THANKS

Many, many members of the faculty have invested a great deal in works of shared governance over this academic year. I doubt whether a complete list of contributors and their principal undertakings could be managed in the time allotted for a general meeting. Let me, then, thank—officially and, as it were, in the aggregate—the members of the Task Forces, search committees, standing committees, ad hoc committees, councils, working groups, consulting groups, study groups (on everything from the web redesign to particular technologies) . . .

I wish briefly—but nonetheless warmly, for that!—to add personal thanks to my Executive Committee colleagues, Tomas Gomez-Arias and Tom Poundstone, for guarding the flanks of my judgment through an eventful year. They are, of course, blameless for whatever has gone astray. For whatever has gone right, or been righted, among the undergraduate core revision’s polymorphic peripeties, many thanks are due the unflappable, unfailingly gracious, Asbjorn Moseidjord. In the hands of Asbjorn, Zach Flanagan, and Jim Sauerberg the art of herding cats blooms uniquely at Saint Mary’s into “cat dressage” or even “feline close-order drill.”

I wish to thank my Senate colleagues all together for putting a good face on their fate these late Thursdays.

In another vein, I wish to thank that half of the Senators who have, so far, honored what the Senate decreed for all faculty, by attending the Campus of Difference Workshop.

Members of the Senate should join me in thanking “Honest Joe” Zepeda, who, in every (humane) way possible, curbed my tendency to Thomas B. Reed Syndrome.

I remain personally indebted—as do all members of the faculty who toil in the sloughs of shared governance—to the thoroughly admirable Cathe Michalosky.

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 12 MAY, 2011

In re: 4. REPORTS

D. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC).

UEPC conducted its final, regularly scheduled meeting for AY 2010 – 11 on 2 May. Senators have in hand the Minutes, which report the sole action taken at the meeting. That action forwards, to the Senate, CCIC Recommendations, under the UEPC finding (11-0-0) that the Recommendations satisfy the Senate’s request (cf. Minutes March 3, 2011, pp. 8 – 10) for modification of the language in the Learning Outcomes and Rationales, under the Pathways to Knowledge, Scientific Understanding and Theological Understanding. I address it below under Old Business.

Among the Agenda of the 2 May UEPC meeting Senators will note consideration of item IV: Proposal for a Revised Business Administration Major. This agenda was the sole subject of a special meeting of the UEPC on Monday, 9 May, 2011. At that meeting the (unamended) proposal was approved by the UEPC on a vote of 6-5-0 (rendering the proposal ineligible on its face for the Senate Consent Agenda). Per the Senate Rules of Procedure adopted for 2010 – 11,
addition of the UEPC recommendation to the present Agenda would have required exceptional action by Executive Committee; that action was declined in a split decision. Why? The proposal is complex and lengthy; the Executive Committee majority are persuaded that the proposal merits—and the Senators deserve—far more than a bare 48 hours for review, research and reflection.

As matters stand at this writing (10 May): UEPC Minutes of the 9 May Special Meeting are still in preparation, and supporting documentation for the Senators is being assembled. If Senate action on the proposal is to be forthcoming in AY 2010 – 11, a Special General Meeting will be required. I direct the interested parties to Handbook 1.6. 1. 2. 9. 3.

In re: 5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Senate Request for Language Modifying Learning Outcomes and Rationales for the Scientific Understanding and Theological Understanding Learning Goals

The Senators have in hand a document accompanying the UEPC Minutes of May 2, 2011, and headed “UEPC meeting: May 02, 2011, Second Agenda Item.” Under the titles “2. Proposed Language for the Scientific Understanding Learning Outcomes and Rationale” and “3. Proposed Language for the Theological Understanding Learning Outcomes and Rationale,” this document contains the restored and additional language to which the UEPC refers by “CCIC Recommendations” (UEPC Minutes May 2, 2011, pp. 1 – 2); this language the UEPC judges 11-0-0 to satisfy the Senate’s request; language proposed for the Theological Understanding Outcomes and Rationale only, the UEPC endorses 10-0-1.

The Chair will entertain a motion ad libidum from among the Senators to accept the UEPC actions under “II. Senate Request for Language Modifying Learning Outcomes and Rationales for the Scientific Understanding and Theological Understanding Learning Goals,” and will interpret a motion to accept the UEPC actions as Senate adoption of the CCIC Recommendations, that is, Senate adoption of all the language above referenced under “2. Proposed Language . . . etc.,” beginning “Mathematical and Scientific Understanding . . .” and running continuously through “. . . or result from developments in modern science” and all the language above referenced under “(3) Proposed Language . . . etc.,” beginning “Theological Understanding . . .” and running continuously through “. . . is crucial for responsible theological work.”

Division of the question will, as is usual, be in order if it pleases the Senate; that is, e.g., the Chair will entertain a motion to consider the language proposed under Scientific or Theological Understanding separately; or to consider the question whether the Senate’s request is satisfied apart from the question whether to adopt the CCIC Recommendations, and so on. As with the original Agenda under Adoption of the Learning Outcomes, etc., the Chair will resist extempore amendments to the proposed language.

B. Core Curriculum Working Groups

The Senators have in hand a roster of nominations for the Corte Curriculum Working Groups established under Senate Actions S-10/11-12 and 13 (as amended), and requiring Senate confirmation.
The Chair will entertain a motion *ad libidum* from among the Senators to confirm the Working Group Nominations *in toto*. A division of the question is, as usual, in order; that is, the Chair will entertain a motion to vote separately on each Working Group, or on any combination of Groups. The Chair will not, however, entertain any motion to divide consideration of any group by individual members. A motion for *in camera* deliberations would also be in order, if Senators wish to discuss the propriety of the nominations.

**C. Seminar Task Force Recommendation**

The Senators have in hand under the heading “Recommendation – Model 1b” a report from the Collegiate Seminar Task Force recommending adoption, for the revised undergraduate core curriculum, of Model 1b among the six proposed to, and deliberated and balloted by, the undergraduate faculty. The Chair will entertain a motion *ad libidum* from among the Senators to accept the Task Force’s recommendation. If and only if a motion to accept the Task Force’s recommendation fails will the Chair entertain a motion to adopt some other among the Models proposed by the Task Force.

*In re: NEW BUSINESS*

**A. CoC Revisions to the *Faculty Handbook***

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias will introduce and move adoption of a series of *Handbook* amendments to sections 1.6.1.1ff., 1.7.2.2, 1.7.4.5, and 2.6.1.; full texts are in the Senators’ hands. Senators so desiring will, as usual, have opportunity to move division of the question.

**B. AARC Catalog Language for Enrollment and Drop/Add Policies**

Senator Bird, AARC Liaison, will introduce and move the Catalog language in the Senator’s hands. The Chair will allow substantive amendments to the proposed language.

**C. AARC Advising Proposal**

Senators have in hand a proposal, in the form of *Handbook* language to be added as section 1.7.4.13, for creation of a Faculty Undergraduate Academic Advising Committee. Senator Bird, AARC Liaison, will introduce the proposal and move a resolution to adopt it.

Some Senators may share the Chair’s disappointment that a proposal to create four further elected positions for ranked faculty and further Senate liaison duties does not seem to have been referred to the Committee on Committees for review of its impact.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate