Chair’s Report
Academic Senate General Meeting
Thursday, 24 March, 2011

ANNOUNCEMENTS

“Director” of the Core Curriculum

For reasons detailed under A. of OLD BUSINESS, Senate confirmation of the Core Curriculum leadership, anticipated for the present Agenda in the ANNOUNCEMENTS for the General Meeting of 3 March, 2011, must await a date yet to be determined. Because the action depends upon substantial amendment to the Faculty Handbook, that determination depends in turn upon practicable assurance that acceptable Handbook language has been attained; historically, on matters of academic governance, the Provost’s acceptance constitutes that assurance. The Executive Committee will, therefore, await the Provost’s response to Senate action arising under today’s Agenda before scheduling a confirmation vote.

Senate Resolution of Commendation to Brother Augustine Boquer, FSC

Senators are asked to linger briefly at the conclusion of business so that each may subscribe to the 3 March Senate Resolution in commendation of the Brother President of De La Salle University–Dasmariñas.

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 24 MARCH, 2011

In re: 4. REPORTS

C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)

Senators have the UEPC minutes for Monday, 14 March, 2011 in hand. UEPC met for an extended session, during which the backlog of ordinary business, arising from UEPC’s preoccupation with revision to the undergraduate Core Curriculum, was cleared. In addition to the Consent calendar, UEPC action generated item A. under NEW BUSINESS, which is addressed below.

At the March 14th meeting, UEPC also received and acted on a report and recommendations from CCIC in re: the revised Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Critical Thinking. The report and language accord with the Committee’s 21 February referral to CCIC of the Senate’s 2-4-3 “Nay” vote (10 February) and explanatory memorandum (cf. Chair’s Report, 3 March, 2011; UEPC Minutes, 21 February, 2011, pp. 1 – 2 under III). On a vote of 10-0-0, UEPC accepted CCIC’s proposed language as a sufficient response to both the Committee’s charge and the Senate’s concerns (cf. UEPC Minutes, 14 March, 2011, p. 4 under VI). In three separate votes, the Committee advised the Senate on aspects of the CCIC’s proposed language [cf. UEPC Minutes, 14 March, 2011, p. 4, nos. (1) – (3) under VI]. The Executive Committee will advance the revised Critical Thinking language to the Senate Agenda once the Senate has completed the first review of all twelve sets of Learning Outcomes and associated Rationales. Senators have a complete dossier of the relevant CCIC and UEPC documents in hand for study in anticipation of later action.

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). UEPC’s next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 4, 2011.
In re: 5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Amendment of Senate Actions S-10/11-12 and S-10/11-13

The Senators have in hand a resolution detailing amendments to the language of the Actions in point.

At the 12 January, 2011 General Meeting, the Senate passed Senate Actions S-10/11-12 (6-0-1) and S-10/11-13 (7-0-0), the first, “Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum,” and the second, “Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups.” The first provided the criteria against which to assess candidates for faculty leadership in the governance of the undergraduate core curriculum and the second proposed Faculty Handbook language, under 1.7.4. ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES, providing for the constitution, governance and assessment of the undergraduate core curriculum. In the view of the Chair and the Executive Committee, these Senate Actions were undertaken pursuant to Handbook 1.6.1.2.1. at 3. and 1.6.1.2.2. at 3, which define matters “for which the Senate has full authority to act, such as faculty committee membership and procedures” (1.6.1.2.2. at 6.), subject to the procedures for changes to the Handbook (cf. 1.6.1.2.2. at 3.).

On March 6, 2011, the Chair received a Provost’s memorandum by way of “formal response to Senate Actions S-10/11-11, S-10/11-12, S-10/11-13, S-10/11-14:

   ... Senate Action S-10/11-12, Position Description and Duties; Director of the Core Curriculum: This action is supplemental to S-10/11-13, which proposes language for the Faculty Handbook detailing the role and structure of the Core Curriculum Committee. As such, I am interpreting this action to be advisory, because while the Senate identifies general roles and responsibilities for academic administrators, the Senate does not define their duties in detail or total. I accept the general purpose of these duties and see no need for modification at this point. However, the process of appointing the Director is inconsistent with other similar positions in the Handbook, as is the identification of course releases and term lengths. If the paragraph, “Position Description and Duties” is indeed advisory, I can accept it without further comment. If the intent is to include this language in the Handbook, the selection process, term lengths, and course equivalency will need to be consistent with the proposed language in S-10/11-12.

   Senate Action S-10/11-13, Resolution for the Establishment of a College Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee, Director of the Core Curriculum, and Core Curriculum Working Groups. I appreciate the considerable energy, attention, and time invested in the development of this Action, as well as the continued commitment of faculty to ensuring the integrity of the new Core. All Director positions listed in the Handbook are filled by the supervising administrator, with no role of the Senate in the selection process. I value the role of Senate consultation and am willing to make an exception in the case of the Director of the Core Curriculum to the extent that consultation is explicitly sought by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. However, selection of an academic administrator by Senate election is inappropriate and inconsistent with our established practices. Therefore, I accept the Action with the revision of 1.7.4.13 to read:
Director of the Core Curriculum (chairperson, voting), a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, appointed by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics in consultation with the Senate, serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics.

The phrase “serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate” is arguably made more ambiguous by this revision; I interpret this to mean that the Director should seek counsel from the Senate when appropriate (this is also a deviation from other Director positions which I am willing to accept).

The Provost’s salient phrases, “while the Senate identifies general roles and responsibilities for academic administrators, the Senate does not define their duties in detail or total” and “Director positions listed in the Handbook are filled by the supervising administrator, with no role of the Senate in the selection process,” suggested that the Provost had read S-10/11-12 and 13 as (over-reaching) Actions pursuant to Handbook 1.6.1.2.2. at 4. The Provost’s responses also suggested that the precise implications of the Senate’s choice of “Director” as the descriptive title for the executive officer of the Core Curriculum Committee remained—as they had been during deliberations at the General Meeting of 12 January—a source of unease. That unease seemed liable to increase in light of descriptive language from S-10/11-12 that could entail essential (as opposed to incidental) administrative functions, e.g.: “Develop budget planes and oversee budget expenditures for the program”; “Supervise any staff who provide administrative support for the CCC”; “…adjudicate student… petitions…”

On March 9, the Provost and Executive Committee met to discuss the apparent differences between the Senate’s and the Provost’s readings/interpretations of the Senate Actions and their Handbook bases. The discussion resulted in a clear and agreed sense of how the Actions could be amended so as to adapt existing patterns of shared governance (which depend, in part, on the clear distinction of faculty and administrative functions) for complimentary goals: to meet the Senate’s concern for authoritative faculty oversight of the common, undergraduate core curriculum; to meet the Provost’s concern for the core curriculum’s effective, accountable administration.

The Chair drafted amended versions of both Senate Actions. These have been reviewed and accepted by the Provost and the Executive Committee. They form the operative language of the Resolution proposed to the Senate. (The texts of the original Senate Actions and the proposed, amended texts are compared in Appendix II.)

The Resolution will require a motion ad libidum and a second from among the Senators. Amendments are in order, but Senators are reminded that substantial changes would likely require renewed discussions with the Provost.

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 Agenda 22, “Whether to adopt the Social, Historical and Cultural understanding Outcomes 1–3?” and proceed sequentially, unless a change to the orders of the day is moved.
In re: NEW BUSINESS

A. UEPC Recommendation to Add MATH 002 and 012 to the Undergraduate Catalog

Senators have in hand the Mathematics and Computer Science Department (DOMACS) proposal which was the subject of the UEPC review and vote; Senators also have in hand the UEPC Minutes, 14 March, 2011, recording a vote of 6-3-1, that is, less than the two thirds necessary to advance the proposal to the Consent Agenda. Senators’ attention is called to the following:

- Math 002 and Math 012 were developed and have been taught (since Fall, 2008) as experimental offerings, and must (in their present form) now either advance to listing in the permanent undergraduate Catalog or be discontinued;
- Everything in the record supports the judgment that MATH 002 (Math Readiness) and MATH 012 (Math Readiness for Calculus) are admirably designed and conducted to attain the goals their titles suggest—that is, that they address needs of students who are ill-prepared for the demands of collegiate-level mathematics, with reasonable success;
- The record nowhere advances an argument to the effect that—on grounds of mission or otherwise—these courses or their equivalent should not be offered at SMC, given the present profile of a substantial minority of matriculants;
- The expressed ground for dissent at the UEPC (cf. Minutes, 14 March, 2011, pp. 2 – 3 under IV) is: the courses are remedial in nature—that is, they do not, on the Mathematics Department’s own showing, rise to the level of collegiate studies—but each is offered for 1.00 course credit;
  - “Proposal for Permanent Status for Experimental Courses Math 002 and Math 012” (hereafter “Proposal”), p. 1, under “Justification”: “The two courses are designed to help mathematically underprepared [sic] students so that when they take their first college level mathematics class they will be successful”;
  - “Proposal, pp. 1–2, under “Justification”: “... students who enter Saint Mary’s College but have not satisfied their high school Algebra II requirement may take one of these courses to satisfy this requirement”;
  - “Proposal,” p. 2, under “Justification”: “Neither of these courses will satisfy the Area B mathematics requirement but will assist students in being prepared for their necessary college level mathematics courses. Both courses will earn the student college credit though”;
- Nowhere in the record is there suggestion of any proposal to make the instruction/content of MATH 002 and 012 available otherwise than as undergraduate course credit;
- Some discussion among the UEPC concerned whether the courses are, de facto (they are not formally), required of matriculants who do not place into a regular Mathematics Department offering through the Math Placement Exam (if the answer is, de facto, affirmative, SMC will be requiring a further general education course of some students).

Action on this agendum will require an an libidum motion and second from among the Senators to approve the recommendation of UEPC, namely, that MATH 002 and MATH 012 be added to the permanent undergraduate Catalog as proposed by the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science. A “Nay” vote will return the matter to UEPC and, given the advanced stage of preparation for the 2011–12 Catalog, assure in effect that neither the courses nor their equivalents will be offered in AY 2011–12.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate
Appendix I

TO: Asbjorn Moseidjord, Chair, Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee
CC: Zach Flanagin, Co-chair, CCIC
FROM: Steve Cortright, Chair, Academic Senate
DATE: March 7, 2011
RE: Adoption of Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes & Rationales

At the March 3, 2011 meeting of the Academic Senate, the adoption of the UEPC approved Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes & Rationales for the New Core Curriculum was discussed. The following actions were taken:

**Learning Outcomes under Mathematical and Scientific Understanding** - A motion to adopt the learning outcomes was defeated by a Senate vote of 2-4 with 3 abstentions. Listed below are the Senate concerns or questions raised.

Considerations regarding UEPC’s striking of retaining #3 under Scientific Learning Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro (the UEPC amendment striking #3)</th>
<th>Contra (the UEPC amendment striking #3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why isn’t there a similar requirement or outcome for social science or other areas?</td>
<td>The absence of statement #3 is inconsistent with the Senate-mandated Learning Goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The original language (of #3) implies that ethical “sensitivity” is peculiarly problematic among the physical sciences as compared to other disciplines.</td>
<td>The word “examined” could be replaced with “considered” (thus tending less toward prescription of course content).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For clarification, the Chair took a series of straw votes:

Six Senators indicated in a straw vote that a vote of “no” or “abstain” was determined by the perceived inconsistency between the language of the Learning Outcome (making no reference to ethical concerns as an object of study under the Goal) and the language of the Learning Goal (which prescribes attention to ethical issues).

Three Senators indicated in a straw vote that restoration of Outcome #3 would precipitate a reversal of their “no” vote to a “yes” vote. Similarly, no Senators indicated in a straw vote that restoration of Outcome #3 would precipitate a change from a “yes” vote to a “no” vote.

Senator Ogawa offered the following recommendation: “Such a statement [sc. prescribing attention to ethical concerns] should be articulated explicitly stated for the entire undergraduate College with application to entirety of the new curriculum.” (NB: Chair Cortright: interpreted the statement to mean recommending and requiring attention to ethical and other questions in a disciplinary setting – while Senator Ogawa added “the process of their inquiry.”) Seven Senators endorsed Senator Ogawa’s statement.

**Rationale under Mathematical and Scientific Understanding**

Since possible changes the Learning Outcomes being returned to the UEPC may also require changes to the Rationale, Agendum 14 is also returned to the UEPC, without comment.

**Learning Outcomes under Theological Understanding** - A motion to adopt the Learning Outcomes was defeated by a Senate vote of 3-5 with 1 abstention.

Listed below are the Senate concerns or questions raised.
• The words “ethical” and “social” are included in the Learning Goals, but are missing from the Learning Outcomes.
  o Suggested to add, “with particular attention to the social and ethical implications.”
  o Not sure students or faculty would necessarily address the ethical/social concerns under the Learning Outcomes dedicated to Biblical understanding/interpretation.
    ▪ For preference, social and ethical implications should be explicit in #3.

• Under the Learning Outcomes, explicit mention of consideration of ethical and social implications of theological inquiry shall be demonstrated by students.

• Consider the parallel laities between scientific understanding and theological understanding, especially with respect to the first of the Outcomes, in Theological, and the third of the Outcomes in Scientific.

Some Senators argued that the Learning Outcomes for Theological Understanding were particularly well done and that social and ethical implications are absolutely presumed in the subjects of theological inquiry.

Rationale under Theological Understanding - A motion to adopt the Rationale proposed for the Learning Outcomes under Theological Understanding was defeated by a Senate vote of 0-8 with 1 abstention.

Listed below are the Senate concerns or questions raised.

The Rationale depends on confused categories, viz: “…all of the subfields of theology and religious studies (e.g., from classical Thomism to Jungian psychology).” Thomism is a school of theology in its own right, not a subfield; Jungian psychology is not a subfield of religious studies, but a psychological technique or perspective or, for that matter, a school of psychology. The intent of Rationale’s language is admirable and might be served as follows: “…all of the subfields of theology (e.g., moral theology, ecclesiology, etc.) and religious studies (e.g., feminist approaches to religion, religion and literature, religion and politics, Buddhist perspectives on the self, etc.).”

The Chair noted that changes in the Rationale should be considered in parallel to changes in the Outcomes.

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

Appendix II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text of Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Senate Action S-10/11-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Description and Duties: Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position Description and Duties: Director of the Core Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) 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 and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. The first Chair 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 Chairs serving three-year terms. Subsequent Chairs will be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Senate, the chair of the UEPC and the out-going Chair of the CCC and confirmed by Senate majority vote. Initially, the Chair will receive three course-equivalent reassigned times each academic year. The duties of the Chair of the Core Curriculum</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 and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. 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 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee are as follows:

1. Provide leadership of the Core Curriculum Committee, ensuring that it fulfills its mandated responsibilities.
2. Establish the seven Core Curriculum Committee working groups based on Core Goals and supervise the selection of faculty to fill those positions, with the assistance of the other CCC faculty members.
3. Address procedural and policy issues that arise in regard to the day-to-day operation of the Core program.
4. Keep abreast of national trends in general education, and initiate consideration of needed reforms in the SMC Core Curriculum Program.
5. Maintain lists of courses that satisfy particular goals and provide appropriate entries for the Catalog of Courses to guide students and faculty regarding Core requirements.
6. Develop and direct workshops to stimulate good teaching in the Core Curriculum and to provide a coherent professional development component for faculty teaching in the Core.
8. Supervise, in collaboration with the CCC, the rotating schedule of regular review of the policies, overall structure, and specific components of the Core, and make recommendations to the Academic Senate for any needed changes, based on assessment measures and evaluations supervised by the CCC.
9. Report as provided above, and as circumstance may recommend, to the Academic Senate and to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics on matters concerning the Core Curriculum Program, such as curriculum, assessment of learning, staffing, budget, and implementation components.

Consult with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, the Registrar, and Deans, respectively, on budget planning and administrative support for core curricular programming; on policies for the adjudication of issues regarding students’ fulfillment of Core requirements; on policies for the equitable staffing of core curricular offerings, and so on, as befits Saint Mary’s system of shared governance.

Text of Proposed Amendment

(in relevant part)

1.7.4.13 Core Curriculum Committee

Role: Core Curriculum signifies the foundational and essential learning expected of all undergraduate students at Saint Mary’s College (as articulated in

Senate Action S-10/11-13

(in relevant part)

1.7.4.13 Core Curriculum Committee

Role: Core Curriculum signifies the foundational and essential learning expected of all undergraduate students at Saint Mary’s College (as articulated in
Learning Goals, Outcomes and Rationales) and the processes by which students achieve that learning (i.e., approved courses and other experiences). Under the leadership of the Chair, in accordance with Senate Action S-10/11-09, the Core Curriculum Committee administers and evaluates policy governing the Core Curriculum: course/experience review (through Working Groups) and approval; assessment of student learning; assessment and development of the Core as a whole and in its elements; intra- and extramural presentation of the Core via catalogues, course lists, published guidelines, workshops, et al.

Membership: the permanent membership of the Core Curriculum Committee includes:
- Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee (voting), a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, nominated to a three-year term by the Senate Executive Committee, UEPC Chair and out-going Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, and confirmed by majority vote of Academic Senate. The Chair serves at the pleasure of the Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics;
- six ranked members of the undergraduate faculty (voting): 2 elected from the School of Liberal Arts, 2 from the School of Science, 1 from the School of Economics and Business Administration, and 1 from the undergraduate faculty at large, for staggered, three-year terms;
- Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics (or designee) (ex officio, non-voting);
- Vice Provost for Student Life (or designee) (ex officio, non-voting);
- Registrar (or designee) (ex officio, non-voting);
- Undergraduate representative chosen by the ASSMC (non-voting).

Chair’s Duties: as the Core Curriculum Committee’s executive, the Chair facilitates the Core’s day-to-day operation; acts as liaison to the undergraduate faculty at large and to academic officers and bodies of the College; consults on budgetary and staff support; coordinates intra- and extramural assessment, et al., according to Senate Action S-10/11-12; the Chair receives yearly reassigned course equivalences commensurate with the office’s demands.

Meetings: The Core Curriculum Committee is convened according to a schedule drawn up by the Chair.

Learning Goals, Outcomes and Rationales) and the processes by which students achieve that learning (i.e., approved courses and other experiences). Under the leadership of the Director, and in accordance with Senate Action S-10/11-09, the Core Curriculum Committee administers and evaluates policy governing the Core Curriculum: course/experience review (through Working Groups) and approval; assessment of student learning; assessment and development of the Core as a whole and in its elements; intra- and extramural presentation of the Core via catalogues, course lists, published guidelines, workshops, et al.

Membership: the permanent membership of the Core Curriculum Committee includes:
- Director of the Core Curriculum (chairperson, voting), a tenured member of the undergraduate faculty, nominated to a three-year term by the Senate Executive Committee, UEPC Chair and out-going Director, and confirmed by majority vote of Academic Senate. The Director serves at the pleasure of the Academic Senate and reports to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics;
- six ranked members of the undergraduate faculty (voting): 2 elected from the School of Liberal Arts, 2 from the School of Science, 1 from the School of Economics and Business Administration, and 1 from the undergraduate faculty at large, for staggered, three-year terms;
- Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics (or designee) (ex officio, non-voting);
- Vice Provost for Student Life (or designee) (ex officio, non-voting);
- Registrar (or designee) (ex officio, non-voting);
- Undergraduate representative chosen by the ASSMC (non-voting).

Director’s Duties: as the Core Curriculum Committee’s executive, the Director facilitates the Core’s day-to-day operation; acts as liaison to the undergraduate faculty at large and to academic officers and bodies of the College; consults on budgetary and staff support; coordinates intra- and extramural assessment, et al., according to Senate Action S-10/11-12; the Director receives yearly reassigned course equivalences commensurate with the office’s demands.

Meetings: The Core Curriculum Committee is convened according to a schedule drawn up by the Director.
Core Curriculum Working Groups

Role: Core Curriculum Working Groups function as subcommittees of the Core Curriculum Committee, as provided under Senate Action S-10/11-9: the Groups recommend, for inclusion in the core curriculum, courses that fulfill outcomes under the Core learning goals, according to guidelines established by the Core Curriculum Committee. Working Groups are convened by the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, each with specific responsibilities under the Core Learning Goals, as follows:

- Group HM (Habits of Mind);
- Group MS (Math and Science);
- Group AU (Artistic Understanding);
- Group TU (Theological Understanding);
- Group HC (Historical, Social, and Cultural Understanding);
- Group CG/CE (Common Good/Community Engagement);
- Group AD/GP (American Diversity/Global Perspectives).

Membership: Each Working Group consists in:

- Working Group Chair (a member of the Core Curriculum Committee designated by the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee);
- four members of the undergraduate faculty confirmed by vote of the Academic Senate on the recommendation of the Core Curriculum Committee.

Eligibility: The Core Curriculum Committee consults relevant deans and department chairs, and considers self-nominations by members of the undergraduate faculty, in pursuit of a mix of disciplinary experts and interested non-experts fitted to the specific responsibilities of each Working Group.

Meetings: Working Groups will be convened when, and as—in the judgment of the Chair and Group Chairs—the volume of material for review requires.

NB: Amendment to Handbook 2.6.1 is unaltered as between the original S-10/11-13 and the present Resolution.