

Minutes of the General Meeting Of the Academic Senate

March 3, 2011

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

Also present were: Sam Agronow, Interim Dean Jerry Brunetti, Vidya Chandrasekaran, Provost Beth Dobkin, Robert Gorsch, Ginny Hair, Teresa Kramer, Dean Zhan Li, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Vice Provost Chris Sindt, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Mindy Thomas, Sarah Vital, and Interim Dean Sharon Walters.

2. Minutes of the February 10, 2011 Meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as amended.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report – Chair Cortright submitted a detailed written report (attached). The Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) received the Senate's remand of the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Critical Thinking from the last Senate meeting and voted to return same to the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC), together with proposed new language. The Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC) has begun a survey and evaluation of the Provost. He encouraged faculty to complete the survey.

4. Provost's Updates – Provost Dobkin reported on the status of the searches. The search committee is currently reviewing applicants for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics position, and the search committee is at the semi-final interview stage for the Dean of Academic Resources.

5. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Chair Cortright reported the following two items listed on the Senate's Consent Agenda for consideration; both were adopted unanimously by the UEPC.

1) The English Department Book Club, permanent .25 activity course.

2) Changes to the Politics Department major and minor.

No objection was noted and the items were accepted on the Senate's Consent Agenda.

6. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) – Senator Bird reported that a substantial report will be available at the March 24th Senate meeting.

7. Committee on Committees (CoC) – Vice Chair Gomez-Arias reported that the faculty elections will be underway the week of March 14th. The new Core Curriculum Committee recently approved by the Senate will be open for election.

8. Announcement on an Initiative to Strengthen Alumni-Faculty Relations – Vice Provost Chris Sindt reported on initiatives of the Alumni Board of Directors and its Committee on Faculty, Staff and Student

Involvement. He introduced Ginny Hair as a member of the Alumni Board of Directors. The committee awards \$10,000 in grants annually to faculty for mission-related research projects. A new initiative for this year is to create a list of alumni offering expertise as curricular and co-curricular aids to faculty. Faculty are encouraged to draw upon the list to invite classroom visitors, speakers, panels, extracurricular lectures, etc. Ginny Hair noted that the Alumni Board is very involved in initiating strong programs to tap the expertise of various alumni and build bridges to faculty and staff. Alumni are looking for significant ways to engage the College beyond giving and tailgating.

9. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Lee to change the orders of the day to allow the New Business item to be heard prior to the Old Business item. The motion was approved by the Senate by a vote of 9-0-0, the Chair voting Present.

NEW BUSINESS

10. Resolution of Commendation to Brother Augustine Boquer, FSC. The following resolution was introduced.

The Academic Senate
Saint Mary's College of California

In commendation of
Brother Augustine Boquer, FSC

on behalf of the Faculty, Students, and Administration of
Saint Mary's College of California,

in Convocation assembled,
the sixth day of April, 2011.

Whereas over the three decades since he graduated from Saint Mary's College as Master of Arts in Educational Administration and Leadership, Brother Augustine has—with remarkably zealous, imaginative and generous leadership—undertaken increasingly consequential administrative appointments among the apostolic works pursued by De La Salle Philippines; and

Whereas following his term (1998–2007) as President of the University of St. La Salle, Bacolod City—which saw establishment, among many notable innovations, of the University's College of Medicine—Brother Augustine, upon assuming the Presidency of De La Salle University–Dasmariñas, has set in train substantial enhancements to the University's distinguished Health Sciences Institute and to the University's signal efforts at attaining an ideally sustainable campus, while the University has earned the grant of Autonomous Status from the Philippines Commission on Higher Education; and

Whereas no academic work among the many Brother Augustine has undertaken is without its complementary initiative for the direct relief of the sick, the oppressed or those bereft; or for the rescue of youth at risk or in need of protection; and

Whereas through his extensive service as trustee or advisor to charitable and educational organizations—local, national and international in scope; Lasallian and civic in provenance—Brother Augustine has multiplied the harvest of his zeal; and

Whereas throughout an exceptionally fruitful life in religion, Brother Augustine has made himself a servant of the sons of La Salle in the vibrant District of the Philippines:

We, therefore, the Members of the Academic Senate of Saint Mary's College, herewith unanimously attest: Brother Augustine, Saint Mary's sometime student, returns as the College's preceptor and ours, to whom our heartfelt thanks and warmest commendation are due.

In testament thereto, we have subscribed our signatures this day, Thursday, the twenty-fourth day of March, at Saint Mary's College in Moraga, California, in the year of Our Lord, 2011.

David W. Bird	Keith Ogawa	William Lee
Laura Heid	Thomas Jude Poundstone	S. A. Cortright
Joan Peterson	Michael Barram	
Samuel L. Lind	J. Tomas Gomez-Arias	

The Resolution was adopted by acclamation of the Senate.

OLD BUSINESS

11. Adoption of Learning Outcomes for the New Core Curriculum – The proposed Learning Outcomes were introduced by Chair Cortright. The document was forwarded to the Senate from the UEPC. Previously the Senate considered Agendum 1 through 4 of the document; the discussion continued where it left off at the last meeting with Agendum #5.

SHARED INQUIRY

Agendum 5 - A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Senator Lee to adopt the Rationale for Shared Inquiry. Chair Cortright announced that the Learning Outcomes for Shared Inquiry had been approved by a vote of 5-4 by the Senate at its last meeting. 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 Rationale was approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 6 – A roll call vote was then taken on the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Shared Inquiry.

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 Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Shared Inquiry were approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

WRITTEN AND ORAL COMMUNICATION

Agendum 7 - A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Senator Heid to adopt the Learning Outcomes under Written and Oral Communication. 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 Learning Outcomes under Written and Oral Communication were approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 8 - A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Vice Chair Tomas Gomez-Arias to adopt the Rationale under Written and Oral Communication.

Senator Bird questioned whether the Composition Program is aware of the language in the Outcomes which prescribes developmental instruction in skills of oral communication. Professor Gorsch of the English Department and CCIC noted that the Composition Program has, traditionally, concentrated on writing. Vice Provost Sweeney added that among the principles upon which the core curriculum rests, the biggest change involves its integrated and developmental scaffolding; ideally, skills of written and oral communication will be fostered more widely than in English 4 and English 5. Future assessment will address whether this instruction is happening widely and in the intended, developmental order.

Past Chair Poundstone inquired where the Outcomes expressly provide that major curricula shall include upper-division instruction in written communication: is the requirement expressly provided only in the Model 1 language? Should it be incorporated in the Rationale? Vice Provost Sweeney responded that Model 1 is the formal structure approved by the Senate; Learning Outcomes are intended to translate the Model into classroom practice.

Past Chair Poundstone suggested that the statements in the “Additional CCIC language” on the bottom of the page containing Agenda 7 through 9, should be incorporated in the Rationale. Vice Provost Sweeney responded that the Rationales deliberately refrain from prescribing specific courses. Chair Cortright ruled that the Senate’s agendum did not include the “Additional CCIC language.” That language will be forwarded to the new CCC, through the UEPC. 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 Rationale under Written and Oral Communication were approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 9 - A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Vice Chair Tomas Gomez-Arias to adopt the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Written and Oral Communication. 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 Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Written and Oral Communication were approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

INFORMATION EVALUATION AND RESEARCH PRACTICES

Agendum 10 - A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Barram to adopt the Learning Outcomes under Information Evaluation and Research Practices. Senator Peterson asked why, although the Learning Goal mentions “validity and reliability,” these qualifiers are not stated in the Outcomes. Chair Cortright said the phrase “critically evaluate” is intended to obviate having to list all of the various predicates of evaluation that might attach to evidence. Senator Ogawa was concerned with the directive language, included under “Additional CCIC Language: Implementation,” and to the effect that English 4 and 5 fulfill the Information Evaluation and Research Practices Outcomes at a lower division level. There was discussion whether specific reference to English 4 and 5 might weaken the intention that sound information and research practices are to be fostered across the curriculum, in the Core and throughout major curricula, and in developmental fashion.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias said the document seems to look at research from the point of view of secondary sources, but not primary sources. Chair Cortright explained that in the language of Model 1 and the language of the Learning Outcomes, the term “primary sources” indicates a certain class of documents, whereas Vice Chair Gomez-Arias seemed to consider “primary sources” to mean any direct object of investigation. The learning goal neither was intended to address, nor does it address, primary research.

Provost Dobkin expressed concern about the discussion of upper division course requirements, namely, that the writing component prescribed for major curricula also meet the Information Evaluation and Research Practices: how should this prescription translate, *e.g.*, into the upper division of major curricula in the performing arts?

Senator Barram referred to #4 of the Learning Outcomes, “Understand the concept of intellectual property and practice academic honesty,” noting that two different ideas are involved: 1) understanding a concept, and 2) engaging that concept appropriately. What happens if a student has an “XF” on a transcript, would that mean they have not met LO #4? In protracted discussion, consensus emerged that present procedures under the College Honor Code and the Registrar’s Office are adaptable to the new core requirements in ways that need not involve students in “Catch 22” situations. 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 Learning Outcomes under Information Evaluation and Research Practices were approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 11 - A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Heid to adopt the Rationale under Information Evaluation and Research Practices. 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 Rationale under Information Evaluation and Research Practices were approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 12 - A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to adopt the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Information Evaluation and Research Practices; 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 Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Information Evaluation and Research Practices were approved by a vote of 8-0 with 1 abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

MATHEMATICAL AND SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDING

Agendum 13 - A MOTION was made Senator Bird and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to adopt the Learning Outcomes under Mathematical and Scientific Understanding (Pathways to Knowledge).

Senator Heid asked why Learning Outcome #3 was deleted. Professor Moseidjord, Chair of the UEPC, answered that Outcome 3 was considered to discriminate against the natural sciences: no similar requirement or outcome is proposed for the social sciences or other families of disciplines. Senator Ogawa said it is not only discriminating, but implies that the need to address ethical principle does not occur in other disciplines; that it is not an issue for disciplines outside the sciences.

Past Chair Poundstone questioned whether the objection articulated by UEPC and Senator Ogawa identifies a flaw in the learning outcomes under the balance of the Pathways category or in Scientific Understanding outcomes only. That ethical reflection is not prescribed in the learning outcomes generally is a general problem (he continued), but in view of the long history of science’s and scientists’ cooptation to exercises of raw, unbridled power (he gave a litany of abuses), Senator Poundstone found the omission

“stunning.” He would advocate adding similar language elsewhere among the learning outcomes, but argued that promotion of ethical principle should be expressly included among outcomes for scientific understanding.

Senator Ogawa responded that science does not operate in a vacuum; it often reflects the values of society: he cited the lack of resources to investigate the auto-immune deficiencies (AIDS) until the illness broke out into the heterosexual community. Such failings neither originate with, nor are they proper to, scientific pursuits, and science faculty are understandably uncomfortable with the implication that they do.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias suggested that exactly the same language could be proposed for outcomes under shared inquiry, research, or religious understanding; he affirmed the concern of School of Science faculty. At the same time, he noted, it is appropriate that this issue be discussed.

Senator Barram observed that, among the Pathways to Knowledge category, faculty of some disciplines—for example, those involved in Social and Cultural Understanding—would argue that questions underlying the discipline, and the methods arising to address those questions, involve the discipline in cultural problematics that, as such, foster broadly ethical reflection. Sociology, for example, cannot get along without posing and investigating questions concerning moral and political value and the human pursuit of values. The natural sciences, he suggested, are not thus intrinsically ordered to ethical inquiry.

Senator Peterson agreed: in her understanding, natural science is different; it cultivates a dispassionate objectivity that tends to discount social and ethical questions. Nevertheless, she pronounced herself troubled over imposing upon science professors something they don't want to do.

Chair Cortright noted that to the extent that arguments which describe scientific disciplines as inherently unengaged with ethical reflection are cogent, those same arguments are good arguments for the conclusion that, disciplinarily speaking, scientists are the least likely candidates to teach ethics (to the extent that can be done) effectively.

Vice Provost Sweeney recalled that, during the CCTF discussions over learning goals, the requirement was heavily debated. The CCTF's goal was to create a core true to, and informed by, the mission. SMC's Catholic heritage, CCTF concluded, precludes allowing natural science to be taught apart from immediate encounter with social and ethical concerns. In any case, she concluded, what would it mean for the Senate to approve outcomes that did not align with—that, in fact, contravene—the learning goal?

Senator Lee noted that the word "considered" is different from the meaning of the word "examined" in statement #3.

Senator Heid asked whether social and ethical issues are typically included in the syllabi of science courses. It was answered that many of the science courses address ethical/social subject matter; however, introductory level courses designed to fulfill the present Area B requirement (which constitute the sum of most students' scientific education at SMC) are likely to be closely focused on the terms of disciplinary art.

Past Chair Poundstone said he would vote against Agendum 13 with LO#3 stricken: the Learning Outcomes are not aligned with the Learning Goal. Science faculty's reluctance to be single out is not the same as opposition to this feature of the proposed curriculum. Senator Ogawa responded that he would vote in favor of Agendum 13 as written, for the reasons he had already outlined. Senator Poundstone expressed his understanding of Senator Ogawa's position; he announced his willingness to join Senator

Ogawa in a “Nay” vote on any set of outcomes that, in Senator Ogawa’s judgment, omit but ought to include language prescribing attention to ethical or social concerns. Senator Peterson explained that she could not vote in favor of the agenda, since it contravenes a goal adopted by the College.

A vote was taken on Agendum 13 as follows:

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

The motion failed by a vote of 2-4 with 3 abstentions.

Chair Cortright ruled that, since changes to the Rationale may be required in light of changes to the Outcomes, **Agendum 14 and Agendum 15** will be returned to the UEPC with Agendum 13.

By way of clarifying the Senate’s intentions, Chair Cortright conducted a series of straw votes:

Six Senators indicated that their "no" vote or their "abstention" on the Learning Outcomes was determined by the perceived contradiction between the Outcome to the Learning Goal.

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

Senator Ogawa offered the following statement to be communicated to the UEPC: "Such a statement should be articulated explicitly for the entire undergraduate College with application to the entirety of the new curriculum." Chair Cortright stated his interpretation: such a statement would mean requiring attention to ethical and social questions in every disciplinary setting. Senator Ogawa specified that his statement would bear on the "the process of their [the disciplines’] inquiry". The statement was endorsed by seven Senators.

Senator Peterson offered a suggestion (to be included in the statement to the UEPC) to exchange "examine" for "considered" in Statement #3.

Agendum 16: A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Heid to adopt the Learning Outcomes under Artistic Understanding. Senator Ogawa observed that whenever terms such as "interpret, analyze, meaning of inquiry, reliability and validity" are used, we are also talking about the ethics of the inquiry in point. Such words entail that we consider that these Learning Outcomes also discuss the ethical implications of their inquiry. A roll call vote on the motion was taken as follows:

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

The Learning Outcomes under Artistic Understanding were approved by a vote of 7-0 with 2 abstentions. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 17: A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to adopt the Rationale under Artistic Understanding. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

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

The Rationale under Artistic Understanding was approved by a vote of 7-0 with 2 abstentions. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 18: A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Senator Bird to adopt the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Artistic Understanding. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

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

The Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Artistic Understanding were approved by a vote of 7-0 with 2 abstentions. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 19: MOTION made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone to adopt the Learning Outcomes under Theological Understanding. Senator Bird pronounced the Learning Outcomes particularly well done and clear. Senator Ogawa questioned the fact that the word "ethical" is mentioned in the Learning Goal but is not mentioned in the Learning Outcomes. Senator Bird also noted that the word "social" is included in the Learning Goal but is not included in the Learning Outcomes. Senator Barram suggested that it is included in the first learning outcome under Christian Foundations, "...including major theological and interpretive principles central to the Catholic..." Past Chair Poundstone suggested the addition "with particular attention to the social and ethical implications."

Senator Ogawa observed that, as he could not be sure students or faculty would necessarily address ethical concerns in pursuit of the interpretative principles cited in the Outcome, he would be unable to vote in favor of the agendum.

Senator Peterson averred that social and ethical implications are absolutely subsumed in the subjects of theological inquiry. Senator Heid averred that she would prefer that social and ethical implications be explicit in LO#3. A roll call vote was taken on the Learning Outcomes under Theological Understanding as follows:

Tomas Gomez-Arias	Abstain	Sam Lind	No
-------------------	---------	----------	----

Tom Poundstone	No	Joan Peterson	Yes
Keith Ogawa	No	David Bird	Yes
Michael Barram	No	William Lee	Yes
Laura Heid	No		

The motion was defeated by a vote of 3-5 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Chair Cortright reported that he would draft a memorandum to the UEPC listing the concerns voiced by the Senate, which he understood to be the following:

- under the Learning Outcomes, explicit mention of consideration of the ethical and social implications of theological inquiry shall be demonstrated by students.
- the parallels between scientific understanding and theological understanding, especially with respect to the first of the Outcomes under Theological Understanding and the third of the Outcomes under Scientific Understanding, should be made explicit.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Poundstone and SECONDED by Senator Barram to extend the orders of the day for 10 minutes. The motion was approved.

Agendum 20: A MOTION was made by Past Chair Poundstone and SECONDED by Senator Barram to adopt Rationale under Theological Understanding. Past Chair Poundstone stated that he would vote against the Rationale, since the Department of Theology and Religious Studies objects to the cogency of illustrative language included in the last paragraph, specifically the fifth line from the end: "...subfields of theology and religious studies (e.g. from classical Thomism to Jungian psychology)..." Professor Poundstone quoted from a statement prepared for the Department:

Thomism is a school of theology in its own right, not a subfield of theology. 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 the quotation is admirable and might be served by something like the following:

"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.)."

Senator Heid suggested adding "social and ethical" to the Rationale. A roll call vote was taken on the Rationale under Theological Understanding as follows:

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

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

Chair Cortright assured the Senate that in his memorandum to the UEPC he will express the Senate's concern that changes in the Rationale should be treated in parallel to changes in the Outcome.

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

12. The Senate was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator

Chair's Report
Academic Senate General Meeting
Thursday, 3 March, 2011

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nominations for Director of the Core Curriculum

Nominations for the first Director of the College's undergraduate Core Curriculum closed on 18 February. The search committee mandated by Senate Action S-10/11-12—the Chair and Vice Chair Gomez-Arias, for the Academic Senate; Chair Zach Flanagan and Cynthia Ganote, for the CCIC; Vice Chair David Gentry-Akin and Ken Brown, for the UEPC—will convene during the week of March 7; the Senate may expect to conduct a vote of confirmation at the General Meeting of 24 March.

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 3 MARCH, 2011

In re: 4. REPORTS

C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)

UEPC met on Monday, 21 February. The committee elected representatives to the search committee, Core Curriculum Director, as noted above under ANNOUNCEMENTS. The committee then took up the Senate's return for reconsideration of the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Critical Thinking. The committee had in hand (as required by the Senate) a digest of Senate concerns (Appendix I to this Report) and language drafted by the Chair of the Senate, at the request of the UEPC and CCIC Chairs, purporting to address the Senate's expressed concerns (see Appendix II to this Report).

In the event, UEPC voted 10-0-0 to refer both the statement of Senate concerns and the revised draft of Critical Thinking Outcomes to the CCIC, with the instructions that CCIC:

- (1) explicitly address the inclusion of formal logic into a new set of learning outcomes and/or a new rationale; and (2) include language to make it more explicit that the first goal is developmental goal (cf. UEPC, "Minutes from meeting, February 21, 2011," posted).

UEPC also expressly requested that CCIC evaluate and report on whether the proposed Critical Thinking Outcomes would impose any additional course requirement on students. No date certain has been established for reconsideration/resubmission of Critical thinking language by the UEPC (UEPC's next regularly scheduled meetings falls on 14 March, 2011).

Returning to its ordinary calendar of business, UEPC approved without dissent the items which form the Senate's Consent Agenda for 3 March, 2011.

D. Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC)

Senators will have seen—and, it is hoped, completed—the AAEC Evaluation of the Provost, which has been sent by individual e-mail to eligible faculty, and re-sent to non-respondents. This survey will close Monday, March 7, whereupon AAEC will commence digesting the results and drafting its report under the able leadership of Mary Kay Moskal, KSOE.

In re: 5. OLD BUSINESS

A. 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 5, “Whether to adopt the Shared Inquiry Rationale?” and proceed sequentially, unless a change to the orders of the day is moved.

***In re:* NEW BUSINESS**

A. Resolution of Commendation

The Senators have in hand the text of a resolution in commendation of the distinguished speaker invited to address this year’s Academic Convocation (6 April), Bother Augustine Boquer, FSC, President, De La Salle University–Dasmariñas, Dasmariñas City, Cavite, Philippines. The Chair would hope that, however the consideration of Old Business may proceed, Senators will move the Commendation by unanimous consent.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate

Appendix I

TO: Asbjorn Moseidjord, Chair
Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee

Cc: Zach Flanagan, Co-chair, CCIC

FROM: Steve Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate

DATE: February 16, 2011

RE: Adoption of Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes & Rationales

At the February 10, 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 Critical Thinking - 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.

- What is the definition of critical thinking?
- Concern about the absence of formal logic
 - o How would we implement a learning outcomes specifically related to formal logic?
 - o What are the implications for departmental and core curricula?

Five Senators indicated in a straw vote that attention to formal logic is a matter of concern.

- Include language specifying that students develop the habit of recognizing and questioning their own assumptions (explicitly mentioned in the Learning Goal).
 - o Include language stating whose assumptions are referred to in #2 of the Learning Outcomes.
- Include language indicating that critical thinking skills are developed through stages of increasing mastery/sophistication.

Rationale under Critical Thinking - The Senate voted unanimously to recommit the Rationale to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee with instruction that Rationale be evaluated in light of the discussion of the rewording of Learning Outcomes. Listed below are concerns and/or questions raised by the Senate.

- Reconsider Rationale based on any possible amendments made to Learning Outcomes
- Encouraged a clear statement about development to be incorporated in the Rationale, making a clear marker to the Collegiate Seminar Committee.

Learning Outcomes under Shared Inquiry - The Senate adopted the Learning Outcomes under Shared Inquiry by a vote of 5-4 with 1 abstention.

Discussion of the remaining Learning Outcomes and Rationales will continue at the Senate's next General Meeting, March 3, 2011.

Appendix II

Critical Thinking (a Habit of Mind)

Learning Goal: Critical thinking includes the processes of analysis, synthesis and evaluation necessary to understand and acquire knowledge. In addition to the application of formal logic, critical thinking also incorporates careful observation, reflection and experience. Critical thinking is not only applied in investigations intended to result in a single, unambiguous conclusion, but also includes skills that allow for sound judgments to be made when multiple, competing viewpoints are possible. Throughout the core curriculum, students will practice the habits of critical thinking and move forward in their ability (and perhaps willingness) to question their assumptions. In short, students will be able to recognize, formulate and pursue meaningful questions about their own and others' ideas.

Learning Outcomes:

1. Across their studies, students will develop habits of critical thinking; that is, they will, with increasing proficiency,
 - a. identify and evaluate premises or theses, implicit or explicit, in others' reasoning;
 - b. originate plausible theses, assess their coherence and expose their (implicit) assumptions;
 - c. evaluate their own and others' theses in the full light of opposing, as well as confirming, evidence;
 - d. evaluate and synthesize evidence for the purpose of drawing valid conclusions.
2. Students will demonstrate conversance with formal principles and methods of discursive thought through course study (a) of the acts of the intellect (i.e., formal intentional logic), (b) of natural deduction (i.e. formal first-order logic), or (c) of the formal methodology of their major discipline.

Rationale: (i.e., the intention of the proposed outcomes): It is worth recalling, first, that “critical” derives from κριτικός—“capable of judgment.” Essentially, critical thinking is thinking capable of (and worthy of) eliciting judgment in the twofold sense of reasoned affirmation or denial on one's own account, and of reasoned acceptance or rejection of others' accounts. Well-reasoned acts of judgment depend on material conditions and respond to formal principles.

1. Materially, well-reasoned judgments depend on one's formulating apposite questions or problems and assembling and evaluating the materials required to address them. Consistent fulfillment of the material conditions for judgment thus supposes sound habits of mind, signal among them: the grounds of judgment—whatever is laid down (theses) and whatever is implicit therein (assumptions)—must be well-explicated (1., a.–b.) and subjected to full, balanced scrutiny (1., c.); the grounds of judgment must be effectively ordered to valid inference (1., d). Such habits are established by sustained practice; principally, practitioners grow in proficiency under the guidance of teachers who are themselves sound, critical thinkers.
2. Formally, well-reasoned judgments result from well-ordered starting-points (principles), according to correct procedures (methods). Formal principles and methods may pertain to all discursive thinking, irrespective of subject [2., (a) – (b)], or they may pertain to specific subject matters [2., (c)]. In the first case, they may be approached as arts perfecting the discursive acts of the mind [2., (a)] or as rules governing evaluation of discursive artifacts, viz., propositions and inferences [2., (b)].