

**Academic Senate Meeting
April 1, 2011**

Present: Warren Rogers (chair), Deborah Dunn, Ron Enroth, Jane Highstreet, Dave Marten, Paul Morgan, Andrew Mullen, Tatiana Nazarenko Sue Savage, Paul Willis. Visitors Present: Rick Pointer, Telford Work.

1) Discussion of "honors" proposal with Telford Work

- a) Work: it might be better to use a word other than "honors". Perhaps the program could maybe named after a potential donor.
 - b) Other comments: One of concerns from students concerned what kind of students would be drawn into the program, and that a perception could develop of two classes of students. Students were positively impressed with programs at other schools.
 - c) Willis: expressed concern regarding the complexity of the point system.
 - d) Highstreet: students were not put off by the complexity issue.
 - e) Work: some department chairs expressed uncertainty regarding the program and several others were positively disposed toward the program. There was some concern among department chairs regarding the impact of the program on faculty workload.
 - f) Nazarenko: asked how many students would be involved in the program.
 - g) Work: potential "honor" students would be drawn from the universe of Monroe scholars and Presidential scholars. Membership would be some percentage of approximately 70 students.
 - h) Enroth: what kind of recognition would be involved?
 - i) Pointer: the Provost office would be willing to consider some added incentive for faculty to participate in major honors projects.
 - j) Willis: likes the added incentive for more students to do major honors projects.
 - k) Savage: would like more incentive for students to spend more time as artists in art program; the honors program might supply such incentive.
 - l) Dunn: perhaps a special scholarship could be given to keep top students for a full four-year tenure.
 - m) Mullen: what is essence of the "honors" program?
 - n) Work: the essence of program that top students get most out of program and Westmont get most out of student. There will tend to be more association between honor students within and between majors.
 - o) "Honors" can be on transcript of grads that have participated.
 - p) Dunn: should there be a grace period on GPA once students enter the program? Faculty could survey current students above a 3.5 GPA to track their typical grade trends.
 - q) Work: may be a good thing that there is some attrition among honors students over the years as in boy scouts becoming eagle scouts.
 - r) Work: showed an example of tracking the program on Google.
 - i) Students do self-reporting on Google docs.
- 2) Rogers: how does this "honors" program become an official college program since it would not go to full faculty for approval?**
- a) Pointer: it would be good to have official senate approval and recommend the program to the provost. The "honors" program has been discussed with many constituents of the college over 20 months. It could be rolled out this fall for the incoming class. It could be called a pilot program.
 - b) Martin: this is an academic and leadership program.
 - c) Work: agreed that there are components of both.

- d) Work should get some course release to do this. Pointer would be willing to support this with some resources.
- 3) **Action**—Dunn moved and Mullen seconded: The Senate affirms the “honors program” proposal and is responsible to review the program in five years. The motion passed with unanimous approval.
- 4) ***Preparation for interviews with provost candidates***
- a) Rogers: what questions should be asked? Consistency of questioning would be desirable.
 - b) Key questions:
 - i) Mullen: what are the trends in faculty governance and its role?
 - ii) Willis: questions regarding the liberal arts, what does that imply for specific aspects of governance. How would you support faculty governance (the senate), the curriculum, and in the context of the liberal arts. how would you support that.
 - iii) Willis: question about a culture of consultation between provost and faculty. who was consulted when decision has been made. personal consultation vs. surveys.
 - c) Pointer: we should have the candidate speak to models of faculty governance that s/he has observed or participated in.
 - d) At Rogers’ request: Dunn will craft some specific questions that can be used with all three candidates.

Pointer: handed out rationale for experiential education.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Morgan