

MINUTES
Academic Senate
October 17, 2019
8:30-9:45 a.m.
Alumni Gallery

Members present: Grey Brothers (Professor of Music), Alister Chapman (Vice Chair and Professor of History), Deborah Dunn (Professor of Communication Studies), Leonor Elias (Professor of Modern Languages), Michelle Hardley (Registrar), Russell Howell (Professor of Mathematics), Patti Hunter (Vice Provost), Heather Keaney (Professor of History), Tatiana Nazarenko (Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness), Lina Reid (Student Representative), Mark Sargent (Provost), Jeff Schloss (Professor of Biology), Randy VanderMey (Professor of English)

Absent:

Others present:

I. Devotional Thoughts – Patti Hunter

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes from October 10th were approved with one paragraph addition.

III. Continued Discussion on the Criteria for Post-Baccalaureate Options

Senate continued discussion on the level of academic rigor for the courses offered in any post-baccalaureate options. Requiring a higher level of rigor may limit the number of proposed programs. If the level of rigor was kept at the level of current Westmont courses, then potential students who studied in non-related disciplines could more easily transition to a new area of study. Senators seemed comfortable with setting the level of rigor of the proposed courses to the Bachelors level or higher.

There was also discussion of the Westmont brand and the impact on the brand with the offering of certificates and post-baccalaureate options.

Mark will draft a revised version of the criteria. At the next faculty meeting he will introduce Bruce's proposal and note that this proposal raised some questions for Senate as to whether or not we need to have guidelines in place for any future post-baccalaureate proposals. He will then show them a draft of the developed criteria and remind faculty that they are able to attend Senate meeting each week if they would like to be a part of the discussion. This way faculty will be brought up to speed with the developing conversation in Senate. This also allows Mark to have additional conversations with Gayle on the criteria to ascertain his vision and how we can make sure that the guidelines are crafted in light of this vision.

IV. Continued Discussion on Senate Review of Global Programs

Patti reviewed the current state of the discussions with Senate. For a number of reasons, a broader perspective on off campus program proposals would be good, especially when considering new proposals, changes to proposal and courses being offered for GE credit.

One Senator would like to see all programs to submit full proposals every time they are offered versus only when something has changed from the prior offering of the program. The rationale is that if something has changed within the program from the prior offering, then the faculty need to address the change in their current proposal. If there were no changes from the prior offering, then it would not be onerous for the faculty member to provide a full proposal as they should have access to their former documents.

Senators asked whether or not the Global Education Committee was still needed with these proposed changes and what the benchmarks would be for approval of programs if this moved forward. Patti indicated that the approval standards would not be changing. She was also not in favor of eliminating the committee at this time.

Senators suggested restructuring the Academic Resources Committee and the Global Education Committee. The Academic Resources Committee could be a separate committee from Senate with former department chairs as members. Since Senate used to be staffed by all of the department chairs, this change would make sense and help to bring back some vitality to the Academic Resource Committee. The Global Education Committee would then become a subset of Academic Senate. The Global Education Committee could take care of most of the business of that committee and would raise issues to the larger Senate body as needed. This would need a handbook change through Faculty Council and Senators were in favor of this idea.

Patti and Mark will work on drafting a revision of the structure for the Academic Resource Committee and the Global Education Committee and bring the draft back to Senate for approval in a future meeting.

V. Discussion on the Policy for Limiting Course Overlap Between Majors and Minors

Senators discussed the policy limiting curricular overlap between majors and minors. There were a few Senators who would be open to removing the policy entirely.

The proposed policy changes were approved, but Senators would like to continue the discussion to see how many majors would generate concern on the overlap with minors if the entire policy was removed.

Michelle will work to analyze the overlap possibilities between majors and minors. This discussion will be continued in a future meeting.

VI. Follow Up Discussion on EB/PSY Request

There was some discussion on the proposal and how involved both departments and their department members were in its creation. There was appreciation for the interdisciplinary nature of the proposal, versus simply proposing to add additional faculty lines.

Senators also noted that if the college would be in a position to add a faculty line there should be an assessment of where it is most needed versus who happens to submit a proposal at the right time.

Mark will follow up with Rick and Ron to let them know that the proposal needs additional work before it can be considered and there needs to be support for the proposal from both full departments.

Respectfully submitted,
Michelle Hardley