1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 3:00 p.m. April 14, 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, Sam Lind, Joan Peterson, William Lee, and Parliamentarian Joseph Zepeda. Absent with notice were David Bird and Laura Heid.

Also present were: Kara Boatman, Jeff Cook, Provost Beth Dobkin, Monica Fitzgerald, Zach Flanagan, Colette Fleuridas, Chris Jones, Cynthia Ganote, Ann Kelly, Dean Zhan Li, Lidia Luquet, Claude Malary, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Jim Sauerberg, Vice Provost Chris Sindt, Cynthia VanGilder, Dean Roy Wensley, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the March 24, 2011 meeting were approved unanimously by hand vote.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson’s Report – Chair Cortright submitted a detailed written report (copy attached). The Academic Administrator's Evaluation Committee (AAEC) has completed its evaluation of the Provost, copies of the final report will be forwarded to the Provost and the President.

4. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Chair Cortright reported that the UEPC met on April 4, 2011. The proposal from the Theology and Religious Studies Department to incorporate TRS 165 in the permanent undergraduate catalog was approved unanimously and appears on the Senate's consent agenda. The UEPC considered applicants and forwarded the name of the 2011 DeLasalle award recipient to the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academics. The bulk of the meeting was devoted to an informational presentation from Professor Barbara McGraw representing the SEBA task force charged to propose comprehensive revisions to the Business Administration major. The revisions will be moved, in part, for the purpose of meeting the American Academic of Collegiate Schools of Business standards, but also to remediate long-standing difficulties with a curriculum which is 20+ years old, and has not kept up with the evolution of the discipline. The scope of the changes proposed for the major will make a significant impact to the undergraduate college at-large. It is planned that the Senate will be considering the proposal at its May 12th meeting.

The UEPC has yet to respond to the Senate’s return of learning outcomes and rationales for Scientific and Mathematical Understanding and Theological Understanding; the item is scheduled for the UEPC at its May meeting, and for the Senate agenda at for the May 12 meeting.

Consent Agenda: TRS 165 - No objection was noted by the Senate, TRS 165 was accepted on the consent agenda.

5. Provost’s Updates - Provost Dobkin announced that she will report to the community regarding the AAEC evaluation in the fall if there is not time available on the May agenda.

6. Committee on Committees (CoC) – Vice Chair Gomez-Arias reported that the faculty elections are concluded. There are two run-off elections to take place after the Easter break. The Vice Chair elect of the Senate is Professor Claude Malary.

7. Graduate and Professional Studies Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC) – Senator Peterson reported on two consent agenda items: Provisional Approval Guidelines and Final Approval Guidelines.
The GPSEPC has been working on these documents for most of the year. The provisional guidelines will replace the Fast Track Guidelines for graduate programs. Both items were unanimously approved by GPSEPC. No objection was noted by the Senate; the items were accepted on the Senate's consent agenda.

8. Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) – Professor Jones reported that the Faculty Salary Policy Task Force continues its work and is currently in the process of reviewing the salary scale. There is a 2% raise to the faculty salary pool. *Academe* has published its nation-wide data on salaries, and the FWC will report on goals 1, 2 and 3 at the May 12th Senate meeting.

9. A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to change the order of the day to discuss New Business prior to the Old Business. The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

10. Senate Confirmation, Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee. Chair Cortright introduced the issue, announcing that the selection committee comprised of: Senate representatives Steve Cortright and Vice Chair Tomas Gomez-Arias, CCIC representatives Cynthia Ganote and Zach Flanagin, and UEPC representatives Ken Brown and David Gentry-Akin met and unanimously approved Jim Sauerberg to serve a five year initial term as the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee. A vote by written ballot was taken; the Senate confirmed Professor Sauerberg by a unanimous vote: 7-0.

OLD BUSINESS

11. Resolution to Refer Senate Action S-9/10-25 (Revised Preamble to the External Speaker and Public Event Policy) to the Board of Trustees – Vice Chair Poundstone introduced the resolution. He explained that the Senate worked over the summer and the fall of 2009 on the Speaker Policy, commissioned by the Board of Trustees. Issues arose during an on campus visit by Gloria Steinem and there was great concern among the faculty about the way in which the speaker policy was interpreted and implemented by the administration. The Senate submitted a Preamble to the policy to try and address the concerns. Various Catholic leaders and SMC President Brother Gallagher were quoted in the Preamble to order to align the policy with Catholic tradition of higher education. The approved Senate Action was sent forward to the Provost; the Senate was informed that the issue would go to the President and the Board of Trustees for consideration. Past Chair Poundstone serves as the faculty representative to the Board; he ascertained, at its October 2010 meeting, that the Board was not aware of the Senate Action. The Senate has not, in the meantime, heard from the President regarding the Senate Action. The following resolution was offered:

**Whereas**, at its General Meeting of May 13, 2010, the Academic Senate approved a revised preamble to the External Speaker and Public Event Policy (S-09/10-2, October 1, 2009) and reported the revision to the Provost and President as Senate Action S-9/10-25;

**Whereas**, the Provost responded to the Senate in a timely fashion on 1 July, 2010, in relevant part:

I have begun initial discussions of the “New Preamble for the Speaker Policy” with the President, and I understand that he does not wish to be quoted in the Faculty Handbook. Therefore, I support Senate Action S-09/10-25 with omission of the third paragraph, beginning “That is also the charge of a university.” . . . Of course, further consideration of this action depends on the response of the President and action of the Board, if the President decides to forward it to them for approval.

**Whereas**, the Academic Senate is in receipt of no further response from the President; while the Past Chair and Senate Representative to the Board of Trustees reports that he informed the Board of Senate Action S-9/10-25 in his presentation at the Trustees’ October, 2010 meeting and that the Board of Trustees has not formally received Senate Action S-9/10-25, either in whole or in part;
Whereas, the Faculty Handbook provides (1.6.1.2.10, at 3): “When the Senate deems it appropriate, they may request that [a] motion and the Provost’s concerns be sent to the President and/or the Board of Trustees. Such an action would require a two-thirds majority vote of the Senate”;

Therefore, be it resolved that Senate Action S-9/10-25, the Revised Preamble to the External Speaker and Public Event Policy be sent, together with the Provost’s July 1, 2010 response to the Senate Action, to the Board of Trustees via the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

(For the Convenience of the Senators, the text of Senate Action S-09/10-25 follows:

(A NEW PREAMBLE FOR THE SPEAKER POLICY

(Be it resolved, the preamble to the speaker policy passed by the Academic Senate on October 1, 2009 should be replaced by the following preamble which should be read as supplying the interpretive spirit with which the protocols of the policy should be implemented.

(Saint Mary’s College of California is a Catholic institution of higher education in the Lasallian tradition where the liberal arts inform, enrich, and shape all areas of learning and where special importance is placed on fostering the intellectual skills, habits of mind, and activities which liberate persons to probe deeply the mystery of existence and live authentically in response to the truths they discover.

(Our mission challenges us to pursue truth wherever it can be found, confident that between faith and reason there can be no fundamental conflict. Fr. Ted Hesburgh, the President Emeritus of Notre Dame, speaks of how a Catholic college must not only strive to be like a lighthouse, standing apart and illuminating issues with the moral and spiritual wisdom of the Catholic tradition, but that it must also serve as a crossroads “where all the intellectual and moral currents of our times meet and are thoughtfully considered,” a place where people of many different perspectives, backgrounds, faiths, and cultures are received with charity, are able to speak, be heard, and engage in responsible and reasoned dialogue.

(That is also the charge of a university. As our President Brother Ronald Gallagher writes in an open letter to the College community, “Institutions of higher education serve society and their local communities by providing a place for opinions and ideas of all types to be examined, questioned and discussed. It is in these ‘academic cities’ that the arts of reason and inquiry are brought to bear on the controversial issues of today and of all time. For students, faculty, staff, and the public, the College provides special opportunities to step away from the often overheated and polarized rhetoric of contemporary culture and examine difficult and controversial issues in the somewhat cooler light of reason.” Brother Ronald continues his letter with an appeal to the educational traditions upon which our College is based: “As a College with a Great Books tradition, we have a responsibility to defend the rights of those with controversial viewpoints to speak. To live up to our great tradition, we must remain an academic community where the free and open discussion of ideas, even those with which we strongly disagree, is possible.”

(As part of that Great Books tradition, we are reminded of what Cardinal Newman writes in his The Idea of a University: “It is not the way to learn to swim in troubled waters never to have gone into them.” If our students are to be tested in their critical thinking, we do not serve them well by insulating them from controversial views; instead, we are called to expose them to a breadth of viewpoints and experiences and to foster free and open discussion of controversial issues.

(Occasionally the President will be pressured to deny or rescind a requested invitation. In almost all situations the President is called to defend academic freedom and explain the basic educational mission of the College and the unique role of universities as a place for ideas to be exchanged while also making clear to all that invitations do not represent endorsements. The cost to the College is virtually always higher when a presenter is silenced. Ideas, we believe, are better answered with thought and conversation than censorship.

(While we place a high value on freedom of inquiry and discussion, and on the opportunity for intellectual stimulation, which can be the product of controversial content, with this freedom also comes fiduciary responsibility. The policy which follows outlines reasonable precautions for the scheduling of controversial events, which are designed to foster authentic dialogue and to protect the reputation of the alma mater we all cherish.

([The italicized passages indicate parts of the preamble passed by the Senate on October 1, 2009])

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Poundstone and SECONDED by Senator Barram to approve the resolution. A roll call vote was taken on the motion as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cortright</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0-0. Chair Cortright observed that the letter of transmittal to the Board will be drafted by the Executive Committee, will include the vote, and will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees via the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, Trustee Harris.

12. **Adoption of the Learning Outcomes for the New Core Curriculum** – Chair Cortright explained that the proposed Learning Outcomes are ongoing. The Senate previously considered Agendum 1 through 30 at prior Senate meetings. Discussion continued where it ended at the March 24 meeting, with Agendum 31.

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE**

**Agendum 31** - A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Barram to adopt the Learning Outcomes (LO) under Global Perspective. Chair Cortright reported that the UEPC vote was 5-1-0.

Senator Barram noted his concern with the term “non-American and non-Western European” in LO#2. Does non-Western European mean non-Western hemispheric? He also conveyed a concern of Senator Bird that there is no expectation of geographic literacy included in the core.

Claude Malary recalled that the initial proposal had included four learning outcomes (LOs). He wondered why two had been dropped in the final draft. Zach Flanagin responded that the CCIC had received negative feedback from faculty on the two omitted LOs, many being strongly opposed to them. The CCIC tried very hard to follow the faculty voice. The complaint was that the prescribed intercultural competency was so broad it would be too difficult to evaluate. Faculty were seriously concerned that were the language included, students would be able to complete the goal only via foreign language study. Cynthia Ganote added that the broader community had conducted arguments over whether particular learning goals would require more than one course, and potentially three different courses. Some felt the language requirement should be independent of global perspectives.

Claude Malary stated his concern that the remaining LOs almost exclude language learning as a way to meet the Learning Goal. Commenting as a member of the drafting sub-committee, Vice Chair Gomez-Arias recalled that the committee had tried to keep the LOs in strict line with the language of the Goal. If foreign language proficiency is a graduation requirement, perhaps it is not necessary as a LO. On the other hand, because a LO would be difficult to evaluate is not sufficient reason to eliminate it.

Kara Boatman conveyed a concern on behalf of Barbara McGraw regarding LO#1. Her reported concern is with the phrase “theoretical perspectives.” She would like to see the courses concern themselves more with the play of perspectives than with the assumption of differing theoretical approaches, which would be burdensome and so limit approaches to the issues. She would not want the bar too high on the theory side and would like to commit the bulk of course time and energy to entertaining diverse perspectives.

Cynthia VanGilder asked the Senate to reconsider adding the word “and” so that students must complete both LO#1 and #2. She averred that non-Western perspectives should be part of the process of “analyzing the process of globalization.” Chair Cortright asked whether Professor VanGilder might allow that the precision, which is given to the sense of globalization operating in the set of outcomes under the Rationale, resolves her question; her answer was “no.”

Senator Barram asked whether the CCIC discussion had considered the implications of changing "or" to "and" for the LOs. Cynthia Ganote said that disciplinary and interdisciplinary experts felt strongly that all four of the LOs were important. The majority felt it would not be possible to accomplish both (for most
disciplines) in one course, and that therefore preserving the original draft would burden students with additional course requirements, something the CCIC had been committed to deliberately resisting.

Zach Flanagin observed that the 4-1-4 calendar cannot accommodate everything the CCIC would, all things being equal, wish to include in the core. The proposed LOs constitute a step forward into territory presently neglected. The review cycle may reveal options for extending the present LOs. Cynthia VanGilder responded that in some ways it is a step backward: the set eliminates a guaranteed exposure to cultural diversity, which is currently part of the graduate requirement.

Kara Boatman observed that the difficulty surrounding the LOs is that they have to be assessable. Vice Chair Gomez-Arias added it is not that difficult to incorporate the surviving and omitted cross cultural outcomes in one course.

Dean Wensley noted that none of the language is set in stone. It is important to move forward. Implementation issues can be addressed in the future as they arise. Senator Ogawa asked that it be stated firmly that upon completion of initial assessment of the core curriculum, if the faculty do not deem it as workable, it be open to modification.

A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to amend LO#2 as follows: “Demonstrate an understanding of the world from a specific non-American non-U.S. and non-Western European viewpoint.” A roll call vote was taken on the amended language as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>William Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

A roll call vote was taken on the Learning Outcomes as amended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>William Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion to adopt the Learning Outcomes as amended was approved by a vote of 5-1 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

Agendum 32 - A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to accept the Rationale under Global Perspective. Chair Cortright reported that the UEPC vote was 5-1-0. A roll call vote was taken on the Rationale as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>William Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion to approve the Rationale passed by a vote of 5-1 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”
Claude Malary noted, after the vote, that the word "ways" is used in the first sentence under Rationale, and the word "areas" is used as the last sentence in the Rationale. He suggested that the same word be used within the Rationale.

**Agendum 33** - A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone to adopt the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Global Perspectives. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion to approve the Learning Outcomes and Rationale passed by a vote of 5-1, with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

**Agendum 34** - A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Ogawa to adopt the Learning Outcomes under Community Engagement. The UEPC vote was 6-0-0. Claude Malary noted that the words "interconnections between" in LO#3 is redundant. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Agendum 35** - A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Ogawa to adopt the Rationale under Community Engagement. The UEPC vote was 6-0-0. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Agendum 36** - A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Peterson to adopt the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Community Engagement. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael Barram Yes

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

13. **Critical Thinking language resubmitted by the UEPC** - Chair Cortright introduced the Resolution re: Critical Thinking Language (Learning Outcomes and Rationale) resubmitted by the UEPC. At its February 10, 2011 meeting, the Senate rejected the Learning Outcomes under Critical Thinking by a vote of 2-4 with 3 abstentions and returned the document to the UEPC, noting the Senate concerns. There was considerable discussion at the UEPC and the CCIC in response to the Senate request that particular language be provided. The UEPC accepted some language and rejected other language. The UEPC and the CCIC language was submitted for Senate consideration. The Chair presented the following approved UEPC language and the CCIC language (shown in bold.)

**Learning Outcomes:** With increasing proficiency, students will

1. Identify and understand assumptions and theses that exist in the work of others; and
2. Ask meaningful questions, originate plausible theses, and identify their own underlying assumptions; and
3. Seek and identify confirming and opposing evidence relevant to original and existing theses; and
4. Evaluate and synthesize evidence for the purpose of drawing valid conclusions

[UEPC]

**In addition, students will**

5. Demonstrate conversance with formal principles and methods of well-ordered thinking, as employed in formal logic and/or formal methodology of a major discipline. [CCIC]

Chair Cortright outlined that a resolution to accept the report from UEPC would be interpreted to mean the acceptance of the above language beginning with "Learning Outcomes" (including the bolded language "with increasing proficiency,” which would be added to each of the Learning Outcomes under Habits of Mind) and ending with "#4...valid conclusions.” Acceptance of the UEPC report would have the effect of rejecting the bolded language of #5. In addition, the motion to accept the UEPC report would accept the proposal from the CCIC, and endorsed by the UEPC, that the addition of language to the Rationale, "Such Habits are established by sustained practice and develop as student’s progress through the curriculum." be added to each of the Rationales under Habits of Mind.

A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone to accept the UEPC report.

Noting that the effect of the motion would be to remove prescriptive study of formal reasoning from the core, Dean Wensley said a logic course probably is needed, but students do not have the room in the 4-1-4 calendar. Zach Flanagin said the CCIC feels that the argument for such an outcome on the order of #5 really stands on the merits of formal logic alone. If the Senate feels differently, the CCIC recommends that the Senate change Model 1 to require a course in formal logic, as the cost of an additional course requirement is prohibitive.

A roll call vote was taken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The motion to approve was passed by a vote of 6-0 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.”

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

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Chair’s Report
Academic Senate General Meeting
Thursday, 12 April, 2011

ANNOUNCEMENTS

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 12 APRIL, 2011

In re: 4. REPORTS

A. Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee

AAEC received a strong response to the evaluative instrument (an average of about 170 responses/question). Under the able (elected) leadership of Professor Mary Kay Moskal, School of Education, the report to the Provost is in draft and should be completed and delivered shortly.

C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)

Senators have the UEPC minutes for Monday, 4 April, 2011 in hand. UEPC approved unanimously the well-crafted proposal to incorporate TRS 165 in the permanent undergraduate catalog which forms the Consent Agenda for this General Meeting.

The Committee considered applicants, and forwarded the name of the 2011 De La Salle Award recipient to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics.

The bulk of the meeting was devoted to an informational-cum-introductory presentation from Professor Barbara McGraw, representing the SEBA/Business Administration Department Task Force charged to propose comprehensive revisions to the Business Administration major. These revisions are moved in large part for the purpose of meeting American Academy of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSBB) standards, pursuant to SEBA-Saint Mary’s application for AACSBB accreditation. Senators’ attention is drawn to Section IV of the UEPC Minutes for 4 April: the scope of the changes proposed for the major promise significant impacts to the undergraduate College at large, rendering it likely under Handbook 1.6.1.2.9.2. d. at i. that UEPC action on the matter will be reported among the Senate’s actions Agenda, as soon as the General Meeting of 12 May, 2011.

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 to the Chair’s Report for the General Meeting of 24 March). UEPC’s next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 2, 2011.

In re: 5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Resolution to refer Senate Action S-9/10-25 to the Board of Trustees

The Senators have in hand a resolution setting forth the reasons for invoking, on the matter of the Senate’s May 13, 2010 revision of the Preamble to the External Speaker and Public Event Policy, the Senate’s extra-ordinary prerogative, under Handbook 1.6.1.2.10, at 3, to refer Senate actions to the Board of Trustees. The resolution will require a motion and second ad libidum from among the Senators; adoption requires a two-thirds majority.

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 31, “Whether
to adopt the Global Perspective Learning Outcomes 1–2?” and proceed sequentially, unless a change to the orders of the day is moved.

C. Critical Thinking Language, Re-submitted by the UEPC

At the General Meeting of February 10, 2011, the Senate voted to return the Learning Outcomes and Rationale for the Critical Thinking Learning Goal to the UEPC for reconsideration. The Senate’s expressed concerns included (cf. Senate Memorandum of 16 February, Appendix I to the Chair’s Report for 3 March, 2011):

---Concern about the absence of formal logic [sc. among the Learning Outcomes]

   How would we implement a learning outcome specifically related to formal logic?
   What are the implications [sc. of an outcome desiderating formal logic] for departmental and core curricula?

---Include language specifying that students develop the habit of recognizing and questioning their own assumptions;

---Include language indicating that critical thinking skills are developed through stages of increasing mastery/sophistication.

Senators have in their hands the Minutes of the UEPC’s 14 March Minutes, setting forth CCIC/UEPC’s response to the Senate’s concerns and detailing recommended language. The Senator’s also have in hand a digest of the relevant originals from CCIC, together with the Chair’s advice on procedure.

This action item will require one or motions ad libidum from among the Senators.

In re: NEW BUSINESS

A. Senate Confirmation, Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee

Senators have in hand the nominee of a unanimous Search Committee, Professor Jim Sauerberg, for the inaugurating Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee. Deliberations, should the Senate require them, will be conducted in camera according to the rules previously adopted.

The confirmation vote will be by written ballot.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate