

Minutes of the Academic Senate January 12, 2011

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 9:00 a.m. on January 12, 2011. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Steve Cortright, Vice Chair Tomas Gomez-Arias, Michael Barram, David Bird, Laura Heid, William Lee, Keith Ogawa, Joan Peterson, and Parliamentarian Joseph Zepeda. Absent with notice were Past Chair Tom Poundstone and Sam Lind.

Also present were: Sam Agronow, Interim Dean Jerry Brunetti, Provost Beth Dobkin, Sue Fallis, Zach Flanagin, Associate Dean Larisa Genin, Christa Kell, Dean Zhan Li, Sue Marston, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Registrar Julia Odom, Jim Sauerberg, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Ed Tywoniak, Sarah Vital, Dean Roy Wensley, Linda Wobbe, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the December 2, 2010 meeting were approved unanimously as submitted.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Cortright submitted a detailed written report (attached). He noted that the proposal before the Senate regarding the creation of the Core Curriculum Committee is timely. In order to be considered in the spring election process, the proposed committee needs to be approved immediately.

4. Provost's Updates - Provost Dobkin reported on the status of administrative searches: The School of Education dean search is in the interview stage; the Dean for Academic Resources search is in the recruiting stage; nominations for Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies will be invited soon, as part of an internal search; the search for Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics has been posted, and the search committee has been constituted: Chair, Steve Woolpert; Jerry Bodily, Zach Flanagin, Larisa Genin, Scott Kier, Br. Richard Lemberg, Mary Volmer, and Hoang Vu.

Provost Dobkin reported that as an institution we are pursuing federal, earmark funds in four general categories: classroom technology, library technology, community partnership for alcohol and substance abuse awareness, and support for first generation and low income students. McAllister and Quinn, a lobbying firm that also consults on grant writing, is helping the college with the earmarks; the firm specializes in representing smaller colleges.

5. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Chair Cortright reported that the single Consent Agenda item, the proposal for the establishment of a study abroad program in Berlin (FU-BEST), was approved unanimously by the UEPC at its December 6th meeting. There being no objection, the proposal was accepted on the Consent Agenda.

On January 5, 2011 the UEPC met for 6.5 hours to consider all but two of the learning outcomes associated with the new core curriculum. A quorum was not present for all aspects of the meeting. At UEPC's next meeting, January 24, the learning outcomes will be the single agenda item.

6. Graduate Programs: Enrollments and Finances – Associate Dean Sindt reported. A detailed written report was submitted, which is on file in the Office of the Academic Senate. Some of the report's highlights follow. The ten year trend in graduate enrollment has remained relatively flat, unlike the ten year trend in professional programs, which has fluctuated dramatically owing to the closure of the School of Extended Education (SEED). Fall 2010 enrollment was 1296, up 12% from 2009. The goal for 2010-2011 enrollment is 850 new students. In the fall, graduate and professional programs accounted for 33% of the total SMC head count. In 2010, 44%

of SMC degrees awarded went to graduate and professional students. 52% of alumni have received their degrees from graduate and professional programs. Graduate and professional students are distributed fairly evenly between the ages of 22 and 64.

Gross revenue for the last fiscal year was \$20.5 million, up 4% from 2009. Net revenue as a percentage of gross revenue was 29% in 2010, up 3% from 2009. Graduate and professional programs set their tuitions individually, based on the markets for specific programs. \$20,541 is the average net tuition/student by FTE in the undergraduate college. For the graduate and professional college, the average by FTE is \$25,200.

OLD BUSINESS

7. Resolution to Amend Senate Action S-09/10-22: Proposal Concerning .25 Courses – Vice Chair Gomez-Arias introduced the Resolution. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias, and SECONDED by Senator Barram to accept the Resolution. Vice Chair Gomez-Arias explained that the Senate approved a Resolution last year regarding .25 credit courses. Several concerns have surfaced regarding the implementation of the Senate's proposal. One of the concerns was how to differentiate activity courses from academic courses. The resolution required partial credit courses to receive a letter grade in order to be counted toward graduation. The Registrar has since pointed out that there are programs in which pass/fail partial credit courses do count toward graduation. Therefore, the following Resolution was offered to amend the original Senate Action:

WHEREAS Senate Action S-09/10-22 provides, in its preambular language, “Whereas .25 courses will cumulate towards the 36 credits required for graduation if, and only if, they are recorded with letter grades A through D”; and

WHEREAS Senate Action S-09/10-22 provides, in its operative language, “. . . that a maximum enrollment of twelve .25 credit courses which are awarded a letter grade A through D may count toward a student’s graduation requirements . . .”; and **WHEREAS** (as noted by the Registrar) students undertake .25 courses for diverse reasons, ranging from unqualified interest to meeting major requirements, while—corresponding to these differences in purpose—departments and programs offer .25 courses on a Pass/Fail or letter grade basis; and

WHEREAS contrary to the implication of the preambular language of Senate Action S-09/1-22, noted above, the Registrar grants credit toward graduation for Pass/Fail .25 (as for Pass/Fail 1.0) credit courses; and

WHEREAS the above-noted language of Senate Action S-09/10-22 requires, in the Registrar’s estimation, application of an infeasible distinction—viz., in grading structures and credit audits—among .25 courses; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED (1) that the preambular language of Senate Action S-09/10-22 beginning “Whereas . . .” and concluding “. . . with letter grades A through D” be stricken and (2) that from the operative language “**Be it resolved**, . . . and that a maximum enrollment of twelve .25 credit courses which are awarded a letter grade of A through D may count towards a student’s graduation requirements (which is the current policy cap)” the phrase “which are awarded a letter grade of A through D” be stricken, so that the amended, operative language of Senate Action S-09/10-22 will read:

Be it resolved, that the Senate recommend to the administration that a policy be implemented that distinguishes between .25 courses and .50 courses; that each semester’s full tuition qualifies a student for an unlimited number of .25 courses upon approval of the student’s advisor; and that a maximum enrollment of twelve .25 courses may count towards a student’s graduation requirements (which is the current policy cap).

Chair Cortright added that in light of the impending implementation of the new core curriculum and the developing outcomes under Pathways for Knowledge, and in particular for Artistic Understanding, we can expect a large number of SMC undergraduates to offer .25 courses to fulfill the artistic practice segment of that outcome. Under general academic regulations, students are limited to three course equivalents of .25 or partial credit courses for graduation credit.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias referred to the Resolution’s request that administration implement a policy that distinguishes between .25 courses and .50 courses; he asked whether Vice Provost Sweeney or Registrar, Julia Odom, had a suggestion as to what that policy would be. Vice Provost Sweeney suggested that it would be more appropriate that either the AARC or the UEPC work with the Registrar’s office to develop criteria regarding contact hours and content of a course for a .25 or a .50 course.

Vice Provost Sweeney explained that what was approved last year and remains unchanged is the ability of undergraduate students to take an unlimited number of .25 courses without an additional tuition charge, which is in line with similar institutions. A roll call vote was taken on the Resolution as follows:

Steve Cortright	Present	Laura Heid	Yes
Tomas Gomez-Arias	Abstain	Joan Peterson	Yes
Keith Ogawa	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	William Lee	Yes

The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

NEW BUSINESS

8. Acceptance of the UEPC Report: “Position Description, Director of the Core Curriculum” – Chair Cortright explained that the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee submitted a proposal for the Director of the Core Curriculum to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee. The UEPC met on January 5, 2011 to discuss the proposed position description, Director of the Core Curriculum. The document, as amended by the UEPC, was presented to the Senate for consideration (see below). A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Barram to accept the following UEPC Report on the Position Description for the Director of the Core Curriculum.

(As amended by the UEPC, 5 January, 2011, on a vote of 7 aye, 1 nay, 0 abstaining.)

Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum

The Director of the Core Curriculum Committee is a full-time faculty member who is chosen for a multi-year term to oversee the Core Curriculum, and who serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate. The first Director will be selected in the Spring of 2011 by a search committee made up of two members each from the Academic Senate, the UEPC, and the CCIC. The initial term will be five years, with subsequent Directors serving three-year terms. Subsequent directors will be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the chair of the UEPC and the director of the CCC and confirmed by Senate majority vote. Initially, the Director will receive three course-equivalent reassigned times each academic year.

The duties of the Director of the Core Curriculum are as follows:

1. Chair and provide leadership of the Core Curriculum Committee, ensuring that it fulfills its mandated responsibilities.
2. Establish the seven Core Curriculum Committee working groups based on Core Goals and supervise the selection of faculty to fill those positions, with the assistance of the other CCC faculty members.
3. Address procedural and policy issues that arise in regard to the day-to-day operation of the Core program.
4. Keep abreast of national trends in general education, and initiate consideration of needed reforms in the SMC Core Curriculum Program.
5. Adjudicate student issues and petitions regarding the student’s meeting of Core requirements.
6. Maintain lists of courses that satisfy particular goals and provide appropriate entries in the Catalog of Courses to guide students and faculty regarding Core requirements.
7. Work with department chairs, program directors, and deans to assure equitable staffing from the various units that are involved in providing courses for the Core.
8. Develop and direct workshops to stimulate good teaching in the Core Curriculum Program and to provide a coherent professional development component for faculty teaching in the Core.
9. Develop budget plans and oversee budget expenditures for the program.
10. Supervise any staff who provide administrative support for the CCC.
11. Report as required to the Academic Senate and to the Provost on matters concerning the Core Curriculum Program, such as curriculum, assessment of learning, staffing, budget, and implementation components.
12. Initiate periodic assessment of student learning in the SMC Core Curriculum Program and report on the results.
13. Supervise, in collaboration with the CCC, the rotating schedule of regular review of the policies, overall structure, and specific components of the Core, and make recommendations to the Academic Senate for any needed changes, based on assessment measures and evaluations supervised by the CCC.

Provost Dobkin stated that she considers the core curriculum as the purview of the faculty. However, she would consider items 5-10 in the list of duties as administrative functions rather than curricular functions. Relative to item #11, she questioned the reporting structure of the position to the Academic Senate. Zach Flanagin noted that there had been much discussion among the CCIC about the reporting structure; comparing the responsibilities and reporting structure to the January Term and Collegiate Seminar departments. The intent is to keep administration of the core exclusively a faculty responsibility.

Vice Provost Sweeney said that currently all academic departments report to an administrator and she suggested that it would be more appropriate for this position to report to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, allowing for coordination and collaboration with the Deans and Chairs; curriculum directors across the country typically report to a dean. Senate membership changes each year, and shifting membership could threaten the continuity/consistency of administration over time. She recommended changing #7 and #11 to include the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, and suggested that the Senate consider the role of the Registrar in #5 (adjudicating student issues and petitions).

Provost Dobkin voiced support for the view that faculty facilitate the core curriculum implementation, but noted that her office is responsible for providing scheduling and budgets. In her perception, the proposal folds two distinct functions things into the director position: she could envision both a faculty chair of the CCC, to oversee the process of curriculum implementation and review, and an administrative Director, to manage requisite, budget-driven structures in support of implementation,

Dean Woolpert noted that deans sign off on budget expenditures, respond to student petitions and appeals, and support chairs through consultation. Neither the Senate nor a Senate committee would wish to take on these sorts of responsibilities. Vice Provost Sweeney confirmed that she meets regularly with the Directors of Collegiate Seminar and Jan Term. She strongly advocated that the position report to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, noting that the Vice Provost position also serves as a liaison to the Provost, Provost's Council, and the Cabinet.

UEPC member, Christa Kell, observed that it was the deliberate intention of the UEPC that the core remain within the jurisdiction of the faculty, although admittedly, some of the responsibilities of the position may not be the best use of faculty time. UEPC Chair Moseidjord agreed that the motivation of the UEPC membership is to have faculty control of all important policy decisions.

Chair Cortright summarized that the concerns raised from the floor could be addressed by revising #5, 9, and 11 of the detailed position description. He noted that the wording in #11, "Report as required to the Academic Senate..." was being used in two senses: "subject to the authority of" and "letting partners know what you are doing." Rather than describe an administrative reporting line, the proposal's wording stipulates that the CCC will provide reports in the second sense to the Senate. By way of clarification, a MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to amend the wording as follows (added language in bold):

Amend the first paragraph: "...who serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate, **and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics.**"

Amend #5, "**In coordination with the Registrar**, adjudicates student issues..."

Neither Zach Flanagin, for CCIC, nor Asbjorn Moseidjord, for UEPC, saw any objection in the proposed amendments. Senate Action S-10/11-13, establishing the Core Curriculum Committee as a whole will be sufficient to insure faculty control. A roll call vote was taken on the amendments as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes	William Lee	Yes
Keith Ogawa	Yes		

The amendments were approved by a vote of 7-0-0. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Senator Bird commented that it appears as though the intention was to make the working of the committee as impervious as possible to administrative interference. Provost Dobkin replied that she understands the motivation behind the proposal; however, the proposed structure is not likely to solve the issue.

A roll call vote was then taken on the amended Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes	William Lee	Yes
Keith Ogawa	Abstain		

The document was approved by a vote of 6-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

9. Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core, and Working Groups – Chair Cortright introduced the Handbook Language establishing the Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core, and Working Groups. A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Bird to accept the following resolution.

Resolved, the *Faculty Handbook* shall be amended to reflect Senate Actions S-10/11-9 and S-10/11-13, as follows. Add the sections, or add to the sections, designated:

1.7.4.13 Core Curriculum Committee

Role: *Core Curriculum* signifies the foundational and essential learning expected of all undergraduate students at Saint Mary’s College (as articulated in Learning Goals, Outcomes and Rationales) and the processes by which students achieve that learning (i.e., approved courses and other experiences). Under the leadership of the Director, and in accordance with Senate Action S-10/11-09, the Core Curriculum Committee administers and evaluates policy governing the Core Curriculum: course/experience review (through Working Groups) and approval; assessment of student learning; assessment and development of the Core as a whole and in its elements; intra- and extramural presentation of the Core *via* catalogues, course lists, published guidelines, workshops, *et al.*

Membership: the permanent membership of the Core Curriculum Committee includes:

- Director of the Core Curriculum (chairperson, voting), a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, nominated to a three-year term by the Senate Executive Committee, UEPC Chair and out-going Director, and confirmed by majority vote of Academic Senate, at whose pleasure the Director serves;
- six ranked members of the undergraduate faculty (voting): 2 elected from the School of Liberal Arts, 2 from the School of Science, 1 from the School of Economics and Business Administration, and 1 from the undergraduate faculty at large, for staggered, three-year terms;
- Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics (or designee) (*ex officio*, non-voting);
- Vice Provost for Student Life (or designee) (*ex officio*, non-voting);
- Registrar (or designee) (*ex officio*, non-voting);
- Undergraduate representative chosen by the ASSMC (non-voting).

Director’s Duties: as the Core Curriculum Committee’s executive, the Director facilitates the Core’s day-to-day

operation; acts as liaison to the undergraduate faculty at large and to academic officers and bodies of the College; oversees budgetary and staff support; coordinates intra- and extramural assessment, *et al.*, according to Senate Action S-10/11-13; the Director receives yearly reassigned course equivalences commensurate with the office's demands.

Meetings: The Core Curriculum Committee is convened according to a schedule drawn up by the Director.

1.7.4.14 Core Curriculum Working Groups

Role: Core Curriculum Working Groups function as subcommittees of the Core Curriculum Committee, as provided under Senate Action S-10/11-9: the Groups recommend, for inclusion in the core curriculum, courses that fulfill outcomes under the Core learning goals, according to guidelines established by the Core Curriculum Committee. Working Groups are convened by the Director of the Core Curriculum, each with specific responsibilities under the Core Learning Goals, as follows:

- Group HM (Habits of Mind);
- Group MS (Math and Science);
- Group AU (Artistic Understanding);
- Group TU (Theological Understanding);
- Group HC (Historical, Social, and Cultural Understanding);
- Group CG/CE (Common Good/Community Engagement);
- Group AD/GP (American Diversity/Global Perspectives).

Membership: Each Working Group consists in:

- Working Group Chair (a member of the Core Curriculum Committee designated by the Director of the Core Curriculum);
- four members of the undergraduate faculty confirmed by vote of the Academic Senate on the recommendation of the Core Curriculum Committee.

Eligibility: The Core Curriculum Committee consults relevant deans and department chairs, and considers self-nominations by members of the under-graduate faculty, in pursuit of a mix of disciplinary experts and interested non-experts fitted to the specific responsibilities of each Working Group.

Meetings: Working Groups will be convened when, and as—in the judgment of the Director and Group Chairs—the volume of material for review requires.

Add “Core Curriculum Committee” to the section under 2.6.1, *viz.*:

2.6.1 **Service to the College**

It is the responsibility of faculty to present clear evidence of their effective service to the College. Faculty service should be shared by all. A faculty member is not expected to serve at one time on more than one committee which has an intensive workload. Upon completion of a full term on an intensive workload committee (Academic Senate, Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee, Rank and Tenure, Faculty Welfare, Program Review Committee, Core Curriculum Committee) a faculty member may ask for exemption from the election process for one year through the chair of the Committee on Committees.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias suggested that due to the amended Position Description the Senate just approved, that an amendment must be in order to the Handbook Language describing the membership under: “1.7.4.13 Core Curriculum Committee”. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to amend the first paragraph under ‘Membership’ as follows (new language in bold):

“Director of the Core Curriculum (chairperson, voting), a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, nominated to a three-year term by the Senate Executive Committee, UEPC Chair and out-going Director, and confirmed by majority vote of Academic Senate. ~~at whose pleasure the Director serves;~~ **The Director serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics;**”

There being no discussion, the following roll call vote was taken on the amendment:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes	William Lee	Yes

Keith Ogawa Yes

The amendment was approved by a vote of 7-0-0. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

The Chair asked for a roll call vote on the amended document as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes	William Lee	Yes
Keith Ogawa	Yes		

The document was approved by a vote of 7-0-0. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

10. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator

Chair's Report
Academic Senate General Meeting
Wednesday, January 12, 2011

Announcements

Final Reminder
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 Learning Outcomes (and their Rationales), proposed for the new Core Curriculum; questions on the curriculum's (proposed) overall shape and administration will also be addressed. 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 UEPC and Senate action on the Core Learning Outcomes. UEPC will meet on 24 January; Senate action should commence with the General Meeting of 10 February, 2011.

A buffet dinner will be served Tuesday evening, a lunch on Wednesday, for the convenience of attendees.

By way of assuring a sufficiency,
PLEASE RSVP IMMEDIATELY TO
cmichalo@stmarys-ca.edu or scortrig@stmarys-ca.edu

Remarks on the Agenda for 12 January, 2011

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

C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)

UEPC met in extraordinary session on 6 December and, again, on 5 January. The result of the December 6 meeting appears on the Consent Agenda as Senate approval (following a unanimous, 8-0-0, UEPC vote) of the IPCC proposal for a new SMC-sponsored program of study abroad, *viz.*: **Freie Universität Berlin and Berlin European Studies Program (FU-BEST)**.

At the January 5 meeting, the UEPC approved (on a vote of 7 – 1 – 1) an amended version of CCIC's proposed "Position Description, Director of the Core Curriculum." The CCIC original and the amended UEPC version are in the Senators' hands. In accordance with Senate Action S-10/11-10 (2 December, 2010), the UEPC version informs—in conjunction with Senate Action S-10/11-9, Core Curriculum Committee (2 December, 2010)—item B under New Business, "Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups," which is cast as amendments to the *Faculty Handbook*.

Now, like Senate Action S-10/11-9, the UEPC "Position Description" (1) contains matter that belongs *ad hoc* to the "start-up" phase of the new Core, and therefore does not belong in the Handbook (to which permanent features of College governance are reserved); and (2) as a position description, the document descends to specificities that—like the full descriptions of other College positions entered in the Handbook—constitute a level of detail inappropriate for the Handbook. Nevertheless, both the *ad hoc* matter and the position detail fall

under the Senate's authority, and should be recorded officially for future reference. Like the Core Curriculum Committee document, then, the UEPC "Position Description, Director of the Core Curriculum" should be made a Senate Action, recorded verbatim. For that reason it appears as Item A under New Business.

For the balance of a marathon, **6+-hour** meeting, 11:00am – 5:45pm, the UEPC reviewed Learning Outcomes and associated Rationales proposed by the CCIC and its working sub-committees for the new core curriculum. Results of these deliberations have been incorporated into an omnibus document, compiled by the Chairs of the Senate, CCIC and UEPC, under the editorship of CCIC co-chair, Jim Sauerberg (to whom special thanks are owing): "Saint Mary's College New Core Curriculum." The document will be distributed to all undergraduate faculty, and will serve as the primary reference for common deliberation at the Special General Meetings of Tuesday and Wednesday, 11-12 January, and beyond.

D. Report on Graduate Programs: Enrollments and Finances

Over the last several weeks, and in the Chair's hearing, Associate SOLA Dean, Chris Sindt, has provided the College Budget Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and Provost's Council of Deans with arresting data on the present scope, enrollment, and financial contribution of Saint Mary's College's diverse graduate programs. Following Vice Provost for Enrollment, Micheal Beseda's, October 1 report on undergraduate enrollments (and following deliberation on Senate Action S-10/11-7, recommending creation of the Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies), Senators have requested comparable, regular reportage on the College's graduate undertakings. Associate Dean Sindt has graciously agreed to inaugurate this reporting.

***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, was postponed to the January 12 Agenda on a hand vote, owing to the unavoidable absences of the Registrar, Julia Odom, and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, Frances Sweeney. The resolution arises from a finding by the Registrar, seconded by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, namely: the proposal's original language entails an imperative to the Registrar's Office to the effect 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. Thus the original Action: ". . . 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 libidum*.

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

A. Acceptance of the UEPC Report: Position Description, Director of the Core Curriculum

The Senators have in hand the UEPC document **Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum**, the UEPC Minutes for 6 January, 2011, and the original CCIC proposal, **Position Description and Duties**, which the UEPC document substantially amends. For the convenience of Senators, there follows a comparison (cf. UEPC Minutes, 6 January, pp. 1–2, under 2A) of the CCIC original and amended UEPC versions, in relevant part (additions underlined; deletions bracketed):

CCIC Proposal

The Director of the Core Curriculum Committee is a full-time faculty member who is chosen for a multi-year term to oversee the Core Curriculum. The first Director will be selected in the Spring of 2011 by a search committee made up of two members each from the Academic Senate, the UEPC, and the CCIC. The initial term will be five years, with subsequent Directors serving three-year terms. Subsequent directors will be [chosen by the recommendation of the CCC, the Senate, and the UEPC.] The Director will receive three course-equivalent reassigned times each academic year.

The duties of the Director of the Core Curriculum are as follows:

Adjudicate student issues and petitions regarding the meeting of Core Goals.

Initiate periodic assessment of the SMC Core Curriculum Program and report on the results.

UEPC Amendment

The Director of the Core Curriculum Committee is a full-time faculty member who is chosen for a multi-year term to oversee the Core Curriculum, and who serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate. The first Director will be selected in the Spring of 2011 by a search committee made up of two members each from the Academic Senate, the UEPC, and the CCIC. The initial term will be five years, with subsequent Directors serving three-year terms. Subsequent directors will be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the chair of the UEPC and the director of the CCC and confirmed by Senate majority vote. ~~Initially,~~ the Director will receive three course-equivalent reassigned times each academic year.

The duties of the Director of the Core Curriculum are as follows:

Adjudicate student issues and petitions regarding the student's meeting of Core requirements.

Initiate periodic assessment of student learning in the SMC Core Curriculum Program and report on the results.

With respect to Senate Action S-10/11-10, Senators should note well the UEPC 6 January Minutes under 2.B. Final UEPC review of the charge and membership of the CCC, including the position description and duties of the director of the Core Curriculum:

A motion to approve, simultaneously, the position description of the CCC director contained in the CCIC proposal as amended and approved under agenda item 2.A. and the remanded composition and charge of the CCC as contained in *ACT10-119corecurcom_000* was offered and seconded.

During the following discussion, one amendment was offered as follows:

Under section I, second full bullet point, first open bullet point, shorten the sentence to read:

“Subsequent directors will serve for 3-year terms.”

The motion, as amended, was approved with 7 votes in favor, 1 opposed, and zero abstaining.

In sum, UEPC has amended the CCIC proposal, **Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum**, and, in accord with Senate Action S-10/11-10, has reconciled the result with the text of Senate Action S-10/11-9 and approved the whole.

For the reasons given above in the Chair’s UEPC liaison report, the Chair requests that the Senate officially accept the UEPC-amended **Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum**. A motion and second *ad libidum* from among the Senators will be required. If moved and passed, such a motion will render the whole document—including temporary provisions, and detail of the Director’s position description, that are not destined for the Handbook—a recorded, prescriptive Senate Action.

Amendments to the UEPC **Position Description** are in order. The Chair asks that Senators who wish to offer amendments have ready, if required, additional language reconciling the changes with Senate Action S-10/11/09 (Core Curriculum Committee) or the Handbook amendments that appear under **NEW BUSINESS B.**, “Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups,” of the Agenda.

B. Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups

In accordance with Senate Action S-10/11-10, the Senate

(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,

amendments to the Faculty Handbook—reflecting the combined Senate Action S-10/11-9 (Core Curriculum Committee) and UEPC-amended **Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum**, so as to establish a Core Curriculum Committee, the position of Director of the Core Curriculum, and Working Groups for review of (proposed) core curricula—are proposed, with the agreement of the Chairs of the Academic Senate, CCIC, and UEPC.

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

Except as offered to correct alleged inaccuracy or inadequacy, or as required by Senate action under New Business, A., of the orders for the day, amendments to the resolution are *not* in order. (Motions to reconsider any Senate Action may, of course, be proposed for future Agenda under the standing rules.)

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright
Chair Academic Senate