

Statement to the Academic Senate
29 April, 2015

In a 16 April e-mail addressed to me both as a Senator and Director of the Integral Program, the Senate Chair reports her “current (final?) recommendations regarding Senate actions S-13/14-46 and S-13/14-48.” There are four such: three concerning S-13/14-46 and one concerning S-13/14-48; this statement addresses two (both concerning S-13/14-46). With the Integral Instruction Committee, I reserve comment on the remainder.

- (1) Joined “to some extent” by the balance of the Executive Committee, the Chair opines “that it is not in Senate’s nor [sic] Integral’s best interest to oppose the Provost’s decision not to approve the above resolution [sc. S-13/14-46] in its entirety . . .”
- (2) The Chair recommends “that Integral and CCC continue to talk about the remaining learning goals for which there was disagreement, and keep trying to identify ways to demonstrate that one or more of these goals are met by Integral students. . . .” and continues, “In an earlier conversation, I believe you stated that you thought this issue could only be resolved with Senate intervention. At this time, I disagree. I believe Integral and CCC are not yet at an impasse, and there is still some common ground to be identified.”

I wish to put the following, documented matters on the record:

Re: (1) In a meeting held September 30, 2014, Senator Ogawa present, the Chair declared her opposition to reasserting S-13/14-46 and S-13/14-48. I expressly acquiesced on behalf of the Instruction Committee (IC), and agreed to seek a Senate-mediated settlement of the Integral Program’s relation to the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC), on the principles enunciated by the Provost: “The Integral Program may have a uniquely articulated relationship to the Core Curriculum and presiding Committee but should not be completely exempt from its purview . . . [A]lthough the Integral Program may approach fulfillment of the ILOs (Part 1) in distinct ways, there must be a connection to them, particularly the Engaging the World outcomes . . .”¹ So doing, I confirmed an undertaking in writing, which was included in the IC’s response to the Provost’s action and delivered to the Chair on 29 September.² In a meeting on March 11, 2015 (Senator Ogawa again present) the full Instruction Committee, responding to the Chair’s direct question, repeated this undertaking, as it had in its written response to preparatory queries from the Chair.³

Re: (2) The Senate Chair’s recommendation suggests that “this issue,” namely, the issue relevant to S-13/14-46, reduces to disputation between the IC and CCC over the minutiae of whether or which aspects of the Integral Program will be accredited to the Core Curriculum. This view is consistent neither with (a) S-13/14-46, nor with (b) the IC’s undertakings of September 30 and March 11, nor with (c) the Chair’s and Executive Committee’s earlier representations both to the IC and to CCC.

(a) In its summation, the Integral Program’s “Petition” to the Academic Senate distinguished the ancillary from the principal reasons for the resolution the Senate adopted as S-13/14-46:

Hence, while the IC and the Program’s tutors at large contest the cogency of (many of) the CCC’s particular findings, the tutors’ and the IC’s reasons for this application to the

¹ Provost to Senate Chair, 16 September, 2014; re: S-13/14-46, 48.

² Cortright to Senate Chair, 29 September, 2014: attachment.

³ Senate Chair to Cortright, 28 February, 2015: attachment, “Integral and Core Curriculum and Institutional Learning Objectives, Re. Senate actions S-13/14-46 and S-13/14-48”; Cortright to Burke, Ogawa and Ahmed, 2 March, 2015: attachment, “Response: Integral and Core Curriculum and Institutional Learning Objectives Re: Senate Actions S-13/14-46 and S-13/14-48.”

Academic Senate go to (α) the coherence of the Integral Curriculum *in toto*, and to the integrity of the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, to (β) the Program's appropriate academic autonomy, and to (γ) academic equity for students who elect and complete the Program.

(b) In the meetings of September 30 and March 11, cited above, I and the IC stressed the reasons that carry the Program's principal concerns well beyond particular findings of the CCC, and which clearly call for Senate guidance, *e.g.*:

Because all 29.25 courses comprising the Integral 'major' are required for the degree, on any question involving substantial changes to Program courses accredited for the Core, *Handbook* 1.7.4.5.1. at f., (re: charges to the UEPC) will be in jurisdictional conflict with S-13/14-35 (24 April, 2014), which provides that Core Curriculum Committee decisions regarding courses designated as meeting Core outcomes are (unqualifiedly) final. ⁴

Jurisdictional questions that fall to the Senate under *Handbook* 1.6.1.2.1.3 arise, as the IC has repeatedly pointed out to members of the Executive Committee, from the Program's character as an integrated, four-year curriculum. For the same reason, upholding the ordinary academic integrity of the Integral Program, and especially within the principles enunciated by the Provost, will require the Senate's authority, under *Handbook* 1.6.1.1.7., to modify the scope and application of CCC responsibilities established by the Senate.

(c) The IC has reason to regard (2) as an unaccountable reversal of representations made both to the Program and the to the CCC. At the instance of the Senate Chair,⁵ between October 26 and November 8, 2014, the IC drafted, and vetted with UEPC Chair (then Robert Gorsch), a petition waiving Core Curriculum requirements (except the "Community Engagement" LO) for the Integral classes of 2016 and 2017. The draft was forwarded to the Executive Committee on November 8, and on November 14, I met with the Chair to review the petition, prior to its submission to the UEPC. The Chair approved the draft (with amendment). The rationale of the approved draft reads (in relevant part):⁶

On 1 October, 2014,⁷ the Director [Cortright] sent an analysis of the Provost's action and its implications to the Senate Executive Committee, *via* the Senate Chair, Valerie Burke. In subsequent *viva voce* conversation, confirmed by e-mail (cf. Appendix VII), the Chair indicated that the Program should seek resolution with the CCC through Senate mediation; she advised the Director to seek "Core waivers for Integral students" in the interim. Since, as a matter of governance, it will fall to the Senate to consider an amended version of Senate Action S-13/14-46, or to rescind and replace the Action, with this request the Integral Curriculum intends to enact Dr. Burke's program for dispositive Senate reconsideration (cf. Appendix VII).

Again, in response to queries from CCC Chair Sauerberg, concerning the implications of the Provost's action re: S-13/14-46, the Senate Chair wrote:⁸

⁴ Cortright to Senate Chair, 29 September, 2014: attachment.

⁵ Senate Chair to Cortright, October 26, 2014.

⁶ The petition was approved unanimously by the UEPC at its 1 December, 2014 meeting, and was subsequently adopted by the Academic Senate, on the consent agenda, at the meeting of 10 December, 2014.

⁷ The petition contains an error: the analysis cited is the memorandum delivered to the Chair on 29 September, 2014 (see above).

⁸ Senate Chair to Sauerberg, 1 December, 2014; cc: Sauerberg to Cortright, 25 February, 2015.

[The Provost] was supportive of a different process for Integral compared to other programs. Now we just need to come up with it. I am hoping to work with [Cortright] in December and January and come up with a draft, then work further with Integral and CCC, and bring something revised to the Senate . . . Senate can (and hopefully will be able to) give permission for a revised process that offers a compromise for CCC and Integral.

In response to my query (on or about 20 February) whether the CCC had had communication with the Senate Executive Committee over the question of a framework for its relations with the Integral Program, Professor Sauerberg confirmed:⁹

From this [sc. the Chair's above-quoted remarks] I conclude Valerie and you (and maybe others?) are working on creating 'a different process for Integral'. A conversation I had with the Senate Executive Committee on 1/29 indicated that this conversation was ongoing and that my input was not currently needed.

Conclusion: From December 10, 2014—date of the Senate meeting at which waivers for the classes of 2016 and 2017 were approved—until February 28, 2015, the Executive Committee took no overt action on the matter of S-13/14-46. On February 28, and in apparent response to my urgent call for action,¹⁰ the Senate Chair sent an e-mail proposing a March 11 meeting among the Executive Committee, members of the IC and members of the CCC to consider a framework (which was attached) for Senate mediation of CCC-IC disagreement over nothing more than four learning outcomes. The CCC declined to attend; speaking for the CCC, Professor Sauerberg replied on March 9, "The CCC met last week and didn't see the need for the Senate to be involved." The Instruction Committee attended the March 11 meeting, as reported above.

After the lapse of more than a month, the Chair's April 16 memorandum now proposes, in effect, to return the question to the *status quo ante* prevailing in September, 2014. It can escape no one that the Chair's recommendations, like Professor Sauerberg's and the CCC's judgment on Senate mediation, are reasonable if and only if S-13/14-46 is not only disallowed, but the concerns it addressed are rendered moot. Those concerns were: (α) the coherence of the Integral Curriculum *in toto*, and to the integrity of the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, (β) the Program's appropriate academic autonomy, which is seriously and uniquely abrogated by having the majority of Integral courses placed under the authority of the CCC, and (γ) academic equity for students who elect and complete the Program. Moreover, as the IC has repeatedly pointed out, the Integral Program's alternative curricular architecture entails jurisdictional conflict between the UEPC's charge and the CCC's charge.

To repeat, the Provost has provided principles for a Senate-mediated settlement that addresses these concerns. I and the IC submit that these concerns are not moot; indeed, they are urgent. The Integral Program remains unable either to apprise prospective students of the Class of 2019 what their graduation requirements will be or to apprise current students of the class of 2018 what their graduation requirements are.

S. A. Cortright, Senator at Large
Director, Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts

⁹ Sauerberg to Cortright, 25 February, 2015.

¹⁰ Cortright to Executive Committee, February 26, 2015.