1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Cortright at 3:00 p.m. on May 12, 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: Sam Agronow, Associate Dean Shawny Anderson, Catherine Banbury, Interim Dean Jerry Brunetti, Cynthia Ganote, Larisa Genin, Dana Herrera, Chris Jones, Christa Kell, Dean Zhan Li, Claude-Rhéal Malary, Sue Marston, Mary McCall, Barbara McGraw, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Ellen Rigsby, Jim Sauerberg, Scott Schonfeldt-Aultman, Vice Provost Chris Sindt, Grete Stenersen, Vice Provost Frances Sweeney, Russ Tiberii, Ted Tsukahara, Cynthia VanGilder, Dean Roy Wensley, Linda Wobbe, and Dean Steve Woolpert.

2. Minutes of the April 14, 2011 meeting were approved by voice vote, with one abstention.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report - Chair Cortright reported that the Provost was unable to attend the meeting; She sent regrets and thanked the Senate for their exemplary work this year.

Chair Cortright submitted a detailed written report (copy attached.) He thanked the many faculty involved in shared governance on campus.

4. Program Review Committee (PRC) - Catherine Banbury reported as chair of the PRC. A detailed written report of the 2010-2011 academic year was submitted and is on file in the office of the Academic Senate. Professor Banbury reported that the PRC examined 14 departments/programs over the past two years. She briefly reviewed several concerns and issues that emerged through the program review process; while acknowledging that, in all cases, the work being done by faculty is impressive and faculty are dedicated to the mission of the college and the students.

- Programs find it difficult to submit reviews on time; they are overburdened. Failures of timely review lead to gaps in the curriculum. The tardiness or absence of reports is only one consequence of the extra burden imposed on departments by the great amount of service ranked faculty perform across the College. Another is lack of participation by ranked faculty in Jan Term and Seminar.
- The issues are systemic and not program specific.
- There is inconsistency across programs regarding the evaluation of adjunct faculty.
- Few of the department reports address the College Blueprint or the new core curriculum.
- Many lack a global focus.
- There is much mention about the lack of technology and corresponding technical support in the classroom.
- The most pressing concern facing the college, as evidenced by the last two years program review, is the need for additional tenure track faculty.

Catherine Banbury concluded by saying that the PRC is considering changing the review period from five to seven years.
5. **Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)** - Chair Cortright reported that the final regularly scheduled meeting was held on May 2, and an additional meeting was held on May 9th. The two approved UEPC items appear on the agenda under “Old Business.” In additional UEPC business, a proposal for thorough revision of the Business Administration curriculum was approved at the May 9th meeting. Due to the timing of the approval, a special Senate meeting will be held on May 25, 2011 from 2-5 p.m. to address the UEPC recommendation.

6. **Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC)** - Senator Bird submitted the AARC Report for academic year 2009-2010. Areas of the 2009-2010 report relevant to New Business item, is Section III of the report, Review of Faculty Handbook language concerning Faculty Advising. Previously, on September 7, 2009, the Senate charged the AARC with the additional responsibility of the academic advising. A subcommittee of the AARC was established for 2010-2011 (composed of persons not members of the AARC) to examine the faculty role in advising. The subcommittee submitted a proposal regarding faculty advising, appearing under “New Business.”

7. **Graduate and Professional Educational Policies Committee (GPSEPC)** - Chair Cortright noted that the GPSEPC has a consent agenda item, “Guidelines for the Approval of Certificates.” Senator Peterson added that the Guidelines were unanimously approved by the GPSEPC. No objection was noted, the item was accepted on the Consent Agenda.

8. **Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC)** - Chris Jones reported on the faculty salary policy. He noted that the report is based on a faculty salary policy now under review by the BoS-mandated Task Force. The current policy has three goals:

   - **Goal One** - the average of salaries by rank should minimally be the average salaries by rank of Pacific States IIA institutions.
   - **Goal Two** - To maintain competitive salaries, the budget process should also consider a smaller cohort of comparable institutions: other WCC schools and Manhattan College.
   - **Goal Three** - To aim for a salary structure that is equitable across ranks.

Of these, Goal Two has been rendered nugatory by the President’s declaration that it is unfeasible. Nevertheless, since the scale over the past two years has flat-lined, WCC colleagues have moved further ahead. Assessment of Goals One and Three is rendered problematic on the prescribed Academe data, since the de facto College policy of paying select off-scale salaries has driven the Academe-reported averages sharply up. While the average reported salaries at the associate and full professor ranks overtook those of the PAC-IIA in 2004-05, and have remained above them since that time, the average of assistant salaries paid by the College now exceeds the published top-step assistant salary, and the average of salaries paid at the assistant rank now nearly equals that paid at the associate Rank.

A full written report is available through the office of the Academic Senate.

**OLD BUSINESS**
9. Senate Request for language modifying Learning Outcomes and Rationales for the Scientific Understanding and Theological Understanding Learning Goals - At the March 3, 2011 meeting, the Senate voted to return the proposed Learning Outcomes and Rationales under Mathematical and Scientific Understanding as well as the Learning Outcomes and Rationale under Theological Understanding to the UEPC. The UEPC, upon consultation with the CCIC, resubmitted language for consideration. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Bird to accept the UEPC findings, so as to adopt language submitted below:

Mathematical and Scientific Understanding (Pathways to Knowledge)

Learning Goal: Mathematics and science courses that are part of the core curriculum will develop quantitative, observational, and problem solving abilities of students. In addition to gaining an understanding of content and methodologies, students will examine mathematics and science as a creative endeavor. They will also consider the social and ethical issues of scientific inquiry and application. [AS]

Mathematics Learning Outcomes: Students will
1. Apply abstract and logical reasoning to identify patterns and solve mathematical problems; and
2. Communicate mathematical ideas and concepts accurately and clearly using mathematical symbols, language, and formulas.

Scientific Learning Outcomes: Students will
1. Demonstrate an understanding of scientific concepts, principles, and theories that explain the natural and physical world; and
2. Collect, analyze, and interpret empirical data gathered in a laboratory or field setting; and
3. Examine social or ethical issues that arise in the process of scientific inquiry or out of scientific or technological developments. [UEPC considered]

Rationale (i.e., the intention of the proposed outcomes): While Mathematical and Scientific Understanding are included in the same learning goal, they constitute two distinct ways of knowing. Thus, we have divided the outcomes. “Science” is the practice of gathering data about the natural/physical world, formulating hypotheses about how the world works based on that data, testing and revising and inductively arguing one’s way forward. “Mathematics”, on the other hand, assumes the validity of certain premises and argues deductively from them.

Mathematics Outcomes: Outcome #1 is written to be intentionally broad, to include both pure and applied mathematics. Outcome #2 is about students’ ability to communicate their knowledge in this area.

Science Outcomes: Outcome #1 makes clear that by “science” we intend students to be able to understand the way of knowing constitutive of the natural and physical sciences, rather than one of the many other disciplines that uses the term “science” (e.g., the social sciences). The areas of the “natural and physical world” that it may address should be understood broadly (e.g., physics, chemistry, biology, neuroscience, anatomy). Outcome #2 uses the phrase “laboratory or field setting” in order to make it clear that “lab” should be understood in the broadest possible way. Outcome #3 intends that students have demonstrated some understanding of one or more of the social and/or ethical issues that occur within or result from developments in modern science. [UEPC considered]

Theological Understanding (a Pathway to Knowledge)

Learning Goal: Through the study of religious texts, traditions, rituals, history, and human experience, students will engage in an academic exploration of religion and theology. They will join in an exploration of God, humankind, and the world as expressed in the Catholic and other religious traditions. Students will appreciate the social, cultural, ethical, and theological implications that such questions have for how we should live both individually and as a community. [AS]

Christian Foundations Learning Outcomes: Students will
1. Demonstrate knowledge of major texts and themes of the Bible—including major theological and interpretive principles central to the Catholic tradition—with attention to their social, cultural, ethical, and/or theological implications; and
2. Demonstrate an understanding of basic methods and tools used in scholarly interpretation of biblical texts; and
3. Demonstrate an ability to read biblical texts in light of relevant contextual factors (e.g., historical, cultural, literary, theological). [UEPC]

Theological Explorations: Students will
1. Demonstrate an understanding of one or more aspects of Christian tradition and/or another religious tradition or traditions, acquired through focused study in a sub-field of theology or religious studies; and
2. Demonstrate an ability to explore religious questions from a believer’s point of reference and from the critical perspective of the academy. [UEPC]

Rationale (i.e., the intention of the proposed outcomes): Students will take two courses devoted to theological understanding. Foundational study in Christian theological understanding will expose students to major texts and themes of the Bible, as well as to issues pertaining to its contextual and scholarly interpretation, and the implications that such texts have for our lives. Moreover, in conversation with biblical texts and themes, students will become familiar with biblical principles central to the Catholic Christian tradition. In addition to being one of the “great books” of Western civilization and culture, the Bible represents within the Catholic and other Christian traditions the fundamental gospel revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Therefore, and in light of Divino Afflante Spiritu and other Catholic teaching regarding the interpretation of the Christian Scriptures, it is fitting that students demonstrate knowledge of major texts and themes of the Bible, including theological and interpretive principles central to the Catholic tradition; an understanding of basic methods (e.g., source-, redaction-, narrative-criticism) and tools (e.g., biblical commentaries) for scholarly interpretation of religious texts; and an ability to engage biblical texts in light of contextual factors (e.g., historical, cultural, literary, theological). [UEPC]

Building upon this foundational work, students will develop further the skills of theological understanding, either through continued exploration of the Christian tradition or through exploration of another religious tradition or traditions. This exploration can focus on one tradition as a whole, a part of one tradition, or several traditions. By “focused study in a sub-field of theology or religious studies,” we intend that students must continue to engage with the disciplinary methods and skills of theological understanding, understood broadly to include all of the subfields of theology (e.g., moral theology, ecclesiology) and religious studies (e.g., from classical Thomism to Jungian psychology, feminist, anthropological, psychological, or literary approaches to religion). A crucial aspect of this theological understanding is the ability to explore religious and faith questions from the inside (i.e., within a believer’s frame of reference) and from the outside (i.e., from the critical perspective of the academy), as such a balance / tension is crucial for responsible theological work. [UEPC]

The motion to accept the report was approved by a hand vote of 8-1 with one abstention. A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone to adopt all of the language under Learning Outcomes and Rationale for Mathematical and Scientific Understanding and Theological Understanding in the UEPC report.

Dean Wensley asked what is meant by the last sentence under "Rationale", "...result from developments in modern science?" It was noted that this would refer to, "that science which is grounded in empirical descriptive method."

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt the language 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>David Bird</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barram</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Lee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Heid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The motion carried by a vote of 7 - 1 with one abstention. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

10. Core Curriculum Committee Working Groups - Chair Cortright introduced the Proposed Core Curriculum Working Group Nominations, as submitted by the members of the Core Curriculum Committee. A MOTION was made by Senator Bird and SECONDED by Senator Heid to accept the entire list of the Core Curriculum Working Groups Nominations. Past Chair Poundstone asked about the terms for the individuals on the Working Groups. Jim Sauerberg responded that the terms are to be two-year, staggered terms. The particular terms have not yet been assigned. The Chair called for a written vote of the proposed nominations. The Senate adopted the nominees by a written vote of 6-1 with 2 abstentions. According to custom, the Chair voted "present." CCC Chair Jim Sauerberg thanked all of the faculty involved with the CCC, CCIC and the Working Groups.

11. Seminar Task Force Recommendation - Ellen Rigsby reported on the recommendation of the Seminar Task Force. The Senate charged the task force to review the Seminar model. After much communication with the undergraduate faculty, the task force recommended Model 1b.

Chair Cortright addressed the rule of procedure: should the motion be moved and adopted, the matter will be settled. Should the motion be defeated, the matter will remain open for action by the Senate.

Professor Ellen Rigsby introduced the recommendation. She reported: a survey was conducted in the fall and focus groups and forums have been held, followed by a direct vote and Likert scaling on the resulting proposed Models, by the faculty, which indicated a clear plurality of faculty continue to favor the four-semester Western chronology, namely, Models 1a and 1b.

She continued: although Model 1a edged out Model 1b on the direct vote, the Likert scale results showed that Model 1b was actually more preferable to the faculty overall; for, the faculty either loved or hated Model 1a, nearly equally—44.2% found it unacceptable, while 43.6% preferred it—but by contrast, 54.4% found Model 1b preferable. Her summary: the faculty has a majority preference for the four semester Western chronology with readings structured developmentally, that is, for Model 1b, and as the Board had agreed to abide by the majority decision, it is returning a recommendation for Model 1b.

In response to Senate questioning, Professor Rigsby verified that ranked faculty as well as lecturers were eligible to vote, and that the results were reported in the aggregate. The argument on the side of disaggregating the lecturer vote was that the curriculum is in the hands of the full time faculty and full time faculty do more work at the college, they have more at stake. The argument in favor of aggregating the lecturers’ and ranked faculty’s votes is that lecturers do most of the teaching of Seminar. Vice Provost Sweeney added that in the fall semester 55-60% of the Seminar faculty are ranked, while in the spring semester, only 45% of the faculty are ranked.

A MOTION was made by Senator Peterson and SECONDED by Senator Heid to accept the Collegiate Seminar Task Force's recommendation for Model 1b.

Senator Barram observed that he had concerns, since the study seemed somewhat inconclusive. There could be an unintended consequence if tenure track faculty are disappointed in the change. It seems as though many do want a change in the Seminar model, but there is not agreement about what type of change. Past Chair Poundstone added: one has to question why the vote is so much different between
the ranked faculty and the lecturers. He averred that he did understand the choice of Model 1b, given the votes. Perhaps faculty could be given the choice between two models; it would be interesting to see the result.

From the floor, Cynthia Ganote acknowledged that the Seminar Task Force had undertaken a complex and extensive study. She expressed concern with the interpretation of the data. The vote between Model 1a and 1b was split two ways; but the vote for Models 2-5 were split 4 ways. She suggested there be a run-off between the top-ranked model for substantial change in the conduct of the Seminar and the top-ranked model which substantially conserves the present conduct of the Seminar. Mary McCall seconded the suggestion, with the argument that voting expressed a desire for change, which should be invited to coalesce around a single alternative.

Dean Wensley suggested that voting, as an expression of preference or interest, may be misplaced in the determination of curricula: what is needed is discussion and decisive argument.

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Poundstone and SECONDED by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias to recommit the question to the Collegiate Seminar Task Force with the instruction that the Task Force conduct a faculty ballot between Models 1b and 3. Ellen Rigsby commented that due to the time of year, the faculty ballot cannot not be conducted until the fall. The motion was approved by a hand vote of 7-0 with 2 abstentions. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

NEW BUSINESS

12. Revisions to the Faculty Handbook submitted by the Committee on Committees - Vice Chair Gomez-Arias introduced the following suggested revisions to the Faculty Handbook. The CoC met to discuss several areas of concern experienced through the faculty election process. The following proposed revisions are suggested in order to clarify language in the Handbook.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias explained that in addition to Handbook language relative to faculty elections, the CoC also proposed the elimination of the Nursing representative on the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), by request of the Director of Nursing. When nursing was an intercollegiate program, the nursing representative was filled by a member of Samuel Merritt. With the change to a two year pre-nursing program, the representative position is no longer required. The CoC proposed to reduce the membership of the UEPC by one member.

1.6.1.1 Nominations
1.6.1.1.1 - A Candidate Information Survey Preference Survey will be distributed and compiled under the direction of the Faculty Governance Coordinator in the spring of each year.

1.6.1.1.4 - Procedure: Each voter must designate twice as many persons as nominees for an office or membership as will be elected to that office or committee (e.g., two persons must be designated by a voter as nominees for representative). The specified number of persons (e.g., two) receiving the most votes are nominees for the run-off election. Upon being notified of nomination by the Election Committee, a faculty member may decline nomination. For each open position, each voter may select up to two candidates. The candidates receiving the most votes are placed on the final ballot. Normally, the final ballot should present twice the number of candidates for each open position.

1.6.1.2 Balloting
2. Ballots will be made available electronically. Access is regulated via individual SMC usernames and passwords newly generated for each election.
1.6.1.1.5 Voting Rights
1.a. Ranked Faculty. Ranked faculty will automatically receive notice that the election ballot has been electronically posted. They will simultaneously receive individual passwords to be used when casting their ballot. Faculty members may vote in one school only...

1.b. Voting eligibility of full-time and part-time non-ranked faculty will be determined by the Dean’s office for the school in which those faculty teach. Each year, by the beginning of the spring semester, Deans’ offices must submit to the Faculty Governance Coordinator a roster of eligible full-time and part-time non-ranked faculty based on the following criteria: full-time and part-time non-ranked faculty are eligible to vote only when teaching one or more full courses in an academic year a given quarter or semester. Non-academic administrators and coaches who are full-time College employees are considered part-time non-ranked faculty if they teach one full course during the scholastic year of the election. If the Faculty Governance Coordinator has not received the voter eligibility roster from a Dean’s office by the first week of the spring semester, a reminder will be sent to the Dean’s office. If any school does not submit a roster after being sent a reminder, adjunct or part-time faculty members in that school will NOT have access to the electronic ballot.

1.6.1.6 Resignations and Appointments

1. A faculty member wishing to resign from an elected committee must inform the Chair of the Committee on Committees in writing.

2. Should a position in an elected committee, other than the Rank and Tenure Committee and Grievance Committee, become vacant at any time, the Chair of the Committee on Committees shall appoint the runner-up in the most recent election of the position of the vacating member to complete the term. If that runner-up is unable to accept the position, the 2nd runner-up, if there is such a person, will be appointed to complete the term. If no runner-up is available, the Chair of the Academic Senate will appoint a replacement for the remainder of the academic year and the position will be placed on the ballot for the next regular spring election.

1.7.4.5 UEPC

Membership: This Committee is composed of eleven members:
- chairperson (tenured undergraduate faculty member)
- vice-chairperson (tenured undergraduate faculty chairperson elect)
- liaison senator (tenured undergraduate faculty member)
- five undergraduate faculty members, one elected from each of the three undergraduate Schools (tenured faculty) and two at-large (tenured faculty)
- Director of Collegiate Seminar
- Director of January Term
- Library representative
- 2+2 Nursing representative

2.6.1 – Service to the College
It is the responsibility of faculty to present clear evidence of their effective service to the College. Faculty service should be shared by all. A faculty member is not expected to serve at one time on more than two elected committees, but a faculty member serving on one committee which has an intensive workload committee may choose not to serve on a second elected committee. Upon completion of a full term on an intensive workload committee (Academic Senate, Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee, Rank and Tenure, Faculty Welfare, Program Review Committee, Core Curriculum Committee) a faculty member may ask for exemption from the election process for one year through the Chair of the Committee on Committees.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Senator Lind to adopt all changes proposed. Senator Ogawa questioned whether the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee should be a member of the UEPC. Chair Cortright responded that the College is now provided with two curriculum committees: one is the Core Curriculum Committee, and the other the general curriculum committee we know as the UEPC; coordination of the CCC and UEPC is a matter in which evolving practice should suggest an appropriate mechanism (perhaps co-service by the chairs or other liaisons).
Claude Malary expressed concern with the deletion of the statement, "Upon being notified of nomination by the Election Committee, a faculty member may decline nomination" under section 1.6.1.1.1.4. He said faculty, under exceptional circumstances, may have to decline a nomination, and he suggested that there be a process.

A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Gomez-Arias and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone to amend the language by adding a sentence, "Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may request that the Chair of the Committee on Committees remove the member from the nomination ballot." The amendment was approved by a hand vote of 9-0-0.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt the Handbook language (as amended) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Senator</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>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Heid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Senators approved the Faculty Handbook language revisions, as amended, by a hand vote of 9-0-0. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

13. AARC Catalog Language for Enrollment and Drop/Add Policies - Senator Bird explained that the AARC was approached by the Registrar's office regarding ambiguities with the current policy. A MOTION was made by Senator Bird and SECONDED by Senator Ogawa to adopt the language for the undergraduate Catalog.

The following information regarding the registration policy should go on page 35 (current undergraduate catalog). It can also be added as an additional paragraph under the DROP-ADD PERIOD of the undergraduate General Catalog.

Students who have not registered in a course by the end of the add/drop period are ineligible to be enrolled or to participate in the course in any way. This includes attending, completing assignments, taking exams or receiving credit for the course at a later time.

Vice Chair Gomez-Arias inquired as to what type of problems the statement would address. Senator Bird said approximately one dozen students at any given time attend courses without being registered, often through a semester, and often generating “interesting” problems for regularizing their status.

Senator Barram noted he has had students approach him for unregistered continuance in class owing to delays in the processing of loans, temporary difficulties with family finances, and the like. As a Lasallian school, he wondered, how ought SMC best to address such issues?

(A motion to extend the orders of the day by 15 minutes was approved by the required 2/3 vote.)

Senator Bird responded that the purpose of the added language is simply to get the students into the Registrar's office, where they can make the necessary arrangements for a plan to regularize their status. The idea is not to punish the students, but to motivate them to cooperate in resolving their difficulties.
Vice Provost Sweeney noted that members of the faculty are often placed in situations in which they are unsure whether, or how, to prevent students from unofficial attendance; the proposed language would provide a policy and a reference for them. The College offers students many options, but they must speak with the Registrar's office. She strongly recommended adoption of the policy.

Past Chair Poundstone expressed concern with the moral ideal to be subserved by the language and its entirely proscriptive character. Agreeing, Professor McGraw suggested that such a policy should somehow exempt students facing issues beyond their control.

A MOTION was made by Senator Barra and SECONDED by Past Chair Poundstone to add the following language, "Students who have not registered in a course by the end of the add/drop period, and have not made suitable alternative arrangements with the Registrar, are ineligible..." The amendment was accepted by a hand vote of 9-0-0. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

The amended motion was approved by a hand vote of 9-0-0. According to custom, the Chair voted "present."

14. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator
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 agendum 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