

**Minutes of the General Meeting  
Of the Academic Senate**

**March 24, 2011**

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 3:00 p.m. on March 24, 2011. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chairperson Steve Cortright, Vice Chairperson Tomas Gomez-Arias, Past Chairperson Tom Poundstone, Keith Ogawa, Michael Barram, Laura Heid, Sam Lind, Joan Peterson, David Bird, William Lee and Parliamentarian Joseph Zepeda.

Also present were: Kara Boatman, Robert Bulman, Provost Beth Dobkin, Zach Flanagin, Cynthia Ganote, Associate Dean Larisa Genin, Charles Hamaker, Chris Jones, Dean Zhan Li, Barbara McGraw, Kathy Porter, Jim Sauerberg, Vice Provost Chris Sindt, Mindy Thomas, Marshall Welch, Dean Roy Wensley, Linda Wobbe, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the March 3, 2011 meeting were approved as amended.

**REPORTS**

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Cortright submitted a detailed written report (copy attached).

4. Provost's Updates - Provost Dobkin reported that there will be an update on the Faculty Salary Policy on April 13, 2011 during community time. The search committee for the Dean for Academic Resources is in the process of scheduling interviews during the month of April. The search committee for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics will meet on March 31 to review the applicant pool. The academic blueprint will be part of President Br. Ronald's address to the Lafayette community on March 31st. She anticipates a change in the way in which faculty contracts are administered for the coming year: for most ranked faculty, individualized contracts will be replaced with letters of appointment.

5. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) - The following items were approved unanimously by the UEPC and placed on the Senate's Consent Agenda:

- a. Department of Art and Art History: Revision of Studio Art Major to Art Practice Major;
- b. Guidelines for Individualized Majors;
- c. Economics Concentration in Sustainability Studies.

No objection was noted from the Senators; all items were accepted on the Consent Agenda.

6. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) - Senator Bird reported that the final report from the 2009-2010 AARC will be forwarded to the Senate in the near future. The AARC has been unproductive this year as it has been difficult to get a quorum together, and it has been difficult to get other entities of the college to respond to requests for information.

7. Committee on Committees (CoC) - Vice Chair Gomez-Arias reported that the Preference Surveys for the spring faculty elections have been distributed, and the nomination ballot will be finalized shortly. The CoC is also working on clarifying Faculty Handbook language regarding faculty elections.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Lee to alter the orders of the day and move New Business ahead of Old Business on the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

**NEW BUSINESS**

8. Add Math 002 and Math 012 to the Undergraduate Catalog - Chair Cortright introduced the proposal which was forwarded to the Senate from the UEPC. The UEPC vote on the item was 6-3 with one abstention.

A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Senator Heid to accept the UEPC report. Chair Cortright explained that the report recommends that Math 002 and Math 012 become part of the catalog and be offered for credit; however, they do not fulfill the Area B requirement. Chair Cortright added that it is possible that these two courses will not fulfill new core curriculum requirements for Mathematical and Scientific Understanding. The intent is to make permanent two remedial courses for students with math skills below those normally expected at college entry. Evidence from the courses' experimental offering is that Math 002 and 012 improve results in the regular mathematics curriculum, thereby also improving student retention. There is no reason to doubt that these courses address some students' needs.

In the UEPC deliberations, some expressed concern that courses whose content is normally covered at the pre-college level would earn college credit. It was noted that SMC already offers a similar course in English 3. If approved, Math 002 and Math 012 would join English 3 in the Catalog as offered for credit without fulfilling any departmental or college area requirement.

Chair Cortright expressly noted that at no time during the UEPC conversation had any aspect of the Mathematics Department's handling of this matter fallen under question. The sole question raised among members of the UEPC is whether we should be granting college credit for these courses.

Kathy Porter summarized the case for offering Math 002 and 012 for credit. The courses reflect common practice: Professor Porter offered a list of schools that offer similar courses for credit. The courses are designed to bring the students up to an appropriate level to move on to collegiate or departmental requirements in mathematics; recent experience is that without these courses many of the students will fail and have to repeat courses, with unwanted effect on retention and timely movement toward graduation. The question of collegiate credit affects students' financial aid: without credit for the course, students' eligibility for financial aid can be compromised. The notion of requiring the courses without credit, prior to regular enrollment, is not feasible: SMC uses a math placement test, along with Math SAT and high school recommendations; SMC summer school is over before the results of the placement test are received.

Provost Dobkin said typically remedial math courses at other institutions appear on a transcript, appear on the schedule, qualify for financial aid, affect students' GPA, and do not substitute as credit for graduation, as is proposed for Math 002 and 012.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Abstain	Sam Lind	Yes
Tom Poundstone	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes

Keith Ogawa	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	William Lee	Yes
Laura Heid	Yes		

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

## OLD BUSINESS

9. Resolution to Amend of Senate Actions S-10/11-12 and S-10/11-13 - Chair Cortright introduced the resolution. He explained that the Senate had received, on 6 March, a response from Provost Dobkin to the approved Senate Actions outlining the Position Description and Duties of the Director of the Core Curriculum and outlining the structure of the Core Curriculum Committee (Senate Actions S-10/11-12 and S-10/11-13) approved at the Senate's January 12, 2011 General Meeting. The Provost objected to the Director of the Core Curriculum: the duties ascribed to the Director are inconsistent with comparable positions in the Handbook; the selection process (Senate confirmation) as outlined is inappropriate and inconsistent with established practices. The Provost objected that "while the Senate identifies general roles and responsibilities for academic administrators, the Senate does not define their duties in detail or total." By contrast, the Senate had understood itself to be acting under its plenary Handbook authority (1.6.1.2.2 at 3 and at 6) to define the procedures and membership of faculty committees of the College.

The Executive Committee met with the Provost on March 9 to discuss the issue since, whatever one's view of the extent of Senate prerogative in the matter, substantive amendment to the Handbook, requiring Provost's approval under Handbook 1.8, is in view. The amended language being proposed was the result of that meeting.

A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Vice chair Gomez-Arias to adopt the following Resolution.

### Resolution to Amend Senate Actions S-10/11-12 and S-10/11-13

**Resolved:** Senate Action S-10/11-12 shall be amended as follows (deletions are ~~struck~~; additions are in **bold**) . . .

#### Position Description and Duties: ~~Director~~ **Chair** of the Core Curriculum **Committee**

The ~~Director~~ **Chair** of the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) 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 and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. The first ~~Director~~ **Chair** 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~~ **Chairs** serving three-year terms. Subsequent ~~Directors~~ **Chairs** will be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the chair of the UEPC and the out-going ~~director~~ **Chair** of the CCC and confirmed by Senate majority vote. Initially, the ~~Director~~ **Chair** will receive three course-equivalent reassigned times each academic year.

The duties of the ~~Director~~ **Chair** of the Core Curriculum **Committee** are as follows:

1. ~~Chair and provide leadership of~~ **Lead** 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. ~~In coordination with the Registrar, adjudicate student issues and petitions regarding the student's meeting of Core requirements.~~
6. ~~5.~~ Maintain lists of courses that satisfy particular goals and provide appropriate entries for 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. ~~6.~~ Develop and direct workshops to stimulate good teaching in the Core Curriculum 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.~~
12. ~~7.~~ Initiate periodic assessment of student learning in the SMC Core Curriculum Program and report on the results.
13. ~~8.~~ 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.
14. ~~9.~~ Report as ~~required~~ **provided above, and as circumstance may recommend**, to the Academic Senate and to the **Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics** on ~~matters concerning the functioning of the Core Curriculum Program, such as curriculum: e.g., on the development of curricular and co-curricular components, on~~ assessment of learning, staffing, budget, and implementation components **on the adequacy of staffing and budget, on the results of program review, and so on.**
10. **Consult with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, the Registrar, and Deans, respectively, on budget planning and administrative support for core curricular programming; on policies for the adjudication of issues regarding students' fulfillment of Core requirements; on policies for the equitable staffing of core curricular offerings, and so on, as befits Saint Mary's system of shared governance.**

. . . and Senate Action S-10/11-13 shall be amended: add, or add to, the designated sections of the *Faculty Handbook* as follows (deletions are ~~struck~~; additions are in **bold**):

#### 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~~ **Chair**, 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~~ **Chair** of the Core Curriculum **Committee** (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~~ **Chair**, and confirmed by majority vote of Academic Senate. The ~~Director~~ **Chair** serves at the pleasure of the Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics;

- 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 Chair's Duties:* as the Core Curriculum Committee's executive, the ~~Director~~ **Chair** 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~~ consults on budgetary and staff support; coordinates intra- and extramural assessment, *et al.*, according to Senate Action S-10/11-12; the ~~Director~~ **Chair** 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~~ **Chair**.

#### 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~~ **Chair** of the Core Curriculum **Committee**, 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~~ **Chair** of the Core Curriculum **Committee**);
- 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~~ Core Curriculum Committee Chair 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.

Past Chair Poundstone questioned the deletion of #9 and #10, regarding budget plans and supervision of staff. Wouldn't the Chair supervise administrative staff? Does the change from “director” to “chair” lessen the grade of the administrative support position? The proposed position is very different from the position of Director of Jan Term or Director of Seminar; especially in terms of generating courses, staffing and evaluating faculty and significant budgets. However, it could be seen as equal in terms of oversight responsibility for the undergraduate core curriculum.

Senator Barram said he is concerned with the change to “chair” from “director” given the campus-wide curricular issue. The Provost responded that that “directors” are appointment positions, not elected positions.

Professor Flanagan noted his concern with the omission of #5. The new language does not state who will do the adjudicating, whereas in the original #5 it states, “in coordination with...” Chair Cortright said it is difficult to image a future case that would not be amenable to adjudication as is now conducted, through informal resolution at the department level and, if required, mediation at the level of the dean. The Provost added that it is to be hoped that most issues will be resolved at the chair level.

Professor Sauerberg questioned whether the “directors” of the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board (CSGB) and January Term will become “Chairs”, as the committees move to elected bodies. Will they also be stripped of budgetary control and of signatory control of petitions?

Past Chair Poundstone explained that even though the membership of Jan Term and CSGB will now be elected, the directors are to be appointed, administrative positions, whereas, the chair can be elected/appointed by the Senate.

Chair Cortright noted that we are—that the College is—venturing into unknown territory. The type of cooperative, faculty-administrative, venture that the core curriculum and its governance represent has not been essayed previously at Saint Mary's. He is loath to prognosticate where things will go, since much will depend on the *modus vivendi* forged by the initial incumbents—Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics—as the venture is launched. What can be predicted is a commitment together, as administrators and members of the faculty, to make the new core

curriculum function well for our students. In the meantime, the Executive Committee has sought a compromise with the Provost, while preserving: 1) the core curriculum as a faculty process, and 2) assurance that the execution of the faculty design remains in the hands of faculty and that the Senate will evaluate the undertakings of faculty officers.

A roll call vote was taken to adopt the Resolution to Amend as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-1. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

10. Adoption of the Learning Outcomes for the New Core Curriculum - The proposed Learning Outcomes were introduced by Chair Cortright via the continuing Chair's Agenda. Previously the Senate considered Agendum 1 through 21; discussion continued where it left off at the General Meeting of 3 March, with Agendum #22.

## **SOCIAL, HISTORICAL, AND CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING**

**Agendum 22** - A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Heid to adopt the Learning Outcomes (LO) under Social, Historical, and Cultural Understanding. Chair Cortright announced that the UEPC approved the Learning Outcomes by a 6-0-0 vote.

Senator Ogawa noted that LO#3 employs Social Science or Historical Methodologies, and that once again the Senate was coming up against the issue of ethics: why should language prescribing inquiry into the ethical implications of the social and historical disciplines be lacking from the LO? Chair Cortright noted that argument had been advanced—in the CCIC, UEPC and the Senate—to the effect that in the case of Social, Historical, and Cultural Methodologies, the question of human values are intrinsically proposed in the methods themselves.

Past Chair Poundstone observed that in the Learning Goals for both Theological Understanding and Mathematical and Scientific Understanding, ethical inquiry is specified, but was not addressed in the Learning Outcomes. In this case, ethical inquiry is not specified in the Learning Goal; therefore, it is not necessary to make it explicit in the LO. He agreed with Chair Cortright's description of the implicit character of the value question. Senator Ogawa was concerned with explicit, as opposed to implicit, goals or expectations. Professor Poundstone wished also to register his concern that ethical reflection is not explicitly prescribed throughout the curriculum.

Professor McGraw asked whether it is possible to teach an Economics class that might fulfill this Learning Outcome without touching on ethics. Professor of Economics, Kara Boatman, answered that it would be quite possible, but would represent entirely irresponsible pedagogy.

A roll call vote on the motion to adopt the Learning Outcomes was taken as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 7-1 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

**Agendum 23** - A MOTION was made by Past Chair Poundstone and SECONDED by Senator Bird to adopt the Rationale under Social, Historical, and Cultural Understanding. Chair Cortright announced that the UEPC approved the Rationale by a 6-0-0 vote. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

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

Senator Ogawa explained that he must vote “no”; that he has great faith in his colleagues in the School of Science, and that they, too, are ethical individuals and would find it irresponsible to ignore any ethical issue within their discipline.

The motion was approved by a vote of 7-1 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

**Agendum 24** - Chair Cortright asked for a vote on the adoption of the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Social, Historical, and Cultural Understanding. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 7-1 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

## THE COMMON GOOD

**Agendum 25** - A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Barram to adopt the Learning Outcomes under The Common Good. Chair Cortright announced that the UEPC approved the Rationale by a 6-0-0 vote.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias noted the emphasis on writing, but it is not expressly stated in the Rationale. Senator Bird said he read that as an assessment. He likes the emphasis on writing, but he sees that a student could fulfill the LO without writing.

The LOs are designed so that that students will complete two of the three listed, which is a somewhat different approach that that taken in other LOs. Professor Ganote said the LOs under Engaging the World Global Perspective are also designed to offer alternative paths to their fulfillment. In this case, different approaches were seen as a legitimate way of designing a “menu” of approaches to the desired outcomes. Professor Flanagan added that the principle of trying to make the LO inclusive is fundamental: the point is to encourage students to achieve the goals in different ways and allow faculty to be creative and experimental.

A roll call vote on the motion to adopt the LOs was taken as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

**Agendum 26** - A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to adopt the Rationale under The Common Good. Chair Cortright announced that the UEPC approved the Rationale by a 6-0-0 vote. The Provost asked if the Rationale is intended to be published in the Undergraduate Catalog. The answer from Chair Cortright was "no," it is intended for the Core Curriculum Committee and the departments. A roll call vote on the motion to adopt the Rationale was taken as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

**Agendum 27** - Chair Cortright asked for a vote on the adoption of the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under The Common Good. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Abstain	Sam Lind	Yes
Tom Poundstone	Yes	Joan Peterson	Yes
Keith Ogawa	Yes	David Bird	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	William Lee	Yes

Laura Heid Yes

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

## AMERICAN DIVERSITY

**Agendum 28** - A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Senator Lee to adopt the Learning Outcomes under American Diversity. Chair Cortright announced that the UEPC approved the LOs by a 5-0-1 vote.

Senator Heid expressed concern with the difference in the language in the Learning Goal, “. . . social, cultural, economic, and political diversity *in the United States*” and the language in Learning Outcome #1, "...and how they affect *American* society." She said she would prefer that both sections specify “the United States.”

A rule of order: A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to overrule the Chair to allow an amendment to the Learning Outcomes under American Diversity only. The motion was approved by a hand vote of 8-1 with one abstention.

A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Bird to amend the statement under Learning Outcome, to read,

"1. Analyze aspects of social diversity (e.g. ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, gender, sexual orientation, religion, age, ability, and political identify) and how they affect ~~American~~ society **in the United States of America**; and . . . *etc.*"

The motion to amend was approved by a hand vote of 9-0-0.

A roll call vote to adopt the amended Learning Outcomes under American Diversity was taken as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

**Agendum 29:** A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Lee to adopt the Rationale under American Diversity. Chair Cortright announced that the UEPC approved the Rationale by a 5-0-1 vote. A roll call vote to adopt the Rationale under American Diversity was taken as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

**Agendum 30** - Chair Cortright asked for a vote on the adoption of the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under American Diversity. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

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

The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

Discussion of the remaining Learning Outcomes and Rationales will continue at the Senate's next General Meeting, April 14, 2011.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky  
Faculty Governance Coordinator

Chair's Report  
Academic Senate General Meeting  
Thursday, 24 March, 2011

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**“Director” of the Core Curriculum**

For reasons detailed under A. of OLD BUSINESS, Senate confirmation of the Core Curriculum leadership, anticipated for the present Agenda in the ANNOUNCEMENTS for the General Meeting of 3 March, 2011, must await a date yet to be determined. Because the action depends upon substantial amendment to the *Faculty Handbook*, that determination depends in turn upon practicable assurance that acceptable *Handbook* language has been attained; historically, on matters of academic governance, the Provost's acceptance constitutes that assurance. The Executive Committee will, therefore, await the Provost's response to Senate action arising under today's Agenda before scheduling a confirmation vote.

**Senate Resolution of Commendation to Brother Augustine Boquer, FSC**

Senators are asked to linger briefly at the conclusion of business so that each may subscribe to the 3 March Senate Resolution in commendation of the Brother President of De La Salle University–Dasmariñas.

**REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 24 MARCH, 2011**

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

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

Senators have the UEPC minutes for Monday, 14 March, 2011 in hand. UEPC met for an extended session, during which the backlog of ordinary business, arising from UEPC's preoccupation with revision to the undergraduate Core Curriculum, was cleared. In addition to the Consent calendar, UEPC action generated item A. under NEW BUSINESS, which is addressed below.

At the March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, UEPC also received and acted on a report and recommendations from CCIC *in re:* the revised Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Critical Thinking. The report and language accord with the Committee's 21 February referral to CCIC of the Senate's 2-4-3 “Nay” vote (10 February) and explanatory memorandum (cf. Chair's Report, 3 March, 2011; UEPC Minutes, 21 February, 2011, pp. 1 – 2 under III). On a vote of 10-0-0, UEPC accepted CCIC's proposed language as a sufficient response to both the Committee's charge and the Senate's concerns (cf. UEPC Minutes, 14 March, 2011, p. 4 under VI). In three separate votes, the Committee advised the Senate on aspects of the CCIC's proposed language [cf. UEPC Minutes, 14 March, 2011, p. 4, nos. (1) – (3) under VII]. The Executive Committee will advance the revised Critical Thinking language to the Senate Agenda once the Senate has completed the first review of all twelve sets of Learning Outcomes and associated Rationales. Senators have a complete dossier of the relevant CCIC and UEPC documents in hand for study in anticipation of later action.

UEPC has yet to address the Senate's return of the Learning Outcomes and Rationales for Scientific and Mathematical Understanding and for Theological Understanding (cf. Appendix I). UEPC's next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 4, 2011.

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

### **A. Amendment of Senate Actions S-10/11-12 and S-10/11-13**

The Senators have in hand a resolution detailing amendments to the language of the Actions in point.

At the 12 January, 2011 General Meeting, the Senate passed Senate Actions S-10/11-12 (6-0-1) and S-10/11-13 (7-0-0), the first, "Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum," and the second, "Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups." The first provided the criteria against which to assess candidates for faculty leadership in the governance of the undergraduate core curriculum and the second proposed *Faculty Handbook* language, under 1.7.4. ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES, providing for the constitution, governance and assessment of the undergraduate core curriculum. In the view of the Chair and the Executive Committee, these Senate Actions were undertaken pursuant to Handbook 1.6.1.2.1. at 3. and 1.6.1.2.2. at 3, which define matters "for which the Senate has full authority to act, such as faculty committee membership and procedures" (1.6.1.2.2. at 6.), subject to the procedures for changes to the Handbook (cf. 1.6.1.2.2. at 3.).

On March 6, 2011, the Chair received a Provost's memorandum by way of "formal response to Senate Actions **S-10/11-11, S-10/11-12, S-10/11-13, S-10/11-14:**

...

**Senate Action S-10/11-12, *Position Description and Duties; Director of the Core Curriculum:***  
This action is supplemental to S-10/11-13, which proposes language for the Faculty Handbook detailing the role and structure of the Core Curriculum Committee. As such, I am interpreting this action to be advisory, because while the Senate identifies general roles and responsibilities for academic administrators, the Senate does not define their duties in detail or total. I accept the general purpose of these duties and see no need for modification at this point. However, the process of appointing the Director is inconsistent with other similar positions in the Handbook, as is the identification of course releases and term lengths. If the paragraph, "Position Description and Duties" is indeed advisory, I can accept it without further comment. If the intent is to include this language in the Handbook, the selection process, term lengths, and course equivalency will need to be consistent with the proposed language in S-10/11-12.

**Senate Action S-10/11-13, *Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups.*** I appreciate the considerable energy, attention, and time invested in the development of this Action, as well as the continued commitment of faculty to ensuring the integrity of the new Core. All Director positions listed in the Handbook are filled by the supervising administrator, with no role of the Senate in the selection process. I value the role of Senate consultation and am willing to make an exception in the case of the Director of the Core Curriculum to the extent that consultation is explicitly sought by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. However, selection of an academic administrator by Senate

election is inappropriate and inconsistent with our established practices. Therefore, I accept the Action with the revision of 1.7.4.13 to read:

Director of the Core Curriculum (chairperson, voting), a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, *appointed by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics in consultation with the Senate*, serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics.

The phrase “serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate” is arguably made more ambiguous by this revision; I interpret this to mean that the Director should seek counsel from the Senate when appropriate (this is also a deviation from other Director positions which I am willing to accept).

The Provost’s salient phrases, “while the Senate identifies general roles and responsibilities for academic administrators, the Senate does not define their duties in detail or total” and “Director positions listed in the Handbook are filled by the supervising administrator, with no role of the Senate in the selection process,” suggested that the Provost had read S-10/11-12 and 13 as (over-reaching) Actions pursuant to Handbook 1.6.1.2.2. at 4. The Provost’s responses also suggested that the precise implications of the Senate’s choice of “Director” as the descriptive title for the executive officer of the Core Curriculum Committee remained—as they had been during deliberations at the General Meeting of 12 January—a source of unease. That unease seemed liable to increase in light of descriptive language from S-10/11-12 that could entail essential (as opposed to incidental) administrative functions, *e.g.*: “Develop budget planes and oversee budget expenditures for the program”; “Supervise any staff who provide administrative support for the CCC”; “. . . adjudicate student . . . petitions . . .”

On March 9, the Provost and Executive Committee met to discuss the apparent differences between the Senate’s and the Provost’s readings/interpretations of the Senate Actions and their Handbook bases. The discussion resulted in a clear and agreed sense of how the Actions could be amended so as to adapt existing patterns of shared governance (which depend, in part, on the clear distinction of faculty and administrative functions) for complimentary goals: to meet the Senate’s concern for authoritative faculty oversight of the common, undergraduate core curriculum; to meet the Provost’s concern for the core curriculum’s effective, accountable administration.

The Chair drafted amended versions of both Senate Actions. These have been reviewed and accepted by the Provost and the Executive Committee. They form the operative language of the Resolution proposed to the Senate. (The texts of the original Senate Actions and the proposed, amended texts are compared in Appendix II.)

The Resolution will require a motion *ad libidum* and a second from among the Senators. Amendments are in order, but Senators are reminded that substantial changes would likely require renewed discussions with the Provost.

## **B. Adoption of the Learning Outcomes for the New Core Curriculum**

The Senators have in hand the “Agenda and Procedure” document, which details the Chair’s intentions by way of conducting the faculty’s business in this matter (members of the faculty will find the document posted on the Senate webpage with the General Meeting Agenda). Consideration of the Agenda will resume with Agendum 22, “Whether to adopt the Social, Historical and Cultural understanding Outcomes 1–3?” and proceed sequentially, unless a change to the orders of the day is moved.

***In re:* NEW BUSINESS**

**A. UEPC Recommendation to Add MATH 002 and 012 to the Undergraduate Catalog**

Senators have in hand the Mathematics and Computer Science Department (DOMACS) proposal which was the subject of the UEPC review and vote; Senators also have in hand the UEPC Minutes, 14 March, 2011, recording a vote of 6-3-1, that is, less than the two thirds necessary to advance the proposal to the Consent Agenda. Senators' attention is called to the following:

- Math 002 and Math 012 were developed and have been taught (since Fall, 2008) as experimental offerings, and must (in their present form) now either advance to listing in the permanent undergraduate Catalog or be discontinued;
- Everything in the record supports the judgment that MATH 002 (Math Readiness) and MATH 012 (Math Readiness for Calculus) are admirably designed and conducted to attain the goals their titles suggest—that is, that they address needs of students who are ill-prepared for the demands of collegiate-level mathematics, with reasonable success;
- The record nowhere advances an argument to the effect that—on grounds of mission or otherwise—these courses or their equivalent should not be offered at SMC, *given* the present profile of a substantial minority of matriculants;
- The expressed ground for dissent at the UEPC (cf. Minutes, 14 March, 2011, pp. 2 – 3 under IV) is: the courses are remedial in nature—that is, they do not, on the Mathematics Department's own showing, rise to the level of collegiate studies—but each is offered for 1.00 course credit;
  - “Proposal for Permanent Status for Experimental Courses Math 002 and Math 012” (hereafter “Proposal”), p. 1, under “Justification”: “The two courses are designed to help mathematically underprepared [sic] students so that when they take their first college level mathematics class they will be successful”;
  - “Proposal, pp. 1–2, under “Justification”: “. . . students who enter Saint Mary's College but have not satisfied their high school Algebra II requirement may take one of these courses to satisfy this requirement”;
  - “Proposal,” p. 2, under “Justification”: “Neither of these courses will satisfy the Area B mathematics requirement but will assist students in being prepared for their necessary college level mathematics courses. Both courses will earn the student college credit though”;
- Nowhere in the record is there suggestion of any proposal to make the instruction/content of MATH 002 and 012 available otherwise than as undergraduate course credit;
- Some discussion among the UEPC concerned whether the courses are, *de facto* (they are *not* formally), required of matriculants who do not place into a regular Mathematics Department offering through the Math Placement Exam (if the answer is, *de facto*, affirmative, SMC will be requiring a further general education course of some students).

Action on this agendum will require an *an libidum* motion and second from among the Senators to approve the recommendation of UEPC, namely, that MATH 002 and MATH 012 be added to the permanent undergraduate Catalog as proposed by the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science. A “Nay” vote will return the matter to UEPC and, given the advanced stage of preparation for

the 2011–12 Catalog, assure in effect that neither the courses nor their equivalents will be offered in AY 2011–12.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair  
Academic Senate

## Appendix I

**TO:** Asbjorn Moseidjord, Chair, Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee

**CC:** Zach Flanagin, Co-chair, CCIC

**FROM:** Steve Cortright, Chair, Academic Senate

**DATE:** March 7, 2011

**RE:** Adoption of Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes & Rationales

At the March 3, 2011 meeting of the Academic Senate, the adoption of the UEPC approved Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes & Rationales for the New Core Curriculum was discussed. The following actions were taken:

**Learning Outcomes under Mathematical and Scientific Understanding** - A motion to adopt the learning outcomes was defeated by a Senate vote of 2-4 with 3 abstentions. Listed below are the Senate concerns or questions raised.

Considerations regarding UEPC's striking of retaining #3 under Scientific Learning Outcomes:

Pro (the UEPC amendment striking #3)	Contra (the UEPC amendment striking #3)
Why isn't there a similar requirement or outcome for social science or other areas?	The absence of statement #3 is inconsistent with the Senate-mandated Learning Goals.
The original language (of #3) implies that ethical "sensitivity" is peculiarly problematic among the physical sciences as compared to other disciplines.	The word "examined" could be replaced with "considered" (thus tending less toward prescription of course content).

For clarification, the Chair took a series of straw votes:

Six Senators indicated in a straw vote that a vote of "no" or "abstain" was determined by the perceived inconsistency between the language of the Learning Outcome (making no reference to ethical concerns as an object of study under the Goal) and the language of the Learning Goal (which prescribes attention to ethical issues).

Three Senators indicated in a straw vote that restoration of Outcome #3 would precipitate a reversal of their "no" vote to a "yes" vote. Similarly, no Senators indicated in a straw vote that restoration of Outcome #3 would precipitate a change from a "yes" vote to a "no" vote.

Senator Ogawa offered the following recommendation: "Such a statement [*sc.* prescribing attention to ethical concerns] should be articulated explicitly stated for the entire undergraduate College with application to entirety of the new curriculum." **(NB: Chair Cortright: interpreted the statement to mean recommending and requiring attention to ethical and other questions in a disciplinary setting – while Senator Ogawa added "the process of their inquiry.")** Seven Senators endorsed Senator Ogawa's statement.

**Rationale under Mathematical and Scientific Understanding:**

Since possible changes the Learning Outcomes being returned to the UEPC may also require changes to the Rationale, Agendum 14 is also returned to the UEPC, without comment.

**Learning Outcomes under Theological Understanding** - A motion to adopt the Learning Outcomes was defeated by a Senate vote of 3-5 with 1 abstention.

Listed below are the Senate concerns or questions raised.

- The words “ethical” and “social” are included in the Learning Goals, but are missing from the Learning Outcomes.
  - Suggested to add, “with particular attention to the social and ethical implications.”
  - Not sure students or faculty would necessarily address the ethical/social concerns under the Learning Outcomes dedicated to Biblical understanding/interpretation.
    - For preference, social and ethical implications should be explicit in #3.
- Under the Learning Outcomes, explicit mention of consideration of ethical and social implications of theological inquiry shall be demonstrated by students.
- Consider the parallel laities between scientific understanding and theological understanding, especially with respect to the first of the Outcomes, in Theological, and the third of the Outcomes in Scientific.

Some Senators argued that the Learning Outcomes for Theological Understanding were particularly well done and that social and ethical implications are absolutely presumed in the subjects of theological inquiry

**Rationale under Theological Understanding** - A motion to adopt the Rationale proposed for the Learning Outcomes under Theological Understanding was defeated by a Senate vote of 0-8 with 1 abstention.

Listed below are the Senate concerns or questions raised.

The Rationale depends on confused categories, *viz*: “...all of the subfields of theology and religious studies (e.g., from classical Thomism to Jungian psychology).” Thomism is a school of theology in its own right, not a subfield; Jungian psychology is not a subfield of religious studies, but a psychological technique or perspective or, for that matter, a school of psychology. The intent of Rationale’s language is admirable and might be served as follows: “. . . all of the subfields of theology (e.g., moral theology, ecclesiology, etc.) and religious studies (e.g., feminist approaches to religion, religion and literature, religion and politics, Buddhist perspectives on the self, etc.).”

The Chair noted that changes in the Rationale should be considered in parallel to changes in the Outcomes.

Discussion of the remaining Learning Outcomes and Rationales will continue at the Senate's next General Meeting, March 24, 2011.

## **Text of Proposed Amendment**

### **Position Description and Duties: Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee**

The Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) 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 and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. The first Chair 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 Chairs serving three-year terms. Subsequent Chairs will be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the chair of the UEPC and the out-going Chair of the CCC and confirmed by Senate majority vote. Initially, the Chair will receive three course-equivalent reassigned times each academic year. The duties of the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee are as follows:

1. 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.

## **Appendix II Senate Action S-10/11-12**

### **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 and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. 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

5. Maintain lists of courses that satisfy particular goals and provide appropriate entries for the Catalog of Courses to guide students and faculty regarding Core requirements.
6. Develop and direct workshops to stimulate good teaching in the Core Curriculum and to provide a coherent professional development component for faculty teaching in the Core.
7. Initiate periodic assessment of student learning in the SMC Core Curriculum Program and report on the results.
8. 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.
9. Report as provided above, and as circumstance may recommend, to the Academic Senate and to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics on the functioning of the Core Curriculum: e.g., on the development of curricular and co-curricular components, on assessment of learning, on the adequacy of staffing and budget, on the results of program review, and so on.

Consult with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, the Registrar, and Deans, respectively, on budget planning and administrative support for core curricular programming; on policies for the adjudication of issues regarding students' fulfillment of Core requirements; on policies for the equitable staffing of core curricular offerings, and so on, as befits Saint Mary's system of shared governance.

Program.

5. In coordination with the Registrar, 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

**Text of Proposed Amendment  
(in relevant part)**

**Senate Action S-10/11-13  
(in relevant part)**

1.7.4.13 Core Curriculum Committee

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 Chair, 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.*

*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:  
– Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee (voting), a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, nominated to a three-year term by the Senate Executive Committee, UEPC Chair and out-going Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, and

*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

confirmed by majority vote of Academic Senate. The Chair serves at the pleasure of the Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics;

– 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).

*Chair's Duties:* as the Core Curriculum Committee's executive, the Chair 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; consults on budgetary and staff support; coordinates intra- and extramural assessment, *et al.*, according to Senate Action S-10/11-12; the Chair receives yearly reassigned course equivalences commensurate with the office's demands.

*Meetings:* The Core Curriculum Committee is

by majority vote of Academic Senate. The Director serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics;

– 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);

1.7.4.14 – 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.

convened according to a schedule drawn up by the Chair.

#### 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 Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, 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).

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

#### 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

*Membership:* Each Working Group consists in:

- Working Group Chair (a member of the Core Curriculum Committee designated by the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee);
- 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 undergraduate 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 Chair and Group Chairs—the volume of material for review requires.

(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 undergraduate 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.

NB: Amendment to Handbook 2.6.1 is unaltered as between the original S-10/11-13 and the present Resolution.