

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
Academic Senate**

September 8, 2011

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tomas Gomez-Arias at 3:00 p.m. on September 8, 2011. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Tomas Gomez-Arias, Vice Chair Claude Malary, Past Chair Steve Cortright, Kara Boatman, Michael Barram, Barbara Grant, Sam Lind, Joan Peterson, David Bird, and Jessica Kintner.

Also present were: Sam Agronow, Michael Allocca, Peter Alter, Linda Baumgardner, Nyame Brown, Jerry Brunetti, Robert Bulman, Vice Provost Richard Carp, Rebecca Carroll, Provost Beth Dobkin, Monica Fitzgerald, Zach Flanagan, Colette Fleuridas, Peter Freund, Cynthia Ganote, Charles Hamaker, Laura Heid, Makiko Imamura, Christa Kell, Tereza Kramer, Guido Krickx, Susan Marston, Keith Ogawa, Tom Poundstone, Ellen Rigsby, Jim Sauerberg, Vice Provost Chris Sindt, Elena Songster, Aeelah Soine, Bill Sullivan, Ed Tywoniak, Ellen Veomett, Dean Roy Wensley, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the May 25, 2011 and the August 23, 2011 meetings were approved as amended.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Gomez-Arias noted that the agenda contained several items pending from last academic year under Old Business voting regarding the Seminar model; and a proposal regarding the creation of an undergraduate advising committee from the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC). Under New Business: an amendment to the membership of the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board, the Faculty Salary Policy, a recommendation from general counsel to dissolve the Equal Employment Opportunity Compliance Committee (EEOCC), and a report from Social Justice Coordinating Committee regarding its membership.

4. Provost's Update on Senate Actions from 2010-2011. All actions have been approved. The Faculty Handbook has been changed to the 6/6 load, which the Senate approved two years prior.

Provost Dobkin reported there is strong support of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for the new core curriculum. She may change the process to use a portion of its budget towards initiatives.

Provost Dobkin reported that the undergraduate enrollment is quite large, over 2800. If we continue with the enrollment goals and accept the number for the next year, it is of serious concern. She personally feels it is beyond our capacity, and she will revisit target goals for next year. She is also trying to address faculty office space needs and how to maximize the space on campus.

5. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) - Ellen Rigsby stated that the FWC has not yet conducted business this year, no report.

6. Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) - Jim Sauerberg reported the duty for the fall is to coordinate the learning outcomes approved last spring.

OLD BUSINESS

7. Voting Question from the Seminar Review Committee - Chair Gomez-Arias introduced the following question addressed to the Senate from the Seminar Review Committee:

Request to the Senate from the Seminar Review Committee (Charlie Hamaker, Ellen Rigsby, Zach Flanagan) – dated 8/26/11:

The Background – In spring 2011, the campus voted on a series of models for Collegiate Seminar. Both full-time faculty and lecturers in Seminar were asked to rate their preferences; 138 full-time faculty voted, as did 41 lecturers who teach Seminar. The results were inconclusive, resulting in a runoff vote between Seminar models 1b and 3 to be held the third week of the fall semester. An element contributing to the inconclusive result was that the survey and its published results distinguished between the votes of full-time faculty and lecturers, with significantly different voting patterns evident in the two groups.

The Question – Should the runoff vote in fall 2011 include lecturers or be restricted to full-time faculty?

Arguments for including the lecturers in the vote: Lecturers staff a large number of sections of Seminar, to which they make a very important contribution. Many lecturers have been involved in the Seminar for years. Some lecturers teach in Seminar more than full-time faculty. Lecturers were included in the spring vote.

Arguments for restricting the vote to full-time faculty: Full-time faculty are more likely to see the “big picture” of the SMC education, i.e., the role of particular programs in the entire curriculum. Full-time faculty are, generally speaking, the ones who have invested their lives and careers in Saint Mary’s. Major college votes / authority (e.g., for Senate, for the new core, for the Collegiate Seminar Governing Board) are, as standard practice rooted in the Faculty Handbook, restricted to full-time faculty for the above reasons and more.

Obviously, this is a major question that could very well determine the result of the Seminar vote. The Seminar Review Committee asks the Senate to weigh the options and make a decision at its September 8 meeting. We offer no recommendation for the proper course of action.

Charles Hamaker said this action has been mandated by the Senate to bring forth a recommendation. Ultimately it is the decision of the Senate.

Vice Chair Malary said one option could be to exclude lecturers or a second option is to evaluate and weigh the votes differently. Charlie Hamaker noted that many other distinctions could be made as well: e.g., faculty who have never taught Seminar or have not taught in a long while. Past Chair Cortright explained that the Senate has charged the Collegiate Seminar Board with the task of the runoff vote. The Senate has a responsibility to give constructive and decisive advice to the Seminar Board.

Senator Kintner said she would be very curious to see the difference in the data from full-time faculty and lecturers, as well as the difference between ranked faculty that have taught Seminar vs. those that have not taught Seminar. Charlie Hamaker responded that the data reported last spring contained that information.

A MOTION was made by Senator Bird and SECONDED by Senator Barram that only full-time faculty be included in the runoff vote between the two seminar models in question. Senator Bird argued that the lecturers voted in the original election and their voice was clear. The full-time faculty have invested their lives and careers in the undergraduate mission of the College and should have the ultimate decision. There were arguments made that a majority of the Seminar courses are taught by part-time faculty, and many spoke against disenfranchising those faculty. Others argued that the full-time faculty have responsibility for the long-term curricular goals of the College.

Provost Dobkin agreed that there are lecturers that have devoted their life to teaching Seminar. They are valued and respected. There is also a possible conflict of interest as the decision could alter their job security.

Senator Barram said he was persuaded with the idea that the full-time faculty should have a privileged perspective of the big picture. But he also acknowledged that those that have taught Seminar heavily have more of an investment. Perhaps a proportional vote is possible. Senator Peterson raised the option of part-time faculty receiving a .5 vote. She also believes that the lecturers perform an excellent job teaching Seminar and they will continue to do a great job regardless of the model chosen. She said she leans towards full-time faculty making the decision.

Vice Chair Malary was opposed to excluding lecturers. It is possible to distinguish and analyze the results from the two faculty bodies and assess the difference, with full-time faculty receiving preference in a tie. Past Chair Cortright reminded the Senate that last spring the Collegiate Seminar Board reported the results of the vote to the Senate with a recommendation. The Senate had the authority to make a decision at that time based on all of the voting data, but the Senate then asked the Seminar Board to conduct a new vote based on a binary choice.

Zach Flanagan said that the vote could be very different this time around with only two choices presented. The lecturers voted 100% for models 1a or 1b in the first vote. The information on the lecturer vote is already available. The full-time faculty vote between the two models is the unknown. Robert Bulman added that the question for the Senate is whether it wants to be advised by part-time or full-time faculty. Senator Kintner said it seems very unlikely that the lecturers will change their vote based on the results of the spring voting. She suggested that the runoff vote be limited to tenure-track faculty; the Senate can still consider the information obtained from the lecturers in the first vote.

Past Chair Cortright argued that parsing faculty electors on the basis of who is or is not a full ‘stakeholder’ in the matter at hand is an invidious game. By way of illustration, he offered the following amendment: “Only full-time faculty who have taught all four Collegiate Seminars in the last ten years shall vote in the upcoming election.” The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Malary. Senator Peterson noted that many teach only one course in Seminar and those faculty would be eliminated from the vote. Another faculty member said she teaches Seminar each semester, but has not been at SMC long enough to have taught all four courses. Cynthia Ganote said that based on department responsibilities, many faculty are eliminated from teaching all four seminars. Lecturers are paid by the class, and she is not surprised that they would vote to keep it the same as it would be much to ask for them to prep for a series of classes. They do have a very understandable economic interest in keeping Seminar the same. Full-time faculty do not necessarily have that constraint. The amendment was withdrawn.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion as follows: “Only full-time faculty be included in the runoff vote between the two models:”

Claude Malary	No	Sam Lind	Yes
Steve Cortright	No	Joan Peterson	Yes
Kara Boatman	No	David Bird	Yes
Michael Barram	Yes	Jessica Kintner	Yes
Barbara Grant	Yes	Tomas Gomez-Arias	Abstain

The motion was approved by a vote of 6-3 with one abstention.

8. Proposal to Create a Faculty Undergraduate advising Committee (AARC) - Senator Bird withdrew the proposal on behalf of the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC).

NEW BUSINESS

9. Resolution to amend the FH 1.7.4.12: Collegiate Seminar Governing Board - Chair Gomez-Arias introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS Senate Action S-10/11-32 (New Core Curriculum: Approved Learning Outcomes and Rationales), under “Written and Oral Communication (a Habit of Mind),” prescribes Learning Outcomes pursuant to “the development of strong written and oral communication skills”; and

WHEREAS the undergraduate core curriculum, under Model 1, will place considerable—albeit yet unspecified—demands on the Collegiate Seminar for the fulfillment of the Learning Outcomes in the category of Written and Oral Communication; and

WHEREAS the undergraduate core curriculum under Model 1 is designed to promote strong written and oral communication skills across the curriculum, that is, through coordinated efforts; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that Faculty Handbook 1.7.4.12, Collegiate Seminar Governing Board, be amended as follows (addition in bold type):

Ex officio and voting, the Director of the Collegiate Seminar (Chair), the Director of the Collegiate Seminar’s Informal Curriculum, **the Director of the Center for Writing Across the Curriculum**, and the Collegiate Seminar's Liaison with the Critical Perspectives Program.

Past Chair Cortright added that he authored the resolution at the specific request of the Director of the Collegiate Seminar and the Seminar Governing Board. It reflects their best estimate of how to increase cooperation between Collegiate Seminar and Writing Across the Curriculum. A MOTION was made by Past Chair Cortright and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to accept the resolution. The resolution was approved unanimously by voice vote.

10. Faculty Salary Policy - Chair Gomez-Arias introduced the Faculty Salary Policy (FSP) for discussion. The policy has been in preparation for the past four years. The Building on Strengths (BOS) Report, Task 3.5, dated 2007 asked for a Task Force to: review the Faculty Salary Policy, examine benchmarks, hard-to-hire positions, flexibility in meeting college needs, and attract and retain excellent faculty. The FSP task force worked with a consultant to develop a policy. The Faculty Welfare Committee made a presentation of the policy at the all faculty day in August. There are three elements to the proposal: Principles derived from the College's mission, salary goals, and administration to address comparison to other institutions and how to address hard-to-hire positions. There were varying levels of agreement along the process. The dissenting opinions are described on page 18 of the proposal.

Senator Grant said that most members of the Task Force were in agreement with the “general” elements of the salary policy proposal. Much of the difficulty revolved around the supplemental salaries. A great deal of effort went into the development of the list of comparative institutions.

Past Chair Cortright recommended that the Senate engage in an institutional review of the document, perhaps as an ad hoc committee of the Senate, for the purpose of preparing a “sense of the Senate” resolution to be sent to the Board of Trustees.

Jerry Brunetti questioned the timeline and an implementation schedule. Chair Gomez-Arias answered that any Senate action should be forwarded to the Board for its October meeting. He agreed with the suggestion of a Senate ad hoc committee, to begin immediately. Keith Ogawa asked the Senate to take this matter to heart; it is

a crucial document for the morale of the faculty. Ellen Rigsby said the members of the FWC have not received any comments from the faculty regarding the Faculty Salary Policy. She supported Past Chair Cortright's suggestion of a close read of the document. She also concurred that the review should be done in time for the Trustee's October meeting. Senator Peterson suggested an all faculty forum be held on the issue.

The Provost made a point of clarification; the Senate recommendation would be addressed to the President and the President will decide what is forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

Past Chair Cortright said the President had announced that Goal 2 of the current policy was unattainable. However, it is his opinion that the proposed policy would not be significantly different in dollars over the next two-three years than Goal 2 of the existing policy. Vice Chair Mallary said he does not think faculty want differential pay, essentially the faculty have sanctioned a violation of policy.

Provost Dobkin responded that while working with the task force, she never had the impression that the faculty on the task force were sanctioning a violation: Senate Chair and Vice Chair, Chair of Faculty Welfare (past and present) were part of the task force. The Trustee serving as the chair of the committee sincerely thought he was getting the views of the faculty.

A small group was formed by the Senate members who participated in the Salary Task Force (Chair Gomez-Arias, Past Chair Cortright and Senator Grant) and three additional Senators (Vice Chair Malary and Senators Boatman and Kintner) to carefully review the document and draft a response to the President/Board. Chair Gomez-Arias also agreed to hold an open faculty forum in the near future for thorough discussion of the document.

11. Introduction of New Faculty - Chair Gomez-Arias asked the deans to introduce their new faculty.

Dean Li, School of Economics and Business Administration: introduced the following faculty:

Nicolas Dahan, International Business and Strategy

Caroline Doran, Business Ethics

Belai A. Kaife, Graduate Business

Judith White, Graduate Business

Phuong Anh Nguyen, Operations Management

Andras Margitay-Becht, Economics

Dean Woolpert of the School of Liberal Arts: introduced the following faculty:

Makiko Imamura, Communication

Rashaan Alexis Meneses, Liberal & Civic Studies

Aeleah Soine, History

Linda Baumgardner, Performing Arts

Nyame O. Brown, Art & Art History

Dean Wensley of the School of Science: introduced the following faculty:

Lucci Lautze, Mathematics & Computer Science

Ellen Veomett, Mathematics & Computer Science

Michael Allocca, Mathematics & Computer Science

Michael P. Marchetti, Fletcher Jones Endowed Chair - Marine & Aquatic Ecology

Jeffrey Bernard, Biology

Sandy Chang, Physics & Astronomy

Rita Smith, Psychology

Dean Metcalf-Turner of the School of Education: introduced the following faculty:

Raina J. Leon, Single Subject

Peter Alter, Special Education

Sandra Mattar, Graduate Counseling

Gloria Aquino Sosa, Graduate Counseling

12. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m., all were invited to stay for the new faculty reception.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky

Faculty Governance Coordinator