feast of the Annunciation, Thursday, March 25, at Saint Mary's College in Moraga, California, in the year of Our Lord, 2010.

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Brother Charles and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak that the Academic Senate adopt the commendation. The motion was unanimously approved by hand vote.

12. Collegiate Seminar Task Force – Chair Poundstone introduced the proposal to create a Collegiate Seminar Task Force. The Core Curriculum Task Force (CCTF) deliberated for three years on the recommendation for the core curriculum. In its final report, the CCTF recommended that a separate process is necessary to give the discussion of Collegiate Seminar the attention it deserves. Therefore, it was proposed that the Provost, the chief academic officer, convene a select group of faculty to thoroughly review the Collegiate Seminar and report back to her and the SMC community. The following dimensions of Seminar were suggested for consideration: The length of the reading lists, the best way to begin the Seminar, the advantages and disadvantages of the chronological vs. thematic organization, the inclusion of voices not heard in the conversation, the student experience of Seminar, the evaluation of instructors and use of instructors who are particularly effective with the first course. The following proposal was submitted for consideration:

Proposal: The Collegiate Seminar Task Force (CSTF) is charged as follows:

1. To lead the continuing campus conversation about seminar (topics detailed below)
2. To synthesize the results of these conversations into two reports (detailed below), including both quantitative and qualitative data generated from students and from the faculty
3. To present such reports, along with specific recommendations, to the CSGB, UEPC, and Senate

The specific topics of that conversation should include, but are not limited to:

Stage 1: Program-specific questions – How can the Seminar best be structured to serve student learning, especially in light of its traditional goals and outcomes? Topics include:

1. The essential elements of Seminar that make it a “defining feature” of the core, explicitly identified in discussion with the campus community, in order to inform any possible transformation of the program
2. The length of the reading list
3. The best way to begin the Seminar
4. The advantages and disadvantages of the chronological vs. thematic organization
5. The inclusion of voices not heard in the conversation
6. The student experience of Seminar
7. The evaluation of instructors and use of instructors who are particularly effective with the first course
8. The issue of “non-compliant” instructors

9. The inclusion of materials / lectures to provide context to the readings
10. The developmental nature of the reading list

These conversations are the first charge of the CSTF, as they do not depend on the implementation of the new core as much as they will shape that implementation. (For example, a decision to have seminar cover a theme that matches one of the learning goals, such as the “Common Good,” would fundamentally affect the CCIC’s planning on how to implement that goal in the core curriculum at large.) Ultimately, the goal is for a focused, open, and frank conversation – and one that has the prospect for real decisions to be made – that could generate the kind of campus-wide buy-in to Seminar that would allow it to function as the “core of the core.”

Timeline:

- Spring 2010 – The CSTF will hold a series of forums and solicit faculty and student input on the topic of Seminar, in order to begin the conversation on these questions.
- Summer 2010 – The CSTF will research best practices at other institutions with great books programs.
- Fall 2010 – The CSTF will continue the campus discussions, present to the faculty a report on those conversations and the summer research, and sponsor a series of events that will officially draw the conversation to its conclusion. The CSTF will then submit a report with recommendations to the CSGB, the UEPC, and the Senate in late fall 2010 or early spring 2011.

Stage 2: Core-curriculum learning outcome questions – How can and should the Seminar meet the learning outcomes of the newly adopted core curriculum?

This conversation is essential if the seminar is going to function as the “core of the core” and not simply operate in a separate sphere. However, it can only take place fruitfully once the learning outcomes of the new core have been generated, discussed, and approved by the UEPC and Senate. (I.e., only when we know exactly what students are going to be required to learn in the core can we discuss what elements seminar can and should be responsible for – though one would imagine that “Shared Inquiry” is going to be rather straightforward in this regard.) Currently, the CCIC is working on these outcomes in clusters, hopefully completing all of them (including approval by the UEPC and Senate) by spring 2011. Timeline: The CSTF should begin this conversation when the learning outcomes of the core have begun to take clearer shape, likely in late fall 2010 and early spring 2011. Thus, this conversation will begin at about the same time that the CSTF is completing its report for stage 1. It is expected that the CSTF will submit a report with recommendations for stage 2 to the CCIC, the CSGB, the UEPC, and the Senate by the end of spring 2011.

Membership – The CSTF will include eight members, appointed by the chair and vice-chair of the UEPC and the chair and vice-chair of the CCIC, in consultation with the director of Collegiate Seminar. Those members will be:

1. The director of Collegiate Seminar
2. The director of assessment for Collegiate Seminar
3. The chair of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee
4. The director of Composition, or her chosen delegate
5. Three faculty who have taught seminar at least twice
6. One student who has taken at least two seminars

Chair Poundstone explained that faculty have been reluctant to approve the proposal; one significant concern is whether the proposal adequately respects the integrity of the Collegiate Seminar program. Zach Flanagan worked closely with Collegiate Seminar Director Charles Hamaker to draft the new proposal. Zach Flanagan, Chair of the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC), explained that the CCIC is beginning to think about how the new core will ultimately look. The full picture cannot be realized without being able to envision what Seminar will look like. The CCIC recommends that the discussion about Seminar take place now, rather than after the work of the CCIC is complete and requests that the discussion take place simultaneously with their work. The first question for the Task Force is what is the quintessential piece of Seminar that we want to hold up as the core of the foundation. Zach said that he would like to see Seminar function as the core of the core curriculum. He would like to see full faculty buy-in, that it be interactive with other courses, and that it become the backbone of the core.

A MOTION was made by Senator Lind and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to approve the proposal.

Past Chair Brother Charles said the College has grown so fast, faster than the faculty have been able to come on board with a depth of understanding of the program. He suggested revising the language in #8 of the proposal as follows: “The issue of ~~“non-compliant” instructors~~ **training and ongoing formation of faculty in leading seminars.**”

Charles Hamaker agreed with Brother Charles’ wording. The issue is supporting instructors in their development.

Zach Flanagan responded that proposed amendment is a substantial change, therefore, it is not a friendly amendment. He explained that he disagreed with Brother Charles that the only issue with Seminar are too many new faculty. His concern with the proposed amended language is that there are faculty who have taught two or three courses, but have not taught more courses precisely because they are dissatisfied with the Seminar program.

Senator Rokeach said every department on campus has a degree of quality control over its faculty, except Seminar. He would like to see some mechanism for Seminar to exercise some power over faculty.

Past Chair Brother Charles amended his proposal of #8 above, agreeing to add “Training and ongoing formation of faculty in leading seminars” as a stand-alone topic as #8, increasing the list to eleven items. This revision was accepted as friendly amendment.

Vice Provost Sweeney said when the Core Curriculum Task Force was looking at those areas of the core for which we have departmental authority (language requirement, composition requirement, January Term, and Collegiate Seminar) the CCTF studied the program review documents. She encouraged the proposed committee to also study the documents of the history of the program review for Seminar. Primary elements of the program review have to do with the articulation for writing, reading and participation within and across the four Seminars, reconsideration of faculty development within Seminar, ensure methods of faculty consistency in the delivery of Seminar, and to look at the complementary nature between the Seminar and any type of disciplinary studies we have relative to Capstone or thesis courses. She encouraged that type of a review.

Zach Flanagan said that the proposal now includes a representative from Composition on the task force. It is critical for Seminar and Composition to jointly discuss the student experience for the first two years.

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Brother Charles and **SECONDED** by Senator Tywoniak to revise the language in #5 under membership to allow greater expertise as follows: “5. Three faculty who have taught **in each of the four required** seminars ~~at least twice.~~”

Cathy Davalos agreed with the amended language. Faculty should have taught in all four Seminars in order to have the conversation about what is happening in Seminar. Senator Tywoniak agreed that it is critical for faculty to have taught in all four Seminars if one is evaluating the four Seminars.

A vote was taken on the proposed amended language in #5 under membership. The amendment was approved unanimously.

Vice Chair Cortright said the proposal is put forward as an aid to the work of the CCIC, and he asked why the work of the CCIC requires the review. The traditional goals and outcomes are not to be reviewed, but what is to be reviewed is the structure of the Seminar in pursuit of those traditional goals and outcomes. The traditional goal of Seminar is that students would meet twice a week, confront a very difficult text and teach it to one another.

Zach Flanagin responded that the proposal arises from conversations around the core curriculum. At the end of the process last year, the CCTF recommended that the process continue with the review of Seminar, which was adopted by the Senate. Even if the conversation is not necessary for the work of the CCIC, it is necessary to the campus.

Paul Zarnoth said the question #1 is relevant to the work of the CCIC; which of the learning outcomes are being addressed in Seminar. Which learning outcomes we as a community feel are relevant within Collegiate Seminar will help to inform which learning outcomes need to be addressed outside of Seminar.

Vice Chair Cortright responded that Seminar has not been thought of as having outcomes in the ordinary sense. The Seminar is an activity; the exercise of Seminar is not a means to an end. The governing board oversees the quality of Seminar. The conversation about learning outcomes, learning goals should be regulated by commitment to the Seminar, not Seminar regulated by a commitment to yet undefined goals and outcomes. In 1982-1986 the College conducted an elaborate discussion of advantages and disadvantages of the chronological versus thematic organization of Seminar. The outcomes were sound, and they remain sound today.

Theo Carlile said that in reading between the lines there is a definite transformative project to the proposal. She is not against changes in Seminar, but it is important to her that the conversation be led, and changes be made by the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board.

Senator Heid asked why the list of questions listed in the proposal could not be addressed by the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board, why the need for an additional body?

Senator Rokeach acknowledged the comments of Theo Carlile, that she is concerned about conserving the stability of Seminar. Long standing committees can have a propensity towards self-perpetuation. A compromise to have board members and others with experience in Seminar can be a good balance.

Claude Malarly said those entrenched in Seminar may not be the best people to make decisions about making changes.

Theo Carlile and Cathy Davalos announced that CSGB meetings are open, but faculty do not attend.

Senator Tywoniak said the CSGB is already in place, what is missing is the formal relationship between the CSGB and the process of the CCIC.

A vote was taken on the proposal as amended. The motion failed by a hand vote of 3-5-0.

13. Discontinuance of SIMS, UEPC Recommendation – *[The Academic Senate charged the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) to follow the Faculty Handbook procedures for the Discontinuance of an Academic Program or Department not Mandated by General Financial Exigency (FH 2.8.5.2) regarding Dean Steve Woolpert’s Proposal for Discontinuance of the Studies for International and Multilingual Students Program (SIMS). After a thorough and open review, on February 22, 2010 the UEPC voted 7-5 in favor of discontinuing the SIMS Program and forwarded its recommendation to the Academic Senate.]*

Chair Poundstone welcomed the faculty, staff and students in attendance. He explained that the Senate has before it a recommendation from the UEPC. The Handbook instructs, “The Senate will consider and take action on the recommendation of the UEPC.” Chair Poundstone added that although the

faculty care deeply about staffing, that is not an issue open for Senate deliberation. The Senate has no authority over adjunct lines.

Chair Poundstone introduced student Jimmy Li, Vice President of the International Club. He read a statement on behalf of the students in the SIMS program. He referred to the Mission Statement, "To create a student centered educational community whose members support one another with mutual understanding and respect." He urged the continuance of the SIMS program: It caters to the diverse requirements of a diverse group of students. It provides support, not limited to academic issues. The attention, support and care received from SIMS faculty are unmatched to other programs. In addition to the academic needs of the students, the SIMS faculty provide awareness of the American culture. International students come from various backgrounds, the SIMS faculty successfully address the wide range of cultural, language and writing abilities. The international students require faculty that truly understand their many needs and that have the ability to advise and support them as they adapt to their new environment. This is what the SIMS program has successfully provided. The international students needs further improvement and support, not reorganization and fragmentation of its courses.

Senator Heid stated that research of college students in non-dominant groups is that they do not fare as well if they are assimilated immediately into the larger dominant culture, they are not retained, and they do not graduate. International students need a core group where they feel they belong in order to make a connection to the College before they become comfortable with the general college community. Will the proposed infrastructure provide for the needs of the students? Many faculty do not have the cultural competence or the skills to provide the academic support for these students.

Past Chair Brother Charles said SIMS is a very healthy and vibrant program as evidenced by the support of the students. He does not understand how the College can cut a living, vital program.

Theo Carlile said that when she served as the Director of Collegiate Seminar she found SIMS to be a very positive program and a model of student-centeredness. She remarked that although the UEPC recommendation to the Senate was to support Dean Woolpert's proposed discontinuance, the arguments contained in the report were preponderantly in favor of its continuance. There has been animosity between SIMS and another program, but it is not appropriate to close a program because of this. She said she remains thoroughly in support of the SIMS program.

Senator Lind explained that Dean Woolpert's proposal establishes the continuance of the support of the SIMS students; although there are those that disagree with the plan for reorganization, it is not a termination of the support and services of the international students. Senator Heid responded that the relationships with people with the teaching skills and cultural competency is what is required to meet the needs of international students.

Senator Tywoniak stated that Dean Woolpert's report is well crafted, he understands the need for Dean Woolpert to look at ways to become more efficient in this economic climate. He said that during the campus-wide debates of the issue, the voice of the students has been most impressive. The students want a home base where they are comfortable. He feared that would be lost through the reorganization. That is not in the best interests of the students. He added that he hopes the community will recognize that the two adjunct faculty in SIMS are long term faculty and that we have a larger purpose as a Catholic institution.

Maureen Little said the reorganization of the program concerns her. She was involved with the program for a very long time and it has been extremely successful. She stays in touch with many of the students who went through the program over the years. She said she hopes the College finds the grace and wisdom to do what is best for the students.

Senator Rokeach thanked the UEPC for the tremendous work they have done through their deliberations of Dean Woolpert’s proposal. The most efficient method does not necessarily result in the most effective learning. He stated that he also serves as a member of the Program Review Committee, which conducted the program review of SIMS this year. At this point Senator Rokeach paused and asked that the record indicate that he thought that it was inappropriate how Professor Rosemary Graham was unfairly criticized in a personal manner in the SIMS program review. He then went on to note that it takes practice to write an exemplary document such as a program review; which is not always directly linked to the quality of the program. The SIMS program review was not well done. Dean Woolpert noted in his September 9, 2009 memo that his assessment of SIMS program review was instrumental in his decision to reassign the functions to other units. Senator Rokeach added that he did not believe the program review accurately depicts the quality of the SIMS program. The SIMS students have consistently and eloquently expressed their support of the SIMS program, which has been most impressive. Clearly, in spite of a weak program review, something magical takes place between the SIMS faculty and its students. The proposal will restructure something concrete and real in favor of something speculative. If the Senate votes to not discontinue the SIMS program, he informally recommended that the two adjunct lines that have been terminated, be restored.

Senator Gomez-Arias said he has been an international student. He understands the students’ comfort with an environment that helps them adjust to a new culture. The issue is what is the most effective way to provide the students with an environment in which they can grow and learn about the culture which is not theirs, but one in which they can thrive in the company of other international students. He is not an expert in this area and he must rely on the recommendations of those involved. If we are not providing what the students need, efficiency is a moot point.

Carl Guarneri complimented the UEPC on a very thorough job of listening to students and faculty about the SIMS program, and also for listing the pros and cons noted through their deliberations in their report. It was an instructive document. He explained that he was more impressed with the arguments not to discontinue the program, and perplexed by the vote of the committee. The faculty in charge of the program have already been informed that they will not be offered adjunct status in the future. This ‘muddies the waters’ in terms of what a vote to continue the program means. The Deans proposal makes a direct connection between the savings to be realized with discontinuing the program and the implementation of a long needed writing center. Carl Guarneri said there is not a logical or persuasive linkage between the two objectives. He noted that the long-term faculty in SIMS were kept on year after year without being given full faculty status; after 30 years, the faculty in SIMS remain at-will employees of the College. The issue may be the way in which we handle personnel matters in creating non-tenure-track positions that are both part-time faculty and part-time administration in the name of flexibility.

Tom Brown said that as a dean for 30 years, the major focus is to get students to faculty. Research shows that the relationships to faculty matter most to students. The SIMS program is intended to support the students’ academic integration, and to the extent that it supports their social and cultural integration, that is in support of them being academically integrated. In 1997 SMC had 150 full tuition paid international students, today there are 60 international students, one half of which are athletes.

A roll-call vote was taken on the endorsement of the UEPC recommendation to discontinue the SIMS program.

Tom Poundstone	Yes	Laura Heid	No
Steve Cortright	No	Sam Lind	Yes
Brother Charles Hilken	No	Marty Rokeach	No
Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Ed Tywoniak	No

The endorsement of the recommendation to discontinue SIMS failed by a vote of 3-5-0.

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

Respectfully submitted
Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator