1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 3:00 p.m. February 10, 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: Kara Boatman, Barry Chersky, Jeff Cook, Zach Flanagin, Colette Fleuridas, Cynthia Ganote, Associate Dean Larisa Genin, An Kelly, Barbara McGraw, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Ellen Rigsby, Associate Dean Chris Sindt, Dean Russ Tiberii, Linda Wobbe, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the January 12, 2011 Senate meeting were approved as submitted.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson’s Report – Chair Cortright submitted a detailed written report (attached). He attended the Board of Trustees meeting in Past Chair Poundstone’s absence. Of special note; Trustee Russ Harrison, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, reported to the full Board on the “serious, collaborative character of the Faculty Salary Task Force’s work.” Trustee Harrison has been nominated to succeed Mr. Peter Kelly as the Chair of the Board of Trustees. It seems noteworthy as well that the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee will assume the Chair of the Board of Trustees.

4. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) – Chair Cortright reported that The UEPC has completed the task of working through the 12 sets of revised Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes and Rationales, as detailed in the document to be considered under New Business.

5. Harassment Policy Revision – Chair Cortright introduced Barry Chersky from the Department of Human Resources, who informed the Senate that the College is in the process of contracting with an on-line harassment prevention training vendor. The College will convert from live training to on-line training. Current SMC policy requires this training every year; however, state law requires training to occur once every two years and the College will also revise the policy to conform to the state requirement.

6. Faculty Welfare Committee - Ellen Rigsby reported on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC). The most important task this year for the FWC is the revision of the Faculty Salary Policy. The current salary policy stipulates a “floor” (Goal 1) and proposes a “ceiling” (Goal 2); Pac IIA schools form the comparators for the floor; the WCC schools, with Manhattan College, are the comparators for Goal 2. The President has declared Goal 2 unfeasible for a number of reasons; the BOS Strategic Plan calls for a review and revision of faculty salary policy. Review and consideration of revisions are underway through a select task force convened by the Provost. The task force has divided into two sub-committees, one dedicated to proposing market comparisons, the other to laying out principles or guidelines for salary policy. The market sub-committee has proposed a list of comparators, comprising approximately 40 schools, distributed across the country and selected for similarity to SMC on quantitative and qualitative grounds, together with the traditional “WCC + Manhattan” group: 48 comparators in all.
Professor Risgby explained that the next steps are to write a philosophy for the policy and write the policy itself. The subcommittee agrees in principle that the philosophy should contain a process of regular assessment, and that the policy be clear and transparent.

The task force’s discussions on philosophy and policy center on differential salaries. SMC is presently paying off-scale or differential salaries in contravention of the current salary policy and on ad hoc bases. The task force’s charge is to form a clear and transparent process. The FWC requests input from faculty on the differential salary policy issue. Differential salaries are the present, and may be the future, reality, but faculty can accept or reject differential salaries in principle, which could influence how the policy is implemented. The Senate will be asked to take up the issue of differential salaries once the final policy is presented by the FWC.

NEW BUSINESS

7. Resolution Amending 2010-2011 Senate Rules of Procedure – Chair Cortright introduced the following resolution to amend the 2010-2011 Senate Rules of Procedure (added language underlined) in favor of permitting the Senate, under specified conditions, to hold a closed session for the purpose of deliberating the merits of candidates for positions for which the Senate must provide confirmation: i.e., the Director of the Core Curriculum and members of the working groups to conduct core curriculum evaluation:

Whereas Senate Action S-10/11-13 (amending the Faculty Handbook, to establish the permanent Core Curriculum Committee and the position of Director of the Core Curriculum) provides for confirmation of the Director of the Curriculum and of members of the Core Curriculum Working Groups by vote of the Academic Senate; and

Whereas deliberation over the merits of nominees, as over the merits of Sabbatical Proposals or candidates for promotion or tenure, should be confidential; therefore:

Be it resolved that the Saint Mary’s College Academic Senate Rules of Procedure be amended as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE
Academic Year 2010 – 11
SECTION II: MOTIONS AND VOTING

(p. 6) VOTING PROCEDURES The ascending order of voting procedures is voice, show of hands, roll call, and secret ballot. A Senator may request a roll call vote. A Senator may also move to have a secret ballot; this requires a second, is not debatable and is passed by a majority vote.

Votes to confirm nominees to Core Curriculum Committee Working Groups or for Director of the Core Curriculum will be by secret ballot in every case.

SECTION III: TYPES OF MEETINGS

(p. 8) DUTIES The Academic Senate has the following five duties:

3. To conduct faculty elections; to confirm nominees to the Working Groups of the Core Curriculum Committee and nominees for Director of the Core Curriculum;

(pp. 10 – 11) SCHEDULE AND ATTENDANCE General meetings are scheduled by the chairperson. The traditional meeting time for general meetings is 3 – 5 p.m. on Thursdays. General meetings are open to all faculty members. Staff may attend without special invitation. Students may attend at the discretion of the chairperson, subject to appeal by a motion from the floor.
When the Agenda of a General meeting requires deliberation over confirmation of nominees, the Chair will request a non-debatable motion for closed deliberation. The motion for closed deliberation requires a second and a 2/3 majority. The General meeting will be reopened immediately upon conclusion of the deliberations in point. Balloting will be conducted in open, General session.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Ogawa to adopt the revised Senate Rules of Procedures. Chair Cortright clarified that discussion of the merits of candidates would be in closed session but the secret balloting would be held in open General Meeting. A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt the revised Rules 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>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>David Bird</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Heid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Steve Cortright</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

8. Adoption of the Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes and Rationales - Each of the 12 sets of Learning Outcomes, with accompanying Rationale were submitted by the CCIC and vetted and (in part) amended by the UEPC. Chair Cortright outlined the Rules of Procedure: a separate vote would be taken; first on the each set of Learning Outcomes, followed by a separate vote on the associated Rationale, then a final vote to adopt the set of Outcomes and associated Rationale in each case. Votes would be to either adopt or return the language to the UEPC.

AGENDUM 1 - LEARNING OUTCOMES UNDER CRITICAL THINKING

A MOTION was made by Senator Heid and SECONDED by Senator Bird to adopt Agendum 1, the following Proposed Learning Outcomes under Critical Thinking.

**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.

**Proposed Learning Outcomes:** 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 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

Senator Barram recalled that during the January meetings, Professor Harter raised questions about the understanding of what critical thinking is and he asked whether those concerns had been considered by the CCIC or UEPC. He pronounced himself “comfortable” with the proposed four outcomes’
treatment of critical thinking in “non-technical” terms, while noting that Professor Harter’s concerns (which he recalled as “technical”) remained unaddressed. Chair Cortright asked, on the point of the conformity of the Learning Outcomes to the Learning Goal, what is to be made of the absence of formal logic? Senator Barram replied that while an explicit reference to some type of logical analysis, that is, to formal logic, is missing and perhaps problematic, he saw logical training implied, e.g., by the Outcomes’ prescriptions that students develop plausible theses and consult confirming and opposing evidence; but he was not surprised that some would not find that adequate.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias asked whether the meaning of “critical thinking,” as used in educational theory or practice, differs from that current among logicians; is “critical thinking” also a term of art, with a specific meaning, in education? Senator Peterson responded that the documents usage is consistent with the understanding of critical thinking among educational theorists generally.

Past Chair Poundstone asked Chair Cortright to explain his concern over the absence of formal logic. Chair Cortright answered that, as he reads it, the Learning Goal adopted by the Senate proposes the core curriculum will lead students from the application of formal logic (thus presupposed by the Learning Goal) to inventive inquiry and argumentation adequate to varying subject-matters. What he reads in the Learning Outcomes is that the foundations proposed in the Goal are neglected in the Outcomes. He noted that “formal logic” need not mean what formal logicians typically mean (exploration of the properties of formal systems); and, given the language of the Learning Goal, it ought at least to mean reflection on and work in the formal methodologies appropriate to a student’s major. A set of learning outcomes that don’t expressly commit us to that kind of work with the students are not, he asserted, serious, since in any case, in a liberal arts institution, grammar, logic and rhetoric, in one form or another, will not merely be present in curricula, but architectonic. In his experience, he observed, SMC students are dreadful when faced with formal exercises in reasoning, and a core curriculum ought to take account of the students’ obvious weaknesses and move to correct them.

Senator Barram added that he would not be opposed to the addition of a 5th bullet point, if needed, not to require an additional class of students, but to ensure that certain logical issues are articulated clearly in the disciplinary curricula.

Past Chair Poundstone posed several questions: What if there were a learning outcome specifically related to formal logic? How would that be implemented? What are the implications for curricula? Chair Cortright responded that it would be possible for every department to take stock of itself with respect to this requirement, but not probable.

Barbara McGraw raised her concern that the Learning Goal includes the ability for students to question their own assumptions, but she was surprised that it is not included in the Learning Outcomes, as it is central to critical thinking.

Zach Flanagin responded that “identifying underlying assumptions,” #2 in the Learning Outcomes, does refer to the students themselves. He added that he would support the students taking a formal logic class in a philosophical format; however, a guiding principle for the work of the CCIC was to keep collegiate class requirements level. Therefore, the CCIC agreed that critical thinking would be interpreted in a broader sense: students to practice the art of step-by-step thinking in which they would have to be able to identify the pieces of their thought and the thought of others, both in terms of the arguments and the assumptions underlying them, and be able to move from the identification to a
conclusion based on evidence. This could be done in many ways and many contexts, and could be integrated into many venues. If something more is to be asked of students by way of critical thinking—a particular type of process—that is a matter for the Senate.

Past Chair Poundstone stated that he would vote against the motion. He suggested that statement #2 under Learning Outcomes could be clarified to state exactly whose assumptions are referred to (the concern brought up by Barbara McGraw). He said he would like to have the question of “logic” addressed. He would like to see language addressing the developmental nature of the process explicitly, to make sure students know what is anticipated. He suggested sending the document back to the UEPC to address these three concerns, which had been raised in the discussion. Senator Heid also asked that note be taken regarding the clarification of assumptions in outcome #2.

Zach Flanagin noted that the language in the documents is directed to faculty and the Senate. Chair Cortright confirmed that the Senate directed the composition of the rationales precisely to guide the CCC. Past Chair Poundstone rejoined that all publicly available documents are available for all to read. The people who do read this are faculty trying to design their courses, which is why the document should be very clear.

Senator Bird added that if developmental language is to be added, it should appear in the Rationale. Goal and Outcomes specify ends, where we want to be; the Rationale spells out how one gets to the goal/outcome. Outcomes, therefore, cannot be developmental. He would not use this reasoning to vote down Learning Outcomes, but perhaps he would vote down Rationale in order to include language about the developmental aspect.

A roll call vote on the Learning Outcomes under Critical Thinking 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>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>David Bird</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Heid</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Steve Cortright</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion to adopt the Learning Outcomes under Critical Thinking was defeated by a vote of 2-4 with three abstentions. According to custom, the Chair voted “present.” Chair Cortright announced that the Learning Outcomes under Critical Thinking will be returned to the UEPC along with the Senate concerns about the document.

The Senators were polled by the Chair as to whether they wished to apprise the UEPC that attention to formal logic is a matter of concern. Five Senators indicated a “yes” vote. The UEPC will be apprised of this vote. Past Chair Poundstone added that he did not see the topic addressed in the UEPC minutes, and he would be interested in knowing about the UEPC discussion on the subject.

Asbjorn Moseidjord, UEPC Chair, affirmed the idea that the critical thinking should be developmental has surfaced in UEPC discussions on several occasions. He requested Senate feedback, which would be addressed by the Rationale.
AGENDUM 2 - RATIONALE UNDER CRITICAL THINKING

A MOTION was made by Senator Ogawa and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone to adopt the following Agendum 2, Rationale under Critical Thinking:

Rationale (i.e., the intention of the proposed outcomes): The essence of critical thinking is the ability to engage in well-reasoned “criticism.” Criticism as used here means development of skills necessary for doing credible analysis of the ideas of others, and developing credible and original ideas of one’s own. The term “theses” is intended to include a broad spectrum of assertions, hypotheses, and premises relative to a variety of academic disciplines. The term “assumptions” is included because sophisticated analysis requires recognition, articulation, and understanding of theses, as well as recognition, articulation and understanding of assumptions that explicitly or implicitly underlie theses. Outcome #3 requires both “confirming and opposing” evidence to be gathered and considered in order to help students engage first in effective “objective” analysis rather than supporting an argument solely with data that favors their position.

The skills necessary to arrive at credible conclusions concerning one’s own and others’ ideas include careful observation, collection, analysis, and use of appropriate data, as well as perception of relevant ambiguities. The outcomes aim to structure the process of developing these skills. Outcome #1, therefore, requires that the student engage with, and understand, ideas in the work of others. Outcome #2 requires the student to explore by formulating questions and answers to develop ideas of their own. Outcome #3 is directed specifically toward teaching the student to recognize and collect evidence that both supports and opposes their ideas and those of others in order to arrive at conclusions characterized, in so far as possible, by objective realities. Outcome #4 asks the student to go further in the process of arriving at conclusions characterized by objective realities by learning to

Senator Barram noted that the Rationale could be affected by any potential change to the Learning Outcomes, which the Senate had just voted to return to the UEPC. Therefore, A MOTION to postpone the discussion of Agendum 2, Rationale, was made by Senator Bird and SECONDED by Senator Peterson. Senator Barram argued that the UEPC would not be able to amend the Rationale if the item is postponed. He suggested remanding the Rationale with the Learning Outcomes, to the UEPC for consideration of amendments following on (possible) changes to the Learning Outcomes. Senators Bird and Peterson withdrew the motion to postpone.

A MOTION was made by Senator Barram and SECONDED by Senator Lind to recommit with instruction that the UEPC evaluate Agendum 2, the Rationale, in light of the discussion of the rewording of Agendum 1, Learning Outcomes. Chair Cortright assured the Senate that all concerns voiced would be communicated to the UEPC for its consideration.

Past Chair Poundstone said some of the implementation language, specifically the clear statement about development, should be incorporated in the Rationale itself. He urged that his concern be forwarded to the UEPC for consideration, as that would be a powerful statement to the faculty, making a clear marker to the Collegiate Seminar Committee and others, in terms of what we are trying to achieve.

A hand vote was taken on the motion to recommit. The motion was approved by a vote of 9-0-0 with the Chair voting “present.”

AGENDUM 3

Agendum 3 was moot based on the two prior actions of the Senate.
Chair Cortright introduced Agendum 4, Shared Inquiry Learning Outcomes. A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to adopt the following Agendum 4, Learning Outcomes under Shared Inquiry.

**Shared Inquiry** (a Habit of Mind)

**Learning Goal:** Shared inquiry is the act of reasoning together about common texts, questions, and problems. It is a goal of the core curriculum to advance students' abilities to develop and pursue meaningful questions in collaboration with others. Through the habits of shared inquiry students will be able to carefully consider and understand the perspectives and reasoned opinions of others, reconsider their own personal opinion, and develop rhetorical skills.

**Learning Outcomes:** Students will
1. Advance probing questions about a common text or other object of study; and
2. Collaborate in sustained lines of inquiry; and
3. Reexamine judgments in light of evidence and collaborative discussion; and
4. Engage in inclusive, respectful conversation with others.

Senator Heid pointed out that the Rationale explicitly states that students “…reevaluate initial hypotheses, both their own and those of others.” She would like to see that explicit in the Learning Outcomes as well, viz.: students will identify and examine their own assumptions and those of others. Past Chair Poundstone supported Senator Heid’s concern.

Senator Ogawa noted the lack of language regarding evaluation or assessment; he questioned: does collaboration end; how long does one reexamine? It is, he observed, a qualitative set of outcomes.

Senator Peterson observed that learning outcomes around shared inquiry are particularly thorny; their articulation has always been a problem for the Collegiate Seminar. How many times does one need to speak to be part of the conversation? She, therefore, would endorse broad statements: because Seminar is taught in multiple ways, goals and outcomes need to be broad; to specify is sometimes to obstruct rather than to guide.

Barbara McGraw said learning outcomes usually state what a student will be able to do by the end of the course, a skill base, not what they do during the course. Senator Barram replied: one could read “the students will” in the perfective present tense; participation in these things suggests “I have developed this skill.”

Dean Tiberii argued that outcomes ought to be the end product of students’ participation in a learning process: if students are “advancing probing questions about a common text” (from #1 under Learning Outcomes), to what end of outcome is the process directed? The outcomes ought to specify what we want shared inquiry to achieve; the assessment piece then comes in to measure the achievement of the outcome. Chair Cortright responded: one might read #1 to mean that students will have the habit of being probative readers of events and texts; they will get that habit by probing.

Zach Flanagan proposed that several of the criticisms of the outcomes pertain to matters addressed in the Rationale. The Senate, he noted, is voting on the items in sequence, but that should not preclude looking to the sequent Rationale for clarification.
Ellen Rigsby spoke in support of the notion that the Learning Outcomes of Shared Inquiry may express process: everyone’s experience in Seminar is different, and students for the most part begin with their own opinion; hence the learning process and goal is that students ask questions and realize that knowing is a capacity to explain something to others, a collaboration, a process.

Senator Bird noted that he had been brought to think about what the difference is between the Critical Thinking Learning Goal and the Shared Inquiry Learning Goal, why they are different and what use it is for them to be articulated distinctly. Critical Thinking goals are goals he could attain alone at home with a book; it possible that they belong to a closed process. Shared Inquiry, on the other hand, is by its nature open, because you can always add another person or a different person to conversational inquiry. Rather than a process that we ask to produce a ‘thing’, these articulate an adverbial description of the qualities our conversations about the objects of study ought to attain. He therefore, he noted, supports the Learning Outcomes because of their open-endedness. Senator Lee agreed; shared inquiry should be relatively broad and not specific.

Senator Lind argued that shared inquiry is the freedom to express one’s ideas and thoughts, but it does not totally preclude the use of critical thinking. He would like his students to take some position and be somewhat critical and evaluative when they are discussing. There has to be some kind of critical analysis in discussing with others in order to validate the conclusion. He would favor adding more structure to the Learning Outcomes. Cynthia Ganote, in addressing Senator Lind’s comments, explained that the attempt to capture this piece is in Learning Outcome #3, “Reexamining judgments in light of evidence and collaborative discussion”.

Senator Heid re-emphasized that Shared Inquiry entails a developmental learning process: the more varied the opinions interlocutors bring to the inquiry, the harder it is to be able to accept and respectfully include them in the discussion.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt Agendum 4, Learning Outcomes under Shared Inquiry 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>Laura Heid</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Gomez-Arias</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Sam Lind</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Poundstone</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ogawa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>David Bird</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion passed by a vote of 5-4 with 1 abstention. Since the orders of the day were immanent, the discussion of the remaining Learning Outcomes and Rationales was continued to the next general meeting of the Senate.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Chair’s Report  
Academic Senate General Meeting  
Thursday, 10 February, 2011

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nominations for Director of the Core Curriculum

Pursuant to Senate Action S-10/11-12, the Chair and Vice Chair will represent the Academic Senate on the nominating committee for the first Director of the Core Curriculum, joining two members of the UEPC and two of the CCIC, yet to be announced by those bodies. An e-mailed announcement, soliciting nominations for Director of the Core Curriculum, was sent to all members of the faculty on 19 January, 2011. Nominations remain open through 18 February, 2011, and may be forwarded to the Chair, Academic Senate.

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 10 FEBRUARY, 2011

In re: 4. REPORTS

A. 1. Meetings of the Board of Trustees

In the absence of Past Chair, Tom Poundstone (abroad with his January Term class), the Chair represented the faculty at sequential meetings of the Trustees’ Academic Affairs Committee (January 6) and of the full Board (January 20–21). Reports submitted to the AA Committee and full Board appear as Appendices I and II, respectively, to this Report.

The Academic Affairs Committee, Chaired by Trustee Russ Harrison, heard and reacted to reports from each of the Deans of Schools and from the Provost, as well as from the Senate. The Committee members present evinced particular interest in six matters of moment to the College:

1. the potential for the College’s recent recognition in arts, debate, and like competition, to raise the College’s public profile;
2. the immediate and intermediate term implementation of the Academic Blueprint;
3. preparations for the up-coming WASC institutional capacity assessment;
4. continuing, timely progress toward institution of the revised undergraduate Core Curriculum;
5. attainment of AACSB accreditation; return of SEBA faculty to the main campus;
6. progress by the Faculty Salary Task Force toward a Report and recommendations, principally in light of salary policy’s implications for recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty.

In the event, Mr. Harrison’s General Session report to the full Board touched on each of the six, but he drew special attention (a) to the “serious, collaborative character” of the Faculty Salary Task Force’s work, to which he wished to attest as a member; (b) to institutional capacity concerns, on-going in the spheres of library resources and physical facilities, and emergent in the sphere of academic technology; (c) to progress on the revision of the undergraduate Core Curriculum.

Much of the General Session concerned financial matters, in particular the FY 2011–12 operating budget, as reported by Br. Ronald (24 January). Two further developments from the General Session should interest members of the faculty: Trustee Russ Harrison, now Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, has been nominated to succeed Mr. Peter Kelly in the Chair of the Board of Trustees; Br. Charles Hilken, FSC, delivered to the Board a statement registering the unanimous judgment of the Christian Brothers on campus on the future cultivation of St. Mary’s Catholic-liberal-Lasallian character.
C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)

Meeting on the 24th of January in regular session, the UEPC completed consideration of the proposed Learning Outcomes and accompanying Rationales for the new undergraduate Core Curriculum. The resulting language constitutes the object of Senate action under New Business, B., of the Agenda. Thanks are owing to Asbjorn Moseidjord, Chair, David Gentry-Aiken, Vice Chair, and their most diligent Committee.

With the 21 February meeting, UEPC will commence work on the backlog of ordinary business pre-empted by the Core project.

D. Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC)

AAEC is scheduled to meet 7 February; the Chair will deliver a brief report viva voce to the Senate.

In re: 5. NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolution Amending 2010–11 Senate Rules of Procedure

Pursuant to Senate Actions S-10/11-12 and S-10/11-13, the Academic Senate will periodically confirm nominees for Director of the Core Curriculum and for membership in Core Curriculum Working Groups. This resolution aims to establish ad hoc provision in the 2010–11 Senate Rules of Procedure for deliberation over nominees’ merits in closed session, along the lines already recognized for Senate committees, as, e.g., the UEPC/GPSEPC sitting to evaluate sabbatical applications. A motion and a second ad libidum from among the Senators will be required. This motion leaves the question whether amendments to the Handbook language governing the Academic Senate are in order to later consideration.

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).

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate
Two matters of overriding importance to, respectively, the undergraduate College and the College at large preoccupy the Academic Senate’s agenda, and will continue to preoccupy the agenda through the balance of the present academic year: I, revision of the Undergraduate Core Curriculum; II, faculty compensation.

I
To date, the Senate’s Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), and the latter’s select Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (CCIC) have delivered two major pieces of the revised Core to the Senate, which has responded with prompt action. Senate Action S-10/11-8 (11 November, 2010) amended the “Model 1” plan for Core revision: acting affirmatively on advice of the CCIC, the Senate re-wrote four of the model’s Learning Goals. The effect: eased implementation of the new Core and an enlarged set of undergraduate options. Senate Action S-10/11-9 adopted, with substantial amendment, UEPC’s recommendations on the membership, structure and charge of the permanent Core Curriculum Committee (CCC), the standing committee which will inaugurate, and thereafter continuously oversee and assess, the Core.

In immediate prospect: the Senate is in receipt of the CCIC-UEPC draft of a position description for the Director of the Core Curriculum, who will chair the CCC and act as the Core’s administrator. This draft is on the Senate Agenda for the General Meeting of 12 January, 2011. Its adoption would complete the Core’s governing structure, enabling election of the initial CCC membership and appointment of the inaugural Director in the upcoming Spring, 2011, election cycle. Also in immediate prospect: CCIC-UEPC have submitted the Core’s curricular outline—viz.: Learning Outcomes for the twelve Core Learning Goals and the Rationales that will guide the CCC as it approves Core courses and curricula—for review by the faculty at large at two general Senate fora, January 11 (evening) and 12 (noon). In light of faculty comment, UEPC will forward final language on the Outcomes and Rationales for Senate consideration at the successive General Meetings of February, March and—if necessary—April, 2011. In sum: the Senate is on pace to have the Undergraduate Core’s guiding curricular language and administration ready to commence assembling Core curricula with the opening of AY 2011–12.

II
The Senate is awaiting a report and recommendations from the “Building on Strengths”-mandated Faculty Salary Task Force. The Executive Committee has reserved time on the Agenda for April or May (or both) to consider proposals from the Task Force. In the meantime, the Senate registered the urgent concern of the College faculty at large by adopting, unanimously, Senate Action S-10/11-3, a resolution of the Senate’s Faculty Welfare Committee, calling for restoration of College TIAA-CREF contributions to 8.25% of salary. It registered, as well, the faculty’s grateful satisfaction with the Board of Trustees’ decision to restore the contribution, despite continued economic volatility. The Senate joins the faculty at large in the hope that the Task Force will offer actionable suggestions for relief, in the near and long term, from a multi-year scale freeze and accompanying erosion of real compensation, the result of increasing out-of-pocket insurance costs and local price inflation.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate
Good morning!

The business dominating faculty attention, and certainly dominating the agenda of the Academic Senate, through the Fall semester, has been revision of the undergraduate Core Curriculum. I propose to use my time to flesh out—concisely—the outline, provided by Trustee Harrison in his Academic Affairs Committee Report, of where we stand in the revision process.

On January 12, just after the Academic Affairs Committee meeting of 6 January, the Academic Senate passed amendments to the Faculty Handbook which established an elected Core Curriculum Committee, and the position, Director of the Core Curriculum.

The former, Core Curriculum Committee, will constitute an elected body of tenured faculty drawn from each undergraduate school, and charged with overseeing the Core Curriculum: policy, content, and assessment. In particular this committee will oversee the evaluation and acceptance of courses and co-curricular undertakings proposed by College departments and individual faculty for inclusion in the Core Curriculum.

The latter, Director of the Core Curriculum, will be a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, nominated to, and confirmed by the Academic Senate, to act as Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, as the Committee’s liaison to the Provost (through the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics) and to the College's academic departments, and as the day-to-day administrator of the Core Curriculum.

A call for nominations for Director of the Core Curriculum has already been issued. The faculty election cycle, commencing February 8th, will include the election of the six-member Core Curriculum Committee, whose terms (and the Director's) will commence 1 July, 2011.

On Monday up-coming, 24 January, the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate will meet to recommend final language specifying the Learning Outcomes which must be met by courses or co-curricular exercises, if they are to be included in the Core. This work is already well advanced; it is expected that final recommendations will be forwarded to the Academic Senate for decisive votes in a series of Senate General Meetings, February 10, March 3 and March 24.

Bottom line: the administrative structure of the new Core Curriculum has been determined; by July 1, 2011, a Core Curriculum Committee and Director will be in place and will—we are confident—have in hand final language for the review, evaluation and acceptance of the first “wave” of core undergraduate courses. That review should commence over the summer of 2011, and be complete in time for publication of the 2012-13 undergraduate Catalog. The leadership of the Academic Senate are confident that freshman of the class of 2016 will benefit from that first wave of core courses, as we begin—on time!—the four-year phase-in of the revised core.

I would be happy to take the members’ questions.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright  
Professor of Philosophy  
Chair, Academic Senate