MINUTES
Academic Senate
January 20, 2015
3:30 p.m.
Alumni Gallery

Members present: Paul Delaney (Professor of English), Mary Docter (Professor of Modern Languages), Michelle Hardley (Secretary - Registrar), Tori Ippolito (WCSA Student Rep), Paul Morgan (Professor of Economics and Business), Tatiana Nazarenko (Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness), Edd Noell (Professor of Economics and Business), Mark Sargent (Chair and Provost), Jim Taylor (Professor of Philosophy), Niva Tro (Professor of Chemistry), David Vander Laan (Professor of Philosophy)

Absent: Brenda Smith (Professor of Psychology),

Others present: Bill Wright (Associate Provost)

I. Devotion – Jim Taylor

II. The minutes from December 2, 2014 were approved

III. Schedule Devotions for the Semester

IV. New ILO/GE SLO for the Quantitative and Analytical Reasoning
Tatiana met with the Math department over the Christmas break and determined that their existing QAR classes will fit within the proposed revised language. They have no concerns regarding the new language.

Senators voted to approve the changes to the ILO/GE SLO for the Quantitative and Analytical Reasoning GE area.

V. Identify Semester Goals and Possible Agenda Items
A number of possible Spring agenda items were presented

Global Education will have a few of issues to bring to Senate on such topics as re-entry courses, off campus language offerings, the Istanbul review, the Asia semester program and a discussion on global studies in the curriculum.

GE Committee will be bringing updates on the assessment of the Performing and Interpreting the Arts and Understanding Society areas.

The Program Review Committee reports will continue to be submitted

Senate is still working on the PE credit for athletes question and the WSI credit changes
There will also be additional conversations on WASC self-study

VI. Discussion of Faculty Loads, Equity, and Resource Utilization
Senators discussed the faculty load issue as they reflected on the list of questions provided by Mark.

A number of issues were mentioned as things to focus on, including the large class sizes encountered by First Year students, the use of adjuncts and the types of courses they tend to teach, considering different ways of calculating an instructor’s load and advising across the curriculum.

Future discussions at Senate will include the First Year Experience, Advising and curriculum design.

VII. Discussion of Attendance Policy and Conflicts with School-Sponsored Events
Senate reviewed the attendance policy for those involved in school-sponsored events. Recently athletics has been more proactive about notifying faculty about their absences. There have been some cases where professors are telling students they can’t sign up for their course with that many absences even though they are excused absences.

Senate reviewed the policy, specifically point #2 and #3 and discussed the implications of these points. One reading of point #3 is that students should not be penalized at all for missing class for a school sponsored activities. An alternative reading soft reading of point #3 is that students should not be penalized beyond the possible loss of credit for missed or late work (which includes participation points). There was also a discussion on whether the allowed absences for all students alluded to in point #2 were used up with their absences for school activities or if they were in addition to their absences for school activities.

Senate decided to keep the existing policy for now but to try to clarify the language and enforce it. Paul Delaney will work on redefining point #3 and #4.

VIII. Introduction to the WASC Self-Study
Bill presented the WASC preliminary self-review. This is the first step of our next WASC accreditation review. We have to meet each standard in order to receive accreditation. The first step is for us to evaluate ourselves, the next step is for the WASC team to evaluate us.

Senators are asked to read the document. In a future Senate meeting we will be able to ask questions and comment on the document. This step is critical for the WASC review and is part of the final WASC report. We want to make sure it represents us well. Specifically, do you think the self-assessment looks accurate? Would you give any item a higher or lower rank or priority? Are there any other pieces of evidence that you think should be there that were missed?
Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Hardley
Registrar