



## Faculty Senate 2025–2026

MINUTES: February 18, 2026

Location: Griggs Hall Council Chamber

Time: 6:00-7:30 pm

A. Bosman, Chair; J. Lim, Executive  
Secretary

**Attendance** (19): M. Bacchiocchi, A. Bosman, S. Badenas, K. Cave, J. Cadet, B. Davis, E. Gallos, D. Gonzalez-Socoloske, S. Hatfield, L. Hamilton, N. Hess, N. Isaac-Dennis, K. Koudele, J. Lim Z. Plantak, W. Scott, J. Skinner, K. Thompson, T. Watson, A. Will.

**On Zoom:** (1) J. Ledesma

**Staff Senator:** M. Cervantes

**Regrets** (8): R. Choi, R. Gatón, B. Gibson, P. Gregor, J. Fraser, J. Johnson, B. Sheppard

**Guests:** K. Bailey, F. Faehner, K. Walker-Fraser.

**Votes and Actions taken** (numbers [n] represent items on original agenda)

**[2] Minutes of Prior Faculty Senate Meeting** (J. Lim)

**MOTION:** VOTE passed. To approve the minutes as presented.

**[3] Council Reports** (K. Cave)

Council Reports were received as follows.

Faculty Policy Development Council Minutes. Advancement Criteria Committee. Workload. Chair decision process for merged departments. Proposal to raise graduate faculty load from 16 to 18 credits with significant discussion, no yet decision.

**MOTION:** VOTE passed. To accept the council reports as presented.

**[4] Updated Admissions Requirement.** (A. Bosman). Undergraduate Council has voted a requested revision to the admissions requirements for undergraduate.

Our current admissions requirements are:

*Regular Admission*  
*2.75 GPA and either:*

*College Prep Curriculum\*\*  
Or ACT of at least 16/SAT equivalent  
Or 3.5 GPA (High School Diploma\*)*

*Gateway Admission  
Accepted: 2.5 GPA (High School Diploma\*)  
Reviewed: 2.00-2.49 GPA (High School Diploma\*)*

*\*High School: At least 3 years of English, 2 years of Math (Algebra I and higher), 2 years of Science, and 2 years of History/Social Science.*

*\*\*College Prep: At least 4 years of English, 3 years of Math (Algebra I and higher), 3 years of Science with lab, and 3 years of History/Social Studies.*

Various committees have been considering this original proposal:

*Original AU Admission Proposal  
Regular Admission  
High School Diploma\* and either:  
2.5 GPA or ACT of at least 16\*\**

*Gateway Admission  
High School Diploma\* and either:  
2.25-2.49 GPA or ACT of at least 14\*\*\**

The Academic Operations and Policy Council voted this recommendation to UGC, based on input from the Academic Resources Committee. This statement was also voted by UGC.

*Academic Operations and Policy Committee Recommendation*

*Given the context of diminishing test scores in math and reading, grade inflation, and growing needs for academic accommodation, the UGC/GC Academic Subcommittee recommends that:*

- *Any proposal to reduce admissions standards to the university must be accompanied by a significant investment in the student support structure including, but not limited to:*
- *Prioritizing the immediate replacement of the Student Success Director*
- *Increased staffing for Student Success*
- *Determination of a first-year advising model and approval of appropriate staffing*
- *Increased resources for proactive education and training of students, faculty, and staff*
- *Commit to providing resources for diagnostic assessment*

*The committee also recommends that the curriculum requirement not be changed if the admission GPA is reduced to 2.5 or 16 ACT/SAT equivalent.*

Undergraduate Council voted an amended version of the proposal on February 4 2026:

*Amended AU Admission Proposal*

*(Approved by UGC.)*

*Regular Admission*

*2.5 GPA and either:*

*College Prep Curriculum\*\**

*Or ACT of at least 16/SAT equivalent*

*Or 2.75 GPA*

*(High School Diploma\*)*

*Gateway Admission/Success Advising*

*Accepted: 2.25 GPA*

*(High School Diploma\*)*

For reference, sister Adventist institutions benchmarking:

*SAU*

*2.5 GPA and 18 ACT*

*Or 2.75 GPA*

*WWU*

*2.5 GPA (College Prep)*

*LSU*

*2.4 GPA and review of courses.*

*Or 2.75 GPA*

*WAU*

*2.5 GPA and 17 ACT Verbal*

*SWAU/UAU/PUC*

*2.5 GPA*

Note: These are acceptance to Andrews University; but other programs may have higher admissions requirements.

The Vice President for Student Life spoke to the proposal, expressing deep concern about what is being observed in classrooms and emphasizing that expanded access will require

expanded support. The Interim Student Success Director is currently managing 140 cases this semester, with 90 students on academic probation — and the university is losing probationary students between fall and spring semesters. Harvard's 37% accommodation rate was cited as a benchmark for the scale of support institutions are expected to provide. The VP affirmed that the Academic Operations and Policy Council statement addresses the essential needs, noted that a previously eliminated office manager position would have handled student alerts, and cautioned that staffing will need to grow alongside the new student pipeline. The proposed diagnostic assessment was identified as a critical and immediate need.

Several senators raised urgent concerns about the adequacy of current student support staffing. It was noted that the situation is unethical given how short-staffed the Student Success office is, with one senator stating plainly that it is neither ethical nor Biblical to accept students, take their tuition, and fail to support them. The AOPC statement was critiqued for lacking sufficient depth. It was noted that the new academic warning step — introduced prior to academic probation — will itself generate additional caseload demand. Dean Faehner is pursuing resolution by requesting that the President approve replacing the Director position and adding two new positions: one focused on diagnostic assessment and one to address the increased caseload. A solution for the office manager position has also been identified.

Concern was raised about declining student preparedness in the context of grade inflation, COVID-era learning loss, and the generational decline in measured IQ in the United States. English faculty noted that students are struggling with reading and writing, and expressed concern about pressure to increase course caps in courses already serving students with lower skill levels. The full AI generation has not yet arrived, and the challenges are expected to intensify.

The Senate discussed the tension between institutional selectivity and financial sustainability. Several senators noted that Andrews is not in a financial position to be selective, and that the institution cannot afford to lose students to competing schools over admissions thresholds. A question was raised about whether benchmarking data exists on peer and sister institution practices around student support and retention rates. It was noted that historically Andrews has had the highest retention rate among its Adventist sister institutions, though senators cautioned against assuming the university is performing better than peers on support infrastructure.

One senator challenged the faculty culture around course preparations, arguing that an obsession with multiple preps reduces faculty capacity for transformative student engagement — invoking the legacy of Goodloe Harper Bell as a model of teacher impact.

The point was made that if the curriculum were made more efficient, faculty would have greater capacity to support a broader range of students. Senators also observed that institutional attention is focused on the financial budget while the "student budget" — the capacity to serve students well — goes underexamined.

Questions were raised about available data on the Gateway program. It was reported that close to 80% of Gateway students have been moved to regular academic status, and the program was commended for its work. Senators raised whether students who need additional support could be directed into step programs, associate degree pathways, or other programs better suited to their current preparation. It was also noted that some students accepted to Gateway choose to attend a peer institution instead when offered regular admission there.

Senators affirmed that even "good and regular" students may need Student Success support, pushing back against any assumption that the proposal targets only underprepared students. It was noted that data in at least one program already identifies which students are at high risk of failing, and that high school GPA remains a reliable predictor of college success. A financial analysis of the proposal was assumed to have been completed, and senators expressed commitment to resourcing the identified needs. The Gateway program was commended for its good work as a model for what intentional student support can accomplish.

**MOTION:** VOTE passed unanimously. To support the admission standards revision and the statement from Academic Operations and Policy Committee Recommendation, including a phrase that Faculty Senate strongly supports the recommendations.

**[5] Faculty Senate Constitution Update.** (J. Skinner). A review of the Faculty Senate Constitution, including the lines between academic policy and administration policy for shared governance.

To reflect the restructuring of academic units, we move the following amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution:

Amendment to Article IV- Distribution and Election of Senators (page 10): To remove "Representation shall be distributed in the following manner" and subsequent College breakdown on pages 10-11 in the Faculty Senate Constitution. To retain preamble specifying "seats shall be distributed so that roughly a ratio of 10:1 in representation exists. Each academic unit shall be represented by a minimum of one Senator." To update "Provost" to "Chief Academic Officer."

Suggestion to consider faculty rank and faculty position vs administrative positions. The Faculty Senate Constitution Taskforce will take this item.

**MOTION:** VOTE passed (27 yes; 1 opposed). To approve the amendment as presented.

**[6] Faculty Senate Representation and Election Process** (A. Bosman). Existing language in the constitution says: "...seats shall be distributed so that roughly a ratio of 10:1 in representation exists. Each academic unit shall be represented by a minimum of one Senator."

Currently our senator list has 30 Senators. We have 28 seats filled and 2 unfilled. The current total faculty FTEs is 202.6. The updated count would be about 21 = 20 the 1 Global Campus adjunct position. In the past when we made changes, When there were any extra Senators, they continued serving as Senators At-Large.

With the mergers, it looks like this:

Academic Units (post-mergers):

17 + Seminary (33 faculty)  
+ Library/CAR (9 faculty) + Global Campus  
= 22

Average faculty per department/school:

~10 (min: 4, max: 19)

We have two options to look at this:

Two Options:

- Elect one Senator per academic unit (and 3 for Seminary, 1 for Library/CAR, 1 for Global Campus). If an academic unit is unable to elect a Senator, another Senator from the same College will be elected.
- Elect Senators at the College/Division level (current practice). This may mean that some academic units have multiple Senators and others have none.

**MOTION:** VOTE passed (27 yes; 1 abstain). To reorganize by electing one Senator per academic unit (and 3 for Seminary, 1 for Library/CAR, 1 for Global Campus). If an academic unit is unable to elect a Senator, another Senator from the same College will be elected.

**MOTION:** VOTE passed (27 yes; 1 abstain). Motion to reduce the Faculty Senate to align to one Senator per academic unit.

## **Senate Discussion & Announcements**

**[1] Devotional.** (S. Badenas). Habakkuk 1-3. V. 1 “How long Lord must I call for help, but you do not listen? V 5. Be amazed. 3:17-18. Though the fig tree does not bud, ... yet I will rejoice in the Lord. “In the darkest days, when appearances seem most forbidden, have faith in God.” Ministry of Healing p. 481.

**[7] Announcement.** (A. Bosman). HR intends for \$60/faculty in departmental budgets for social activities; and considering an \$25/faculty incentive to be used for social/developmental activity for departments where everyone completes the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). Work is being done on a chair’s checklist.