

Minutes of the Academic Senate
March 4, 2010

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tom Poundstone at 3:00 p.m. on March 4, 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, Keith Ogawa, Phil Perry, Marty Rokeach, and Parliamentarian David Bird. Absent was Ed Tywoniak.

Also present were: Ron Ahnen, Sam Agronow, Michael Barram, Vice President Michael Beseda, CTO Ed Biglin, S. Jamila Buckner, Valerie Burke, Dean Tom Carter, Martin Cohen, Provost Beth Dobkin, Monica Fitzgerald, Zach Flanagan, Cynthia Ganote, Christa Kell, Interim Dean Larisa Genin, Charles Hamaker, Robert Henderson, Lidia Luquet, Mary McCall, Barbara McGraw, Dean Michael McKeon, Deepak Sawhney, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Carl Thelen, Mindy Thomas, Dean Russ Tiberii, Ted Tsukahara, Interim Dean Roy Wensley, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the January 13, 2010 meeting were approved as submitted. Minutes of the February 11, 2010 meeting were amended and approved.

3. A petition signed by eighteen faculty was submitted to the Senate. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Cortright and SECONDED by Senator Rokeach to add the Petition to Suspend Implementation of New Course Assignment Policy in the Collegiate Seminar Program to the agenda as a New Business item. The motion was approved by the Senate.

REPORTS

4. Chairperson's Report – Chair Poundstone announced that the Senate will discuss the UEPC recommendation on Dean Woolpert's proposal for the Discontinuance of SIMS as well as the reconsideration of the proposal for the Collegiate Seminar Task Force at the next meeting of the Senate.

Consent Agenda: Revised Theatre Minor – received from the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee. Accepted on the consent agenda.

5. Vice President Michael Beseda – Michael Beseda introduced the new Dean of Admissions, Michael McKeon, and he thanked the many faculty that served on the search committee.

6. Provost Updates - Provost Dobkin introduced the new Director of Institutional Research, Sam Agronow. She reported on the College Committee on Inclusive Excellence (CCIE). A workshop was held with the deans to discuss the next steps; distribution of the climate survey, how to bring institutional assessment levels to other areas of the institution, and to begin drafting a plan moving forward. She encouraged faculty attendance at the Campus of Difference Workshops. She also urged faculty to participate in upcoming conversations with staff regarding staff/faculty relations on campus.

Provost Dobkin's report on the budget: SMC is receiving a higher number of applications, however that may not mean the College will have more students accepting, and particularly, more students with less need. She referred to the Presidents address where he mentioned lower yield and less net tuition revenue. The College had an historic level of aid given last year, which will stay with us for the next three years. Incoming student net tuition revenue has dropped from a high in 2007 of over \$20,000 to \$17,700. Families are interested in coming to SMC, but not necessarily able to afford the tuition. There is a need for long-term and significant reductions in order to sustain our programming. The reductions must be considered permanent. She reviewed some of the

reduction methods taken: renegotiated contracts, delayed purchases, cut discretionary spending, not filled vacant positions. The President has announced that any notifications of staff or faculty effected by the reductions are to be completed by March 19th.

Staff reductions: Provost Dobkin said staff reductions are painful because they affect people we know and have worked with for many years. Staff are feeling anxious and stressed. There have been reductions made in some office hours or summer hours. It is likely that a few positions will be eliminated. The College does continue to hire for key positions, based on the essential functions required to preserve the integrity of the programs moving forward. She stipulated that it may make sense strategically and fiscally to replace a faculty member in an administrative position with a staff person. Separation packages will be offered to staff affected by the reductions.

Faculty reductions: Provost Dobkin began by stating that it is important to acknowledge that there is a system of privilege in which ranked faculty are protected. The rank and tenure process really is a merit-based performance. Through rank and tenure there is peer evaluation overseeing the integrity and quality of the programs. There have been enough reductions realized to allow the preservation of the step scale. This will affirm the system of rank and tenure.

Adjunct position reductions: Two reductions are a result of faculty not making tenure. Every person that has been reduced or eliminated has brought incredible value to the College. Every adjunct faculty affected has contributed to students' lives and to the mission of the College. All must be treated consistently according to the Handbook. It is difficult in a community like ours because it is much like a family. It is an employment situation that privileges ranked faculty above staff and adjunct faculty. The need for adjunct faculty is based on the level of expertise an individual brings to a department, expertise necessary to add depth and breadth to department's curriculum that is lacking, and on sufficient need across the course offerings to justify a full-time position without counting courses taught in other departments and programs such as Jan Term and Seminar. Reductions begin with the departmental assessment of need by the Dean. Six adjunct positions will be eliminated for next year from a total of approximately 45.

Decisions are made primarily on the needs of students. Average class size has been raised from 20 to 20.5, which means a reduction of 26 courses over the year; which will yield a savings of \$200,000.

It is difficult to ascertain, but there are approximately 170 course reassignments across the college. Most of the course reassignments are administrative duties, nine are located in centers and institutes, five are faculty development fellows, five are research projects. Eighteen (18) course reassignments have been identified for elimination or conversions to stipends. Each course reassignment counts as \$8,000. She said that further discussion is necessary around course reassignments; e.g., how are the number of course reassignments determined for department chairs, process to receive reassigned time for centers and institutes?

Chair Poundstone thanked Provost Dobkin for such a full report but encouraged a more complete and open reporting of course releases. While salaries should be kept confidential, course releases should be part of the open record. We might need some explanation why certain positions merit more course releases than others, but it is something we will be capable of understanding. He expressed interest in Provost Dobkin's statement that our course release system was often an expensive way to fund administrative and clerical work, and he agreed with her desire to get faculty back in the classroom. In response, Provost Dobkin noted that there was a move to regularize contracts so that administrative positions would not be paid with course releases. In response, Chair Poundstone repeated his hope for more open reporting of courses releases and noted that if some

adjunct positions were largely administrative and funded with course releases, it would be of cost savings to the college if those positions were funded as staff positions and not as faculty lines.

7. Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) – Zach Flanagin reported that the CCIC has chosen to break down the learning goals by groups of four. The first four chosen are 1) critical thinking, 2) shared inquiry, 3) social, historical and global understanding, and 4) global perspectives. Subcommittees have been created for each one of the four goals to determine the learning outcomes. The next task is to decide exactly we want the students to learn in these areas. The CCIC committee members are serving on subcommittees that are not their expertise in order to represent the core curriculum and not their own discipline. Faculty volunteers are needed to serve on the four subcommittees. Open discussions will also be held campus-wide. Each subcommittee will meet for approximately six to eight weeks. At that point, the plan is to bring the proposals forward to the UEPC for approval before moving on to the next four learning goals. The CCIC will continue to meet through the summer.

Zach Flanagin said he will update the UEPC at each of their meetings and ask for feedback throughout the process. It is a conversation about student learning and what we want students to learn in a core curriculum. Our challenge is to identify that as clearly as we can. The next stage will be how to structure the core to allow students the opportunity and resources for success.

Vice Chair Cortright asked which colleges are the principal paradigms? Zack Flanagin answered that five or six examples have been collected, ranging from Santa Clara to the Air Force Academy.

8. Bookstore: Textbook Alternatives - CTO Ed Biglin, Carl Thelen, and Dean Tom Carter reported in response to an issue that was discussed on the ‘faculty’ email relative to delayed availability of textbooks for students for the spring semester. CTO Biglin said that when the Bookstore has a new manager, the issue seems to arise, because they do not tend to order the full number of textbooks required for each student. He added that there are many resources available to help faculty. Dean Carter said faculty can place the textbook on reserve with the Library. The Library can also digitize the first few chapters of a textbook and place them on e-Res, which is an electronic reserve system. The Library can scan articles and book chapters, available through Backboard and the Library website.

CTO Biglin reported there is a growing array of online materials. Many publishers now publish electronic versions of textbooks, which often are less expensive than a printed version. It is possible to have a reader created online, to be delivered electronically to your students. There is an online community used by university and college professors called “merlot.org” (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching) which has a library of materials developed by professors to teach various subjects. There are other online sites where open source textbooks are being created, written collaboratively by a number of faculty at various institutions. Other sites that may be useful: “ichapters.com”, “oerconsortium .org,” (Community College Consortium for Open Educational Resources) or “flatworldknowledge.com.”

NEW BUSINESS

9. Sabbatical Deferral Policy - Chair Poundstone introduced the proposed revision to the sabbatical deferral policy submitted by the Council of Deans. The document addresses three primary changes to the policy: 1) placing the responsibility on the department chairs to address staffing needs when two or more faculty members from a department are on sabbatical, 2) requiring submission of a form to Academic Affairs by March 1st to complete the acceptance and funding process and formalize deferrals (Chair Poundstone added that currently there is no process for faculty to indicate their intention to defer a sabbatical), 3) requiring a faculty member to complete

their sabbatical leave prior to applying for the next sabbatical. The intention of the policy revision is to help in tracking sabbaticals.

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Hilken and SECONDED by Vice Chair Cortright to approve the proposed revision to the policy. Chair Poundstone added that currently there is no process for faculty to indicate their intention to defer a sabbatical. The motion was approved unanimously by hand vote.

(Strike-outs are deletions of current language. Bolded material is new language for 2010-11.)

2.10.1.4 Sabbatical Protocols and Timeline for Consideration

1. On or before August 15th, applicants will ~~consult with the Dean for Faculty Development~~ **submit Form A or Form B (Sabbatical Eligibility) with the appropriate signatures to the Office of Academic Affairs** ~~assess their~~ **to begin the official process of determining** eligibility for sabbatical leave.

2. Upon verification of eligibility, applicants will submit their proposal to the ~~Dean for Faculty Development (or directly~~ **Office of Academic Affairs. Sabbatical proposals from faculty whose eligibility for sabbatical leave has been verified will be forwarded to the Chairs of the UEPC and GEPC through the Office of the Academic Senate. ~~), and~~ **In addition, candidates for sabbatical leave should submit a copy of the proposal** to their department chair or program director on or before September 1 of the year preceding the academic year of the proposed sabbatical. The chair or program director upon receipt of the proposal, will forward to the Dean of the School a brief explanation of the staffing arrangements which will need to be made in the applicant's absence. (Normally, sabbatical faculty are either not replaced or are replaced with part-time faculty; the use of pro-rated or temporary full-time faculty must be approved in writing by the Provost.)**

3. The Dean of the School will review the explanation of staffing arrangements, amend them **in consultation with the chair/program director** if necessary, and confirm the ~~estimate~~ **plan by forwarding it to the Office of Academic Affairs.** In the event of multiple requests from any one department/program, **it is the responsibility of the Department Chair or Program Director to explain how staffing arrangements will meet the needs of the curriculum when more than one faculty member is on sabbatical at the same time and the Dean must approve their** ~~the~~ **proposed timing.** The Dean will forward each explanation of staffing arrangements to the ~~Dean for Faculty Development~~ **Office of Academic Affairs** on or before September 15 of the year preceding the academic year of the proposed leave.

~~4. The Dean for Faculty Development will compile and forward to the Provost all information regarding staffing arrangements. This information will not be distributed to UEPC or GPSEPC members nor considered by them in the deliberations concerning the merit of proposals.~~

~~5~~ **4.** After the deadline for applications has passed, the members of the UEPC and GPSEPC meet jointly to review and evaluate all proposals submitted **to them after the verification process** and rank them in order of merit, indicating as part of the ranking those that do not merit recommendations. The sets of rankings by the individual committee members will then be tallied and an overall ranking of each proposal arrived at. If the overall ranking of one or more proposals cannot be agreed upon by the committee member collectively, the Chairs of the UEPC and GPSEPC will resolve the contended rankings. When the Committees are in agreement on the rankings of all proposals, or the disagreement has been resolved by the Chairs, the proposals will be sent forward to the Provost by the Chairs.

If the total number of qualified proposals is fewer than the number currently approved for that year by the Board of Trustees, the Committees will forward these qualified proposals to the Provost without rankings. If the total number of qualified proposals is greater than the number currently approved, the Committees will forward the approved number without rankings, and will rank the remainder according to the tally previously taken. This group may be further divided into the following categories: a) strongly recommended (as extremely close to the original approved group); b) recommended (as qualified, though not as close in merit as the "strongly recommended" group). In either case, those proposals deemed not qualified will be ranked after the rest but identified to the Provost as "not recommended".

~~6~~ **5.** The Provost will review those sabbatical proposals deemed qualified by the Chairs of the UEPC and GPSEPC. This review will be with respect to (1) fiscal impact and (2) the overall quality of the group of advanced proposals. In the event that the Provost identifies problems pertaining to the overall quality of the proposals advanced by the Chairs of the UEPC and GPSEPC, the Provost will consult with them. Such

consultation will aim at maintaining year-to-year, appropriate and consistent application of the standards for sabbaticals described in the Faculty Handbook.

6. Upon completing the review of the proposals, the Provost will forward the proposals, along with the comments regarding fiscal impact, to the President, who will render the final decision and notify each faculty member in writing, with copies to the Provost, Academic Dean, department chair or program director and the Chairs of the UEPC and GPSEPC. **A faculty member whose sabbatical request is granted by the President must fill out Form C and submit it to the Office of Academic Affairs no later than March 1 of the academic year in which the sabbatical was granted in order to complete the acceptance and funding process.**

7. Upon completion of sabbatical leave, the leave recipient shall submit a written statement to the appropriate Dean of the School and to the Provost within the first academic term after returning which shall describe the nature of the activity engaged in and the extent to which the proposed project was completed. During the academic year of the individual's return, the sabbatical leave recipient, in consultation with the ~~Dean for~~ **Office of Faculty Development**, will offer an appropriate presentation of the sabbatical research to the College community.

8. When sabbatical leave is not granted, the faculty member should be given the opportunity to know the reason for that decision. This information, if requested, will be provided in writing by joint letter of the Chairs of the UEPC and GPSEPC.

9. If a sabbatical leave is recommended by the Chairs of the UEPC and GPSEPC but not approved for funding because of departmental, programmatic, or School circumstances, if a sabbatical leave is funded but must be deferred for personal reasons, or if because of financial exigency there is a reduction in the number formally approved by the College for that year, the sabbatical leave applicant's services during ~~that~~ the year(s) in which he/she might otherwise have been on sabbatical leave shall count toward the next six years of accumulated services toward eligibility for the next sabbatical leave.

10. **Despite any accrued "credit for service" that results from a deferral (see #9 above), a faculty member must have completed one sabbatical leave before applying for the next sabbatical leave. Except for years of service covered under the deferral process described above, a faculty member who accumulates over time more than the six years of service required for sabbatical leave may not carry forward excess accumulated years of service credit toward a subsequent sabbatical.**

10. Faculty Petition to Suspend Implementation of New Course Assignment Policy in the Collegiate Seminar Program - Chair Poundstone asked Ron Ahnen to introduce the petition. The Collegiate Seminar Governing Board has adopted a new course assignment policy; to rotate faculty among all four required seminars, allowing no preference for content. He reported that 18 faculty signatures have been collected to the following petition:

Pursuant to section 1.6.1.2.9(2)d of the Faculty Handbook, I propose the following petition for the Academic Senate's consideration and action regarding the Collegiate Seminar's new course assignment policy. I have gathered at least 10 other signatures to advance this petition as required.

Whereas the Collegiate Seminar Program's new course assignment policy (hereafter "Policy") was not subject to direct input from faculty members at large whom it directly affects, and

whereas the Policy was instituted by a non-elected body, and therefore may not reflect the sense of the faculty at large, and

whereas the problem or problems the Policy was created to redress have not been clearly specified or established by evidence, and

whereas alternatives to the Policy exist that may better address some of the alleged problems thus far identified,

I, and the signatories of this petition, request

a) that the implementation of the Policy be suspended immediately and that the previous policy of stating preferences be reinstated until such time that a new course assignment policy can be devised, and

b) that the goals of any such future change in policy be clearly identified, including the nature and scope of problems that the policy change is attempting to address, and

c) that the process for any substantial changes in seminar policies that directly affect faculty teaching duties include the opportunity for faculty input and discussion, preferably approval by direct vote or by a governing body that is elected by the faculty.

Background: According to the minutes of their October 2009 meeting (available on the Seminar website), members of the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board (CSGB) began a discussion about “upper division course standards” in the program. During that discussion, the issue of faculty preference requests arose and, after some discussion, the new policy was adopted on a 9 to 0 vote. The three sentences referring to this discussion and change are embedded in the middle of the second paragraph in the section about upper division courses (See November 2009 meeting agenda from Collegiate Seminar website). The relevant portion of that section reads as follows:

Professor Davalos suggested looking at the way the Program assigns faculty. Many prefer to teach the same course over and over, while rotating among all the seminars seems to give faculty fresh eyes on the texts and new strategies for assignments. After some discussion, the Board voted to make a policy to rotate faculty among all four required seminars, allowing no preference for content. The Board voted nine to zero to formalize this guideline with the next scheduling process for 2010-11.

Professor Hamaker presented the new policy at the TUG Chairs and Directors meeting on February 16, 2010 because the issue of teaching schedules for the coming year was on the agenda that day. When the chair of the Politics Department informed the members of our department of the new policy, no member was aware of it. In the following week, as we began to talk to colleagues about it, we found that other members of the faculty were equally unaware of this change even though it occurred four months ago.

After the chairs meeting, individual members of our department sought a more complete explanation of the policy directly from Professor Hamaker in the following days of that week. On Sunday, February 21, Professor Hamaker sent a response in which he tried, as best he could, to recapture the essence of the discussion from the October meeting. He gave us permission to share these thoughts with others and these are included here as an appendix.

On Sunday, February 28, I circulated a proposal on behalf of the members of the Politics Department to suspend immediately the implementation of the new course assignment policy. The proposal questioned the process by which the new policy was adopted, and several of the key substantive arguments that we perceived formed the basis for the change in policy. Subsequent in person conversations and email posts to the faculty list serve have made it clear that a variety of views exist about how courses should be assigned in the program, and that the goals of the new policy (or the alleged problems it is trying to solve) are not entirely clear.

Thus, the thrust of my petition is to slow down the process. I am not against change per se, and I welcome a vigorous, inclusive debate about the significance and meaning of the seminar program and its policies. While most of the signatories would seek to change the substance of the policy, some of us feel that the lack of faculty consultation and untimely announcement of the new policy (February, when scheduling is now upon us as opposed to October when it passed) merits its temporary suspension in order to permit consultation. I do not question the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board’s jurisdiction to make policies for the program. For this reason we are not asking that the policy be repealed. We are merely asking for a suspension of its implementation until the faculty has been duly consulted about this issue that directly affects them.

Ron Ahnen explained that with a policy change such as this, there should be faculty input. It has been difficult to ascertain what the perceived problem is that the new policy is intending to solve. Even if preferences are not accepted, how will the course assignments be done? Many faculty are concerned that they had no input into the adoption of the new policy, which speaks to why the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board should be an elected body. The petition is not meant to change, rescind or appeal the policy, but that the new policy be suspended in order to fulfill the requests of the petition (a, b, and c above).

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Cortright and SECONDED by Senator Lind; it is the sense of the Senate that the CSGB should consider carefully sections 'a' and 'b' of the faculty petition to the Academic Senate dated March 3, 2010.

The following comments, questions, and concerns were expressed:

Past Chair Brother Charles spoke against the motion. He said the new policy has value, and it will encourage faculty to speak with one another as learners.

Senator Lind said he reads the petition as more of a call for collaboration in regarding to curricular changes rather an objection to the policy itself.

Vice Chair Cortright explained that his motion refers to petition sections 'a' and 'b' only. Section 'c' would require change in Faculty Handbook language, which is not provided for as part of the faculty petition. This would change substantially the way in which Collegiate Seminar is governed. He further stated that a vibrant community of learning among teachers of the seminar who are involved in all phases of the program is absolutely requisite to the attainment of its ends at SMC. However, when a substantial community is made a matter of rules, that will be the death of the community of learning. He requested that the CSGB revisit its deliberations.

Senator Rokeach said he does not think this issue is appropriate for the Senate. He deferred to those closer to the details of Seminar, their governing board. The Senate is not competent to give advice in this area. Seminar is the only program that involves every single student at SMC, and no program has less quality control than seminar. We must respect them enough to manage their own affairs.

Parliamentarian David Bird responding to Senator Rokeach's concern quoted the Handbook, "All concerns related to the academic life of the College are within the Academic Senate's purview..." The Handbook does give the Senate standing to have an opinion about this subject. However, the Senate cannot suspend bylaws, or change the Handbook language on its own, without process.

Senator Lind suggested that the purpose of the petition will not be accomplished under the current resolution, which does not address section 'c' of the petition. Ron Ahnen acknowledged that Brother Charles (and the CSGB) has a different view on the best way to construct Seminar, and he would encourage a campus-wide discussion of the issues. It is his opinion that by changing the way courses are assigned in Seminar, the CSGB took a strong step away from normal collegial practice, e.g., faculty design their courses, give certain preferences, look at the needs of the department, decide how to rotate courses, in a collegial negotiated way.

Past Chair Brother Charles responded to Ron Ahnen's rationale for normal collegial practice. The Seminar program is going to a rotation system, to remove the question of expertise. Many departments use a rotation system to keep it fair. Rotation as a device in a department is normal operating procedure. Expertise in Seminar is working with groups of students and conducting the conversation around the text, in the pedagogy of the Seminar, not in the books being presented.

Lidia Luquet said the issue of how teaching duties are assigned is worth discussion. Past practice has been that Chairs assign courses. On the other hand, faculty may not wish to take on a new Seminar if they are already taking on a new course in their department during the same time. There are factors to be considered when assigning courses, especially for young faculty.

Barbara McGraw implored the Collegiate Seminar Director to have the conversation; there may be many unintended consequences as a result of the lack of faculty input. The new policy could have a great impact across the campus.

Charles Hamaker explained that he has raised the issue at the TUG chairs meeting. He said he would considered specific pleadings; referring to a situation as described by Lidia Luquet. As a general principle, especially for those that are experienced Seminar teachers, faculty should be willing to teach across the program. He does not think it healthy for faculty to continue to teach the same course for many years. It is impossible for all faculty to receive their preference for course and schedule, so how are courses to be distributed equally?

Interim Dean Wensley said that department chairs are responsible for the course schedule. Ultimately, it rests on faculty to allow the Seminar to make the decision faculty may or may not agree with because they are in charge of the program.

Chair Poundstone noted that some eloquent and persuasive rationale for the Seminar course assignment policy change have been given by faculty such as Alexis Doval, but that they came only after faculty concern was expressed. It would have been preferable if the CSGB had articulated the purpose and reasons for the change to a rotating system as Alexis has done so that there would have been more reason for faculty buy-in, or at least more informed dissent from the policy change. That noted, he said he joined Brother Charles in agreeing with the wisdom of the rotating classes and assuring that faculty teach all Seminar courses. At the same time, he expressed agreement with the petitioners that there be more consultation with the faculty in the formulation and reporting of such decisions.

The question was called. A vote was taken by the Senate on the motion. The motion failed by a hand vote of 2-2 with five abstentions.

11. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator