ANNOUNCEMENTS

Final Reminder
Special General Meetings of the Senate

Contiguous Special General Meetings of the Senate are scheduled for Tuesday evening, January 11, 2011 and Wednesday, January 12, 2011, the latter immediately following the regularly scheduled General Meeting of that date. Both will be devoted to faculty discussion of the Learning Outcomes (and their Rationales), proposed for the new Core Curriculum; questions on the curriculum’s (proposed) overall shape and administration will also be addressed. All available members of the Senate, UEPC and CCIC will be in attendance—above all, to listen and to respond to undergraduate faculty. The meetings will precede final UEPC and Senate action on the Core Learning Outcomes. UEPC will meet on 24 January; Senate action should commence with the General Meeting of 10 February, 2011.

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

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

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 12 JANUARY, 2011

In re: 4. REPORTS

C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)

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

At the January 5 meeting, the UEPC approved (on a vote of 7 – 1 – 1) an amended version of CCIC’s proposed “Position Description, Director of the Core Curriculum.” The CCIC original and the amended UEPC version are in the Senators’ hands. In accordance with Senate Action S-10/11-10 (2 December, 2010), the UEPC version informs—in conjunction with Senate Action S-10/11-9, Core Curriculum Committee (2 December, 2010)—item B under New Business, “Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups,” which is cast as amendments to the Faculty Handbook.
Now, like Senate Action S-10/11-9, the UEPC “Position Description” (1) contains matter that belongs ad hoc to the “start-up” phase of the new Core, and therefore does not belong in the Handbook (to which permanent features of College governance are reserved); and (2) as a position description, the document descends to specificities that—like the full descriptions of other College positions entered in the Handbook—constitute a level of detail inappropriate for the Handbook. Nevertheless, both the ad hoc matter and the position detail fall under the Senate’s authority, and should be recorded officially for future reference. Like the Core Curriculum Committee document, then, the UEPC “Position Description, Director of the Core Curriculum” should be made a Senate Action, recorded verbatim. For that reason it appears as Item A under New Business.

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

D. Report on Graduate Programs: Enrollments and Finances

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

In re: 5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Resolution to Amend Senate Action S-09/10-22

The resolution to amend Senate Action S-09/10-22, the proposal on 0.25 courses adopted at the May, 2010, General Meeting, was postponed to the January 12 Agenda on a hand vote, owing to the unavoidable absences of the Registrar, Julia Odom, and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, Frances Sweeney. The resolution arises from a finding by the Registrar, seconded by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, namely: the proposal’s original language entails an imperative to the Registrar’s Office to the effect that degree audits discriminate between 0.25 classes awarded letter grades and 0.25 classes offered on a Pass/Fail basis, permitting the former only to cumulate toward the 36-course graduation requirement. Thus the original Action: “... a maximum of ... twelve .25 credit courses which are awarded a letter grade A through D may count toward
a student’s graduation requirements . . .” (S-09/10-22, 5-13-10). The Registrar and Vice Provost note that the imperative seems contrary to standing academic regulations, which permit students to offer up to three elective course credits, graded on the satisfactory/pass/fail basis, among the 36 required for graduation (cf. 2010 – 2011 Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, p. 37: SATISFACTORY/PASS/FAIL GRADING). The language of S-09/10-22 thus appears to require the Registrar to establish alternative, inconsistent grading structures and credit awarding systems for, respectively, 0.25– and 1.0–credit classes. Standing academic regulations (Catalog, loc. cit) already preclude offering any S/P/F class to satisfy general education [sc. core] requirements, or requirements for the major or minor. The prevalence of 0.25 classes in the major/minor offerings of certain departments—e.g., Performing Arts and Kinesiology—would thus seem to be accounted for by the standing regulations.

The principal intention of S-09/10-22 was, of course, precisely to accommodate the use of 0.25 classes by departments whose curricula demand that students undertake diverse practicals—i.e., classes devoted to performance of various kinds: musical, athletic, theatrical. This intention in no way depends upon the language in question; and, again, so far as 0.25 offerings fall among major/minor or collegiate requirements, standing academic regulations provide that students’ achievement be evaluated by letter grade.

It should be noted that the inconsistency found by the Registrar and Vice Provost could be eliminated otherwise than by amending S-09/10-22: (1) the satisfactory/pass/fail option provided by the present Catalog could be eliminated altogether; (2) departments and programs could be required to offer 0.25 courses on a letter-grade basis only, etc.

The Resolution will require a motion and a second from Senators ad libidum.

In re: 6. NEW BUSINESS

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

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

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

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:

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


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

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) directs that, upon agreement by the respective Chairs that the proposal is accurately and adequately embodied in the resolution for revision of the Faculty Handbook, the resolution be presented to the Executive Committee for inclusion among the General Meeting Agenda of 12 January, 2011,

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate