MINUTES
Academic Senate
March 10, 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), Brenda Smith (Professor of Psychology), Jim Taylor (Professor of Philosophy), Niva Tro (Professor of Chemistry), David Vander Laan (Professor of Philosophy)

Absent:

 Others present: Bill Wright (Associate Provost), Cynthia Toms (Director of Global Education)

I. Devotion – Mary Docter

II. The minutes from March 3, 2015 were approved with one correction

III. Westmont in East Asia Proposal

Cynthia gave a short background into the process of developing the proposal for the East Asia proposal. There were a number of meetings that Helen attended with the Off Campus Programs committee and there were a number of versions drafted and conversations held with Edd and Helen.

Students on the program would be required to take all 16 units while abroad. There will also be a pre-departure class that will focus on an introduction to the Mandarin language as well as information regarding the East Asia region. This will allow the group to be somewhat grounded in the culture and region before attending the program. There will be five General Education areas covered on the program (Thinking Globally, Thinking Historically, Understanding Society, Modern Foreign Language, Serving Society/Enacting Justice. For the Serving Society component students will be working with refuges and people with disabilities in China.

The Senators asked questions regarding the itinerary and location visited on the program, the nature of the Modern Foreign Language course and the budget.

Cynthia, Edd and Helen were asking for two pilot offerings of the program in the Fall 2016 and the Fall 2018. The proposal was unanimously approved. It will be moved to Faculty Council for a vote of the full faculty.

IV. Westmont in Istanbul Review

Cynthia gave an overview of the process of review for Istanbul including the first proposal, the development of a review protocol, and the attempt to fit this review
into the new protocol. There was a lot learned through this process regarding the protocol for reviewing a program that puts the Off Campus Programs Committee in a better position for their future reviews. Cynthia would like to get the final version to the program directors as their application deadline for next year’s program has already passed.

The Senators asked questions regarding the removal of the executive visit and the differences between this review and the earlier version. This version (using the newly developed protocols for evaluating off campus programs) focuses more on the program itself (versus who is staffing it in any given year). Senators liked the suggestions on establishing a semi-permanent route that might be affected less on any possible volatility in the regions.

The review was approved with one abstention.

V. Follow up Discussion on Lumina and the Degree Qualification Profile Criteria
Mark gave some additional background into the Lumina Foundation and their goals. They are interested in change in higher education but are not promoting that change through funding higher education initiatives. They are creating pressure from the outside to create change within higher education. The Lumina Foundation has created the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), which are a set of standards that students earning an associates, bachelor’s or master’s degree should achieve by the completion of that degree. WASC doesn’t embrace the DQP but they do say that the DQP is something that institutions can use to demonstrate their educational quality.

Mark's interest is to see how can we sustain a healthy dialog about the DQP while also recognizing that we are not going to adopt it as our new standard. It is healthy for the leadership to be aware of these currents of conversation between college, governments and employers. His proposal is to do an internal audit to compare where we are (our ILO’s, rubrics etc.) with the DQP standards. This would give us a change to be in the conversation and a sense of where we might be strong or weak. His vision is to have 2-3 representatives from Senate, 2-3 representatives from Faculty Council, Bill, Tatiana and himself to be part of the team to do the quick assessment. The group would produce a report of their findings for conversation in Senate. We could also share the findings with WASC to show how we overlap or don’t overlap with DQP. It also helps to define the meaning, quality and integrity of our degree for WASC, which is something they are asking for in this review cycle. It will show how we fit into the landscape but also how we are distinct.

The motion to do informal audit with the DQP was unanimously approved. Jim and Brenda agreed to join the conversation as the Senate representatives.

VI. Changes to the Program Review Guide
The Program Review Committee is trying to work in a way to close the loop on the Program Review cycle. Their proposal is to have both the E-Team and Senate provide feedback to each department on the department’s action plan and their
multi-year assessment plan. The department will then have this feedback as they plan their assessment strategies for years 2-5. This proposal will also add language to this effect to the program review guide.

Mark is in favor of having a faculty body review the program review plans. He would appreciate having more faculty voices within the responses he writes to provide a robust review of the curricular aspects of the plans.

Senators were in favor of this addition and suggested that the department chair come when their department’s proposal is being discussed to allow for questions and a richer understanding of the departments history and vision within their proposal. Mark will pass along our goodwill for the idea to Faculty Council.

VII. Proposed Changes to the Attendance Policy
Mary and Paul presented the latest version of their revisions to the attendance policy (see below). The current version was more explicit in defining that it was for unexcused absences that the student might be dropped from the course and made it clear that the excused athletic absences were not in addition to the number of unexcused absences that all students receive.

There were some concerns raised that the policy might be putting the students in the middle between their coach’s determination of the athletic schedule and the attendance policy when they have no control over either. We would not want the student to be caught in the middle. There was also concern that point number 3 was trying to put restrictions on an athletic teams schedule when Senate had no control over the setting of the schedule. Senate was not sure who sets the schedule for the teams.

Senators agreed to send the current version of the proposal to the Athletic Committee for their opinion and feedback. The key issues for Senators are that athletes recognize they don’t get additional excused absences along with their athletic absences, and to see if students can be proactive in scheduling their courses so that they don’t enroll in courses that they would miss often.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Hardley
Registrar