FACULTY MEETING AGENDA
MARCH 24, 2006
HIERONYMUS LOUNGE
3:30 P.M.

I. Call to Order

II. Devotion

III. Business
   A. Approval of Minutes of 10 February 2006
   B. Elections
      1. Vice Chair for 2006-2007
      2. Personnel Committee
   C. Motion from Faculty Council to Approve Revisions to Tenure Review Process
   D. Motion from Academic Senate (Review Committee) to Clarify Restriction on Double Majors and Minors
   E. Motion from Academic Senate Regarding Final Exam Policies

IV. Provost’s Perspective 5:00 p.m.

V. Adjournment
Vice Chair Ballot
*Vote for One*

☐ Deborah Dunn
☐ Kim Kihlstrom
☐ Rick Pointer
☐ Glenn Town

Personnel Committee Ballot
*Vote for One in Each Category*

Full Professor, Humanities:
☐ Marilyn McEntyre
☐ Paul Willis

Full Professor, Natural & Behavioral Sciences:
☐ Dave Marten
☐ Michael Sommermann

Full Professor, Social Sciences (one year):
☐ Ron Enroth
☐ Laura Montgomery

Associate Professor, Tenured:
☐ Leonor Elías
☐ David Vander Laan

Full Professor “At Large” (one year):
☐ John Blondell
☐ Paul Morgan

Assistant Professor, Untenured:
☐ Wayne Iba
☐ Telford Work
Proposed Changes to Review & Tenure Procedures

2.2.1.4. Procedure

Personnel Committee Reviews & Recommendations. Typically, the intermediate tenure review will occur in the spring semester of the third year, and the final tenure review in the spring of the sixth year. Promotion reviews not connected with the tenure process typically will occur in the fall semester.

a) For each promotion and tenure review, each faculty member being reviewed is responsible to demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion in the form of a portfolio presented to the Personnel Committee. Required items include:

1) a current curriculum vitae;
2) personal statement (self-assessment essay and faith-learning portfolio as described in section 2.2.1.3);
3) course evaluations for all courses taught during the previous two years, or the results of alternative means of evaluation previously approved by the Provost and the Personnel Committee;
4) the schedule and class rosters for each current course;
5) a list of students for potential interviews;
6) a list of faculty for potential interviews;
7) a list of external references to be contacted (required of candidates for promotion to full professor, optional in other reviews);

b) At the time of each review for promotion and tenure, the Personnel Committee will assign one of its members (“reviewer”) to each faculty member undergoing review (“reviewee”). The reviewer must be at least of the same rank as that for which the faculty member is a candidate, and must be tenured in the case of a final tenure review. The Personnel Committee shall endeavor to avoid conflict of interest when assigning members to review cases. Faculty not on the Personnel Committee who believe an assignment may result in a conflict of interest may state their objections to the Personnel Committee through the Provost. Both in gathering data and in writing reports and summaries, reviewers shall endeavor to ensure confidentiality and, except in the case of student course evaluations, shall disregard comments or evaluations for which authorship is not claimed. Responsibilities of reviewers are as follows:

1) review the faculty member’s personnel file, including departmental assessment summaries and any prior reviews;
2) meet with the reviewee at least once toward the beginning of the review process in order to provide an orientation to the process and both ask and answer questions, and again toward the end of the process in order to address any issues or concerns raised during the review process (see number 9, below);
3) solicit written feedback from and interview each member of a reviewee’s department (alternate means of soliciting input may be required if a departmental colleague is out of the area; in such instances telephone interviews or extensive written feedback should suffice; a formal departmental recommendation is not required);
4) solicit evaluations from faculty colleagues and administrators who have relevant information;
5) examine student course evaluations provided by the reviewee;
6) attend two class sessions taught by the reviewee, preferably of two different courses;
7) interview at least eight students from classes taught the previous two years, one-half of the number of students interviewed selected from a list provided by the reviewee and the other half chosen by the reviewer from class rosters;
8) solicit external reviews and evaluations of professional competence in teaching and scholarship (required for candidates for promotion to full professor; optional in other reviews);
9) provide the reviewee with a written list of any problems or concerns raised by the review process at least 24 hours in advance of a face-to-face meeting between reviewer and reviewee, and allow the reviewee the opportunity to respond in writing to such concerns, within 48 hours following the meeting;
10) prepare a written report for the Personnel Committee’s deliberation and recommendation (the reviewee’s written response, if there is one, shall be presented to the Committee together with the report for consideration during the scheduled review meeting);

c) The chair of the Personnel Committee (or vice chair, as appropriate) will notify the reviewee of the Committee’s recommendation on the day the review is concluded (the conclusion is reached when the summary statement is finalized). Within three weeks of this date, the Provost will meet with the reviewee to discuss the review and its implications, and to obtain written acknowledgment jointly signed by the Provost and the reviewee of notification of the above mentioned recommendation. If the Personnel Committee has recommended against tenure or promotion, the Provost will seek to arrange a conversation with the faculty member within 24 hours of the negative recommendation.
2.5 Faculty Development

2.5.1: Leave

2.5.2: Conferences and Travel

2.5.3: Professional Development

a) **Faculty Mentoring:** As a resource for newly hired full-time faculty, a mentor will be appointed from outside the department (selected by the Provost in consultation with the department chair) to help the faculty member adjust to institutional practices and expectations, to answer questions as they arise, and to create a safe space for asking questions and addressing difficulties. While the nature of the mentoring relationship is largely informal, a probationary faculty member may request that the mentor be involved in early probationary assessment meetings and processes. Guidelines for mentors will be provided by the Provost’s office.

b) **Initial Departmental Assessment:** To develop newly hired full-time faculty, a departmental assessment shall be conducted in the second year of employment.

1) The assessment shall occur in the fall semester of the second year and shall consist of both a written summary and a meeting among the probationary faculty member, the department chair, and the Provost. Such meeting shall be initiated and scheduled by the Provost’s office. In the event that the department chair having the most relevant information is off-campus or no longer serving as chair when the assessment must take place, the Provost (in consultation with the department and faculty member) shall designate the most appropriate person to submit the written assessment and attend the required meeting. The probationary faculty member may request that the mentor be included in the assessment process and/or the meeting.

2) The probationary faculty member will provide the chair with a progress portfolio not later than the first day of class of the faculty member’s second year of service. The progress portfolio shall include: an up-to-date curriculum vitae, a 2-3-page self-assessment addressing his or her performance in the first year according to the full range of responsibilities outlined in the Faculty Handbook section 2.2.1, and any evidence which seems appropriate to the self-assessment.

3) Following receipt of the progress portfolio, the department chair shall provide the Provost’s office and the probationary faculty member a written assessment, identifying both strengths and areas for improvement, relative to section 2.2.1 in particular, and requirements for promotion and tenure in general. In preparation for the written assessment, the department chair shall: attend no fewer than two of the probationary faculty member’s classes, preferably in two different courses and in two different semesters, during the faculty member’s first year of service, paying particular attention both to professional competence and general pedagogical effectiveness; read the entire set of the faculty member’s first-year teaching evaluations; solicit feedback from departmental
colleagues and students, formally or informally; and meet with the probationary faculty member at least twice during the first year both to provide feedback and to solicit questions or concerns.

4) Within two weeks of the joint assessment meeting, any participant (chair, mentor, or probationary faculty member) may provide additional written response to the Provost. Such responses will be placed in the probationary faculty member’s personnel file, together with the rest of the department assessment documents and a summary statement written by the Provost.

c) **Fifth-Year Departmental Assessment**: The department chair and a probationary faculty member shall meet during the fall semester of the fifth year of probationary service in order to discuss progress toward tenure and promotion. The summary statement arising out of the intermediate tenure review (conducted by the Personnel Committee) will serve as a catalyst and benchmark for discussion and goal-setting. Following this meeting, the department chair will notify the Provost’s office that such meeting has taken place.

d) **Curricular and Professional Projects**

e) **Summer Session Salary and Policies**

f) **Loans for Completion of a Terminal Degree**

g) **Accountability of Full Professors**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 2.2 Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure

Evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure benefits the individual and the College. The procedures are similar, but particular criteria are weighted differently depending on the objective of the review. These differences correspond to the complementary roles promotion and tenure play in accomplishing the educational mission and goals of the College.

a) The purpose of the intermediate review is to make a judgment concerning the reviewee’s progress towards tenure. Is the candidate on a trajectory that would lead to tenure?

b) The tenure review, although based in part on the criteria for the Associate Professorship and the expectation of sustained professional growth (see Section 2.2.2.2.4), places special emphasis on dedication to the institutional mission, classroom teaching, commitment to the integration of faith and learning, and contributions to student growth and development.

c) Evaluation for promotion, while taking into account institutional service, emphasizes professional criteria generally associated with the faculty member’s discipline in the larger academic community and at Westmont College.
Restriction on Double Majors and Minors

The Review Committee of the Academic Senate has asked that the policy on double majors and minors be clarified/modified.

Current Policy: (pg 35 of Catalog)

5. Four units of upper-division credit earned in a major may be applied to meeting the requirements of a minor. No upper-division credits may be shared by two minors. (There is no limitation on the overlap between two majors.)

The issue:
Some majors/concentrations are either nearly identical to or are subsets of each other. For example:

1. A student completing a BS in Physics would need only two additional courses (one of which would be lower division) to complete a BS in Engineering/Physics.
2. A student completing a Social Science major is quite close to completing a second major in the area of primary emphasis.
3. With modest attention to the selection of courses, a student completing a Neuroscience degree can complete a BA in Biology with two additional courses.

Such double majors seem to reduce the significance of the idea of a major and place Westmont in an unflattering light. Moreover, in each of the above scenarios, the four-unit overlap restriction would preclude taking a minor in the second area. Thus, under the current regulations, a student may relatively easily obtain a double major where a minor is precluded.

Proposed Solution from the Executive Committee:

5. Four units of upper-division credit earned in a major may be applied to meeting the requirements of a minor. No upper-division credits may be shared by two minors. (There is no limitation on the overlap between two majors. However, a student will not be awarded two majors when one coincides with the area of concentration of or is a specialization within the other major.)
EXAMINATIONS

1. **FINAL EXAMINATIONS**

   As an academic institution that holds scholarly rigor in high esteem, the Westmont community affirms the importance of a final examination week at the conclusion of each semester. The week of final exams is the 15th instructional week of Westmont’s academic calendar and is reported as such to both WASC and the state of California.

   a. The study day and final examination schedule will be published by the registrar prior to advance registration for each semester.

   b. Some sort of required, retrospective course activity is to take place during the scheduled examination time. Appropriate activities include comprehensive exams, unit exams, portfolio or project reviews, and other types of reflective activities.

   c. The last examination in any course may not be scheduled during the last week of classes. A unit exam may be given in the last week of classes provided a final exam is also given during the final exam week.

   d. When unit exams are given or projects are due in the last week of classes, care should be exercised to ensure that the total workload for the last week of classes and the exam week is appropriate and does not place an undue burden on diligent students.

   e. Classes, laboratories, and other types of new instruction are not to be held during the examination week. The final date for the submission of regular written work must be no later than 5:00 p.m. on the last day of classes.

   f. Take-home examinations and projects may be used at the faculty member's discretion, but these must not involve new instruction or research during the week of final exams and must be submitted by the student no later than the published examination time.

   g. Faculty members are not free to reschedule final examinations for individuals or for the whole class. The Academic Senate Review Committee acting on petitions from students or faculty must approve exceptions for individuals or classes. All requests for rescheduling are to be presented at least two weeks in advance of the scheduled examination time.

   h. Professors and students who arrange for tests to be taken outside the regularly scheduled block are urged to take appropriate steps to ensure the confidentiality of the test. Such steps might include offering an alternative version of the test, asking students to sign an honor statement, or scheduling make-up tests as close as possible to the regular test.

   i. Individual students will be granted permission to reschedule examinations in the event of serious illness or family tragedy. The registrar will grant permission to
reschedule examinations when needed to accommodate extended examination times required by students with documented learning disabilities.

j. Students will not be required to take more than two final examinations on any day. Requests to reschedule additional examinations may be presented to the registrar for rescheduling. The Academic Review Committee will consider all other requests. Rescheduling requests must be presented to the registrar at least two weeks in advance of the scheduled examination time.

k. Prior to submitting any request for rescheduling, the student will negotiate with the instructor a tentative alternate time, to be approved by the registrar. For students who are scheduled to take more than two exams in one day, the exam to be rescheduled is: first, any examination given in the 12:00 – 2:00 p.m. time period; secondly, any examination given in the 8:00 – 10:00 a.m. time period.

l. Examinations should be designed so they can be completed within two (2) hours, but students may be allowed three (3) hours for completion if the instructor permits the extended time. Only in cases of documented learning disabilities should students be permitted to continue working on an exam into the next exam period.