Minutes for the 422nd Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:10pm
II. Roll Call
Absent: Senator Brown and Senator Harfenist

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 420th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Discussion: Senator Blatchly – At the end of Page 7 in the packet the word netted should be changed to Meta.
Senator Martin – After reviewing the transcripts of his comments from the last meeting he thought a number of changes would be desirable. He put forward a request that the body of the Senate reconsider as early as possible the decision that was made a year ago concerning transcription.

Vote: Motion carries as amended

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 421st meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish noted the minutes of 419th Senate Meeting will be brought forward for approval at the October meeting.

IV. Courtesy Period

President Kahn – A few days ago each campus within the University System presented a distinct vision of their campus at a Board of Trustees meeting. With the support of the Administration, President Kahn presented the kind of excellence we are striving for in our undergraduate programs as a public liberal arts college and founded on a strong foundation of multi disciplinary liberal arts going through applied learning and capstone experiences. It was worth noting and he pointed out to the Board of Trustees that we have data that shows nearly ¾ of our graduated senior students a year ago in the spring expressed they had completed some kind of capstone experience. It is unique for us to reach that kind of level without a requirement going through the campus.

The second thing President Kahn noted was the accepted report of the Change Management Task Force – a group that was convened by Chairman Dupont a year ago in response, in part, to achieve greater administrative efficiencies within the University System and to respond to Legislative criticism about inefficiencies in the University System.

Following a set of principles adopted by the Board of Trustee and a report from a National Higher Education consulting group, they accepted a series of principles and bylaw changes to implement these efficiencies. Parts of those efficiencies affect academic affair policies. Provost Treadwell will be working with her colleagues throughout the year to define some of the implications. They had redefined what had been the Programs and Services Committee of the University System as an Education Excellence committee that is more driven by metrics and outcomes than it is by rigidity and policy. More conversation will be led by the Provost with the campus. These are now matters of public record and President Kahn wanted to keep everyone up to date with these principles.

The Board of Trustees also approved a bi-annual budget request for the University System. All of the Presidents of the University System have been talking with the Gubernatorial Candidates about USNH 100, trying to keep public in Higher Education for New Hampshire and to restore the appropriation back to $100,000,000.00 as it was in 2010/11. The Board of Trustees adopted that and the principle that we would freeze tuition for a two year period in this next Biennium if the legislature appropriated $100,000,000.00 to the University System. This has important implications for our students and our future operating budget over the next two years.

There was one other change President Kahn mentioned and that was noted at the Opening Address It is based on principles. Representation to the legislature and direct reporting relationship to the Board of Trustees is now established for each of the Presidents. We will be much more outcome driven for our institutions goals and for the goals of the University System. We are responsible as Presidents for both the successes of our campuses and the University System.

V. Subcommittee Reports
• **Executive Committee**

Senator Stanish gave an update of items discussed at the SEC meeting held Sept. 5th

- Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson is taking a one year leave from Keene State College. If anyone has a suggestion on someone who would like to serve in this capacity forward those names to Senator Stanish.
- Open Senate seats:
  - One student seat - Should be filled by the next Senate meeting.
  - Adjunct Faculty – Working with KSCAA to find someone to fill that seat.
  - At-Large – Has been filled by Steven Lucey
  - Several Non Senate Seats open on the AOC
- Senate Minutes – Discussions are taking place to reconsider the vote from last year’s meeting and continue with transcriptions of the Senate meetings. They are looking into investing in better equipment and software.
- ISP Task Force Report – The SEC is putting together a group of people with a specific charge of the kind of action steps to bring forward suggestions to the Senate. The SEC plans to bring their plan and membership at the October Senate Meeting.
- AOC – This will be the last year that the AOC will be in existence. The program review process would still happen very much the same way in departments but would go to the Dean and/or Provost. The SEC will be meeting to have details in place before July 2013 when the AOC will no longer exist as part of the Senate.
- By-Laws – Changes that were approved last year have been updated and can be located at [http://www.keene.edu/senate/](http://www.keene.edu/senate/)

• **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Darby gave an update of items discussed at the SCC meeting held Sept 5th.

- The committee discussed an apparent discrepancy in the SCC Guidelines related to course objectives and learning outcomes - namely, the Guidelines stipulate that course proposal sponsors must include both course objectives and learning outcomes, whereas the course proposal form requires only learning outcomes. The SCC will continue to require learning outcomes only (not course objectives), in keeping with current practice, and will counsel the school curriculum committees to consider the same.
- The committee discussed problematic language in the Guidelines related to course objectives and learning outcomes - namely, the Guidelines should do a better job in guiding faculty in how to develop objectives and outcomes. The SCC chair will draft new language and submit it to the committee for approval by the end of the current academic year.
- The committee discussed the requirement that ‘course addition’ proposals (i.e., proposals for new courses) must have a syllabus appended to the proposal. The SCC will continue to enforce the requirement, but it does not have the authority to reject a proposal based on the content of the syllabus beyond the basic criteria stipulated in the Guidelines. The SCC will counsel the school curriculum committees to consider the same.
- The committee discussed the importance of advisory opinions related to II course proposals. The SCC chair will meet with the II subcommittee (or its chair) to ensure that II course proposal sponsors are made aware of their obligations under the Guidelines.
- The committee discussed ongoing confusion regarding the program proposal form - namely, what is the difference between a programmatic ‘change of requirements’ and a ‘program redesign’. The SCC may consider a revision of the program proposal form, effective next academic year, to eliminate the confusion.
- The SCC chair will meet with the Academic Standards Committee chair to improve communication between the two committees related to proposals under review by both committees.
- The committee reviewed a draft meeting schedule for the semester,

VI. New Business

Senator Darby - There was some confusion on an approved document by the Senate last year concerning time to graduation requirements. Around the graduation strategy in which all Bachelor of Arts and Science degrees are normally 120 credits which is different currently or what had been. It is normally 124 credits. Looking at the Senate documentation, the effective date for that change is noted as spring 2013. There is some confusion in the Registrar’s office. It appears that we have set up a scenario where
students who matriculate in this academic year they are obligated to the 124 credits where as students that are in a cohort that matriculate in January 2013 would be held to the standard of 120 credits. That is a complicated factor to have two cohorts of students with different requirements within the same catalog year.

Provost Treadwell – I will review the transcript of the original vote and issues of the Registrar because I do agree and think it would be a terrible disadvantage and I suspect an unintended consequence for students during this academic year. After I review I will let you know what I uncover

In regard to the Academic Planning Council, I have raised this at the Chairs meeting and Faculty meeting as well on of the bylaw changes referenced by President Kahn has actually created a process by which campuses have much more autonomy with regard to program proposals and curriculum. With regard to the SCC work and within the School Curriculum Committees this year significant new program proposals would not be required to create the early notice of potential proposal and SAPC documents that has been our practice in the past. I am seeing clarity with the other Chief Academic Officers within the system regarding notification requirements by the Chief Academic Officers to the Educational Excellence committee to the system. The good news for us I believe is the autonomy and control of our curriculum internally. The challenging news is simply that it will come back to each of our committees this summer request for notice that could be presented in meetings later this year to the Educational Excellence committee this year by those actions we are taking as a campus. In exercising our privileges to our own curriculum SAPC documents should not be observed as they had in the past. Any questions you may have please direct them to me and I will make sure we attend to that. I will bring back information to our faculty at large and to this body as well with greater clarity. This is new and the motion was just approved and we are still in the process of what are steps are for each campus to give notice to the system.

President Kahn – Under the rubric of the American Democracy Project I am speaking to the University’s action of the biannual budget. We do have on September 18th a Democratic Gubernatorial Candidate Maggie Hassan coming to the campus at noon to the Lantern Room. Attendance during the turnout for our two candidates was not very strong. They have had interesting platforms but were obviously not interesting enough. This would be a great opportunity if you do spread the word to students and colleagues to hear from an important person of influence.

VII. Adjournment 6:07pm
I. Call to Order 4:04pm

II. Roll Call
Absent: Senator Fleeger and Senator Brown

III. Secretary's Report
Senator Stanish - We have minutes from both the 419th meeting which was April 11th of last academic year as well as the 422nd meeting that was held on September 12th.

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 419th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Discussion: Senator Blatchly - Cheryl and I had a brief conversation and about 6 out of about 18,000 words were wrong and I wanted to put that into context. On page 12 of the minutes in the 3rd paragraph discussing the music report I make a statement according to the minutes that says the correct state of affairs and it should be the current state of affairs. The second one we did check with the tape and between pages 13 and 14 I made a rather mysterious statement according to the minutes, replacement is just department floor rules and I have no idea what that means. It turns out what I said was the cart before the horse.

Senator Welsh - As transcripts go this is an excellent one. The conversation flows, the meaning is clear and it's nicely done.

Vote: Motion carries as amended
Motion: To accept the minutes of the 422nd meeting of the Keene State College Senate.
Vote: Motion carries

IV. Courtesy Period
Provost Treadwell - I just wanted to provide an announcement regarding the 18 credit policy. As all of you might recall since the beginning of the academic year I have been reviewing the policy implemented by our office this summer that would require a fee charge for 19 credits and above for our students. I have been reviewing communication regarding this policy and have also met with our student governance group and had a number of conversations with individual students. The reason I raise it here is I think it is important for the College Senate to know first and I will follow up tomorrow with communication to the entire campus. A couple of key elements, the policy itself is intended to encourage that our students do not enroll in 5 courses. As we moved to a 4 credit curriculum, as some of you will recall, a number of our conversations centered around the ability to go deeper in fewer number of courses and have the academic engagement we would expect in a college environment. On that merit alone I think the policy is sound and it holds our academic principles. However, I don't believe that my office communicated effectively to all of our students and to our faculty regarding this policy and the intention for the fees to begin being collected in the spring semester of 2013. I made the following motion yesterday to our Cabinet which is that full time matriculated enrollment for undergraduate students as defined as a course load of 12 to 20 credits students enrolled in 21 or more credits will pay a per credit overload charge determined by their residency status. I will continue to review a campus policy of an overload charge implemented at the 19th credit hour, working with the campus community and Cabinet to finalize any policy change before the end of this academic year. I have blocked implementation of the financial penalty for this year. It will not be implemented 1/2 way through. The Cabinet approved this request but that does not mean that I in anyway disagree with the intention behind the policy which is that as academic units I will be working very actively with the faculty and Deans who understand our holistic forum and where we may have barriers to students success where they needed to take 20 credits. It will be a lot of work that we need to engage in the fall semester and into the spring but I will make a policy recommendation in the spring semester for the benefit of our students. My thanks to you for inviting me in sharing what was difficult for many of our students and that they had made plans not accounting on the additional $880.00 to be collected beginning in the spring semester. I respect and appreciate that and I regret about the other communication and I take responsibility for it. So we move forward and thank you for the courtesy period.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I just wanted to announce and encourage everyone to announce in their classes and whatever forums that you have that we have a voter registration table for students on Friday from 11:00am -1:00pm in the Student Center. I know that people have lots of questions about our students and whether or not they are eligible to vote and how that will happen. We have the City Clerk here who has the most up to date information; although I am guessing that Professor Weed could probably help us out there to. They will work directly with our students and help if the student wants to get registered. They will help the students get registered so please encourage students to use that service or to go directly to the City Clerk’s office. The City Clerk is ready and very much wanting to help our students register to vote.
Senator Sapeta - This Friday between 12:00pm and 4:00pm the new TDS Center will be open officially for business and there will be a dedication ceremony at 2:00pm. You are all welcome to attend and would like to see you there to share the joy of having a new building and being able to teach there.

V. **Subcommittee Reports**

- **Executive Committee**

Senator Stanish - I will try to summarize our meeting notes that you have in your packet. Our first order of business is that Chuck Weed has agreed to serve as a Parliamentarian for us. He is at least available for the fall semester and hope he can go into the spring semester. We thank Chuck for being here and as part of our bylaws the Parliamentarian does need to be approved by the whole Senate.

**Motion:** The SEC moves that the Senate approve Chuck Weed as the Parliamentarian for 2012-2013

Discussion: Senator Stemp - One minor spelling mistake in the motion he is listed as Chuck Week.

Chuck Weed - The copy of the bylaws that I received when I first was asked to consider this - item H said that people should [see Article VI, J 6] and I am wondering if that shouldn't be [see Article VI, J 8].

Senator Stanish - We did vote to change that we just need to change that. Does anyone have any questions on what the Parliamentarians role is?

Senator Haas - What is the Parliamentarians role?

Senator Stanish - In the bylaws it says The Parliamentarian shall, at the request of the presiding officer, offer advice upon Senate rules, matters of procedure, and points of order and privilege. So anytime that we have a question of are we doing this properly we can review that. The Parliamentarian may, upon request of any member, rule that the gavel pass to the Vice Chair because of the trend of the debate. The Parliamentarian may be a member of the Senate. If we are in the middle of a debate and we need points of order or we need clarification we could ask the Parliamentarian procedure type questions.

Chuck Weed - I don't have Robert's Rules of Order and I should probably have that before we get into any heavy debates.

Senator Stanish - We do not have any motions today but we will get Robert's Rules of Order for you.

**Vote:** Motion passes

Senator Stanish - Our next order of business is back to the Senate minutes. As you saw we just approved the minutes from our September meeting and are already allowed to do that but we are enacting on this next motion. For those of you who were on the Senate last year, in April the Senate approved a motion to simply follow what is required by Robert's Rules of Order for minutes and what is required is really just a listing of the motions. However, with that in discussion we also added an amendment that any member of the college community could request a written transcript or a certain portion of the minutes and those requests are already coming. We have already found requests and we think this will be a common occurrence. In addition we have heard from a few Senators that as a Senate we do value having some sort of transcript in addition to just the motions. Given all of that we have worked a little bit to investigate in a better technology that we are starting today we will see how it goes. The microphones in this room continue to be a challenge and we will continue to work on that but, all of that aside we are going to move forward with the motion here.

**Motion:** The SEC moves that the Senate Minutes format goes beyond the requirement of Robert's Rules of Order and that a complete transcript, to be approved by the Senate, be prepared for every Senate meeting (retroactive to September 2012).

Discussion: Senator Welsh - It's a fine motion and I support it completely. The only comment I would make is that my eye and my mind catches on that clause that the Senate format goes beyond what is required. I would consider a more concise and equally functional version and it might be that the Senate moves that the transcript be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stanish - We can do that and we did think of that. We wanted to acknowledge the wording in the previous motion which is why we put it in. If anyone would like to make that amendment we certainly can make that amendment.

Senator Welsh - I would like to amend the motion to read;

**Amended Motion:** The SEC moves that the Senate be a complete transcript, to be approved by the Senate, be prepared for every Senate meeting (retroactive to September 2012).

Discussion on amendment: Senator Martin - I tripped over that as well and that the motion as it was originally appeared in the minutes of the SEC diminished itself by saying we are doing something beyond that requirement. We can give ourselves our own requirements so for that reason I would be voting in favor of the amended motion.

Parliamentarian Weed - You are talking about something that is related to Robert's Rules of Order, shouldn't that be included in your bylaws? Is there a change in bylaw requirements and isn't that a different procedure?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - There is no mention of the minutes in the bylaws and how they should be taken.

Senator Stanish - They would go to our bylaws by default unless we do something differently.

Senator Hanrahan - With the wording in the amendment as it is now it doesn't say anything that it is referring to the minutes. It just says a complete transcript.

Senator Stanish - You are right.

Senator Hanrahan - Should we just add that the Senate minutes be a complete transcript

**Amendment to the amended Motion:** The SEC moves that the Senate minutes be a complete transcript, to be approved by the Senate, be prepared for every Senate meeting (retroactive to September 2012).

Senator Stanish - Is that acceptable?

Senator Welsh - Absolutely

**Vote:** Amended motion carries

**Vote:** Motion carries
Senator Stanish - The next item we have in our packet is that we have charged the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Team. The SEC together with the Provost had agreed that this year the SEC would put together and that is what we have done. You will see on senate document [SD 12/13-8] is the charge to this team as well as the committee members to this team. The motion to the Senate has already been passed that this committee would exist and we are charging the membership now. I would like to thank Senator Jean for agreeing to Chair this committee and Senator Welsh for being the other Senate representative as well as the other members of the committee. As you can see in our charge that this group would come up with different strategies in 6 different areas and bring them back to the SEC. We will then bring it back to both the Student Government and to this group for action. That is what we are looking for going forward.

Senator Blatchly - Are you looking for discussion?
Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Blatchly - As I scan through this and sort through some things, one thing which might be an extension to the charge or it might not be is the relationship between the ISP and the Senate which I think has been a little confused at times. I don't know if you on the SEC considered that that is included in the charge as it is written down or would that be potentially an additional item to consider.

Senator Stanish - It is implicitly in with previous leadership models and before the curriculum review process as it comes out in the task force. I do want to say that it is on the radar of the SEC anyway. Whatever comes out of this group we will also be working with the relationship of ISP and the Senate and we can certainly coordinate efforts as we move forward.

Senator Stanish - The last few items in our notes are just updates and I will let you read them in the packet. In the last two items it says that Karen will set up meetings and Karen has set up meetings so those meetings are scheduled or at least in the process of being scheduled and people should check their meeting makers.

- **Academic Overview Committee**
  - Senator Blatchly - Very brief report. We have organized and set up subcommittees. We have members of the subcommittees as you see in the report. We are receiving materials and gathering reviewers and hope to be able to push the process forward more or less on schedule. That is pretty much what we are up to. It is a very brief report and thank you for giving me the opportunity to do that.

- **Academic Standards Committee**
  - Senator Stanish - The ASC has no report Senator Welsh did you want to say anything.
  - Senator Welsh - The ASC has no charge yet so it has not met although I will take the opportunity now to remind members that we will meet after today’s meeting to elect another Chair as I will be stepping down as part of the Mike Welsh overcommitted reduction act. So members stick around it should be brief.

- **Senate Curriculum Committee**
  - Senator Darby - I will just summarize the senate document here. One correction, our next scheduled meeting is not next Wednesday, October 17th it’s the subsequent Wednesday the 24th. I have met with a number of colleagues and committees across campus as listed here including Senator Welsh. I have received some communications including those from the Chairs in the School of Sciences and Social Sciences, met with the School of Arts & Humanities, met with Professor Antonucci who chairs the II subcommittee of ISP. I have met with Melinda Treadwell, Karen Stanish, Tom Richards and Ann Miller about curriculum policy and processes and met with members of the II subcommittee last week related to the II proposals. The rest is in the documents.
  - Senator Welsh - I have a question that the item in the report reminds me of an item that was in our minutes that they approved last time it was discussed last year and that was a charge composition and history of the II subcommittee. I was wondering and question when it was originated and the composition as approved by the Senate. These kinds of things came up as a result of discussion about placing in the official line for approval of curriculum proposals. I am wondering if there has been any closure or information regarding those questions.
  - Senator Stanish - I have done a little bit of investigating to exactly what you are speaking to and in terms of the way that the Senate had handled it in the past. In our bylaws it says that Integrative Studies program committee would be part of curriculum process. It is really up to the program committee to decide within itself how that would happen and so what they have decided is that it would be the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee that would be looking at the interest of the proposals and so we are not really violating our bylaws because it is still part of the larger Integrative Studies Program Committee. We can continue to investigate further exactly the questions that you have raised.
  - Provost Treadwell - I believe the ISP discussion facilitation group will specifically look at the goals and barriers in the Interdisciplinary and specific strategies supported along disciplinary goals that the Interdisciplinary program and as we have mentioned previously in this meeting there will also be support about curriculum review processes. So I expect that the committee will give us more of that but to reinforce the Chair. I do believe that was part of the bylaws of the original Integrative Studies Program approval process and the creation of the ITW coordinators, IQL coordinators and the II coordinators and their approval processes were part of that in keeping with bylaws of the Senate. It is time to review that and I think that is part of the charge element of this discussion team.

VI. **New Business - none**

VII. **Adjournment 4:31pm**
I. Call to Order  4:09

II. Roll Call
Absent: Senator White-Stanley and Senator Brown
Excused: Senator Hanrahan, Senator Martin and Senator Rust

III. Secretary's Report
Motion: To accept the minutes of the 423rd meeting of the Keene State College
Vote: Motion carries

IV. Courtesy Period
Nothing to report

V. Subcommittee Reports
Senator Stanish - Senator Darby has a guest here for the Curriculum. Would you like to go first? We will be doing the committees in reverse order and we will start with the SCC.

- Curriculum Committee
Senator Darby- We have had three meetings since our last Senate meeting on October 24th. We met and reviewed proposals from Communication, Criminal Justice Studies, and Sociology. Revisions were requested from each program. There are two courses presented to the Senate as information: SOC 210, SOC 433. Our next meeting was on October 31, in which we met and reviewed proposals from Anthropology/Sociology, Sociology, Film, Holocaust & Genocide Studies, and Sustainable Product Design & Innovation. Revisions were requested from HGS for selected proposals. The following approved course proposals are presented to the Senate as information: FILM 355, HGS 289, HGS 494, SPDI 152, and SPDI 352.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IHHGS 189 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the ISSOC 125 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Holocaust & Genocide Studies major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the addition of the Anthropology/Sociology major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Sustainable Product Design & Innovation major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the CJS 340/WGS 340 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Communication major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Senator Darby - We request that the next proposal be tabled. The Nursing major, there was some miscommunication around this proposal for which I apologize. I believe we will get it back on to our next meeting which is December 2nd. We need to table the Nursing proposal for the time being.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Criminal Justice Studies minor be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the addition of the Criminal Justice Studies major be approved by the Senate
Senator Lucey - What had happened was Senator Robinson asked if we should get an advisory opinion from Admissions and we did. There was a concern on Peggy Richmond's part that we are being a bit too, I am going to use the word liberal, with applying such standards and there were some perplexities with that result. It was her understanding that the admission standards were really there to sort of answer issues of accreditation within particular professional programs and that they have been used elsewhere say like Plymouth. If students are comparing they can say well their program doesn't have...so if the student with a C average can't be a Criminal Studies major now at Keene State because of this. It was troublesome and yes we do want to discuss this further. When, where it's prudent to have such things can we actually have a policy that we can implement sort of campus wide. Of course the impact would be huge depending on if we sort of let things go but as things stood the way the proposal was written forwarded to us by the SCC, Senator Darby. The standards were well in keeping with other programs that have admissions requirements. A couple of gatekeeper courses were in keeping with what we do in other programs because we have no campus wide policy or implementation policy.

Senator Treadwell - Thank you that is very helpful just as we talk about the standards committee a little later but I wanted the consideration. It is not for this proposal and I know there are other departments so I appreciate you discussing this.

Senator Darby - Around advisory opinions to admissions, Admissions is not an academic program as I understand it but maybe I am misinformed. The SCC guidelines state a list of names of affected departments with programs can include advisory opinions. A proposal must list all affected departments. Is there a precedent for requesting an advisory opinion from the department or program which is not recognized as an academic department at Keene State College?

Senator Lucey - I would like to add that I had asked the question when I was chosen to be Chair of the ASC and what exactly the ASC charge is. Unlike the AOC and SEC we have no bylaws, we have no standards. We just do whatever we want to do. When Senator Robinson suggested that, we were like sure why not. The term or phrase advisory opinion was interesting for discussion. I do not feel that just because I presented it as information I didn't feel one way or another about it. It was just interesting to have that information. The Provost just suggested there is a larger issue. I also suggested that the ASC needs some guidelines as a result. So it's one thing to consider. How does it act as a subcommittee with the SCC particularly because I would not have thought about the SCC guidelines?

Senator Robinson - In my experience the ASC seeks information from whatever source it feels it needs. It could be the Registrar's office, the Admission's office, the Provost's office, an academic department or to go back to the original proposals. So the information seemed relevant for discussion and it is usually sought. In past years we had Brendan Denehy on the committee who often represented the Registrar's office so he would go back and do a little research of the implications. So it seemed perfectly appropriate to ask for pertinent information.

Senator Darby - Number one, does Admissions have an objection to this proposal? Number two, do they have a philosophical objection to admissions requirements for programs?

Senator Lucey - I think the way you made those statements misrepresents both. The first one, there were no objections at all to the Criminal Justice Studies major and the second was just a concern. I am guessing it was a very short email that we got. Let me see if I can simplify the language, there is a pattern of admissions standards that students have had to meet in the past as I mentioned earlier. It had been applied specifically to Professional Studies accredited programs. She is seeing a trend that is going in another direction but there was no value judgment. It was just information.

Senator Robinson - I do think concern is exactly the right word but the question is what the impact on overall enrollment is if we restrict enrollment in certain programs but not in other programs. Criminal Justice is interesting because it is a highly sought out major and one of the reasons we are going to that as a major. Many of our perspective students ask about Criminal Justice. So in fact it is an impact on enrollment but restricting in some way. What is the impact? Just a question, a concern question.

Senator Lucey - I'll just go back again and say that this came up in discussion that I had for Art History and if there had been a sort of gatekeeper kind of thing I would have been locked out of a potential major that I wanted because I screwed up as a first year student and that would have happened to anyone anywhere else. Those standards are more sort of campus wide. I realized I had to get on the ball and change it but I think about our students where you know first time in college coming in and not doing well in the first year and the fear is that they get locked out of programs that they are interested in because of that or they are spending all their time taking courses which very soon will be much more expensive but they have to take that course for a full credit. That does concern me but I don't think I really started to think about this until we were having this discussion.

Senator Prosper - I just want to say that I didn't attend the meeting with our subcommittee. So whatever I say is me and not the subcommittee. I think our Chair made a great point in saying that our student population are first year students and some of the challenges they face in navigating colleges and universities and its different when it's a 4 year institution and not at a community college. Also, we have in our mission that we are very concerned about our academic standards and we can definitely think of other
ways we can make sure that the academic standards are held where we want it to be, other than having these initial gatekeepers. Does that make sense? Thinking of other ways on how we can make sure our academic standards are well thought out for us and also for students, for example, in training programs and having to maintain a certain GPA in that program.

Senator Stanish - This vote is really for the curriculum and then we also separately vote for the admissions standards. Although we are discussion the admissions standards right now we are actually voting on the curriculum piece. We will vote on the admissions piece in a second.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Darby - Our next meeting is this Friday and all curriculum proposals are available on Blackboard

Senator Stanish - I have encouraged all Senators to take advantage of Blackboard and I want to thank Senator Darby for reorganizing and really cleaning up the Blackboard site. I encourage everyone to go there as it is very well organized and you can find curriculum proposals very easily.

- Academic Standards Committee

Senator Lucey - I have pretty much said what happened for the proposal for Criminal Justice Studies, during the SCC report. We did decide, because everything as we said is consistent with current practice and similar admissions criteria, to pass it and I did bring it forward as a motion. We did agree that part of what the ASC does and this would be kind of an interesting thing. We heard through the grapevine that we might be charged with having this actual discussion in the future about our criteria and their purpose. I want to backtrack for just one second and say the point that I was speaking to earlier that I am playing part of devil’s advocate, that I do believe that certain admissions criteria are appropriate at certain times and others maybe not. I just didn't want to make it sound that I don't believe in them for fear when it comes to the ASC and that is not necessarily true. We do have a motion to bring forward to the Senate.

Motion: The ASC moves to approve the admissions criteria for the proposed B.A. program in Criminal Justice Studies be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

- Academic Overview Committee

Senator Blatchly - We are in our site visit cycle so we have two site visits scheduled and another one which I hope soon to be scheduled. We are very busy as we are seeing visitors on campus to look at programs and working through making reports from them for next time. I am also hoping to have the Geology report for next meeting which is lingering from last year. We are busy but not much to write.

- Executive Committee

Senator Stanish - We are still working with our new technology and hopeful it will help us save some time and we will let you know how it comes. The ISP Facilitation and Discussion team is in place and will begin meeting next week. The next item may take a little more discussion. The SEC did put together a bylaw change to update our policy regarding Senate absences. We bring that forward as discussion only today but will not be voting on it today. We will vote on it at one of the December meetings. We wanted to bring it forth for discussion. We welcome any discussion or comments on the attached proposal for the change.

Senator Stanish - I will point out a couple of the changes. A lot of it is the same when you see the whole picture. The big changes are instead of having a number of three unexcused absences. That number didn't make sense in a couple of different ways. In terms of these meetings, the full Senate meetings we meet 8 or 9 times a year so three absences is quite a few. We thought two absences were more appropriate for the full Senate meetings. However, for subcommittee meetings three absences may not be very many at all. Some subcommittees meet quite frequently and some subcommittees meet infrequently. It depends on the nature of the work and whether you may or may not need to be there or you meet individually. So having this sort of general catch all policy didn't seem to make a whole lot of sense, so we broke it into a couple of different pieces. There are excused absences and you can get excused absences simply by contacting your Senate Clerk or the Senate Secretary. But two unexcused absences from the regular Senate meetings will sort of trigger the process where the Senate Chair will contact the Senator and the Senator would have 48 hours to respond in writing for a rationale for the absences. The Senate Chair would bring that rationale to the SEC at their next meeting who would look at the rationale and determine if the Senator should continue to serve or do we need to find a new Senator. As opposed to the old policy, where the policy was to have the Senator come before the SEC and it was very unclear as to what was supposed to happen. We thought it was ironic that someone that is missing meetings is required to go to yet another meeting. We didn't think that made a lot of sense. As for subcommittees as they stand in the Senate, or any other special committees that may be formed in the
future, it would be up to the committee Chair to determine what the threshold for an acceptable number of unexcused absences is. Once that threshold has been reached that committee Chair would notify the Senate Chair and that same process would go into action in terms of contacting the Senator, getting a rationale in writing and the SEC making the decision. Those are the main changes.

Senator Welsh- It looks just fine to me although the thing that did stick out as I was reading this was the 48 hours and I was considering that perhaps it is reasonable period and then I am a bit of a Luddite and I would go 48 hours without checking my email on occasion. I was wondering if given it 4 days or 7 days or something like that.

Senator Stanish - I think that's very reasonable. Do you have a strong suggestion on any of those two time frames?

Senator Welsh- 7 days will cover the bases and is very generous.

Senator Lucey - Point of clarification. You said the policy at the very end is consistent with that of subcommittees, so once the offender reaches that sort of number then....

Senator Stanish - The procedure is the same. It is the Senate Chairs responsibility to make contact with the Senator, then they would have whatever our time period is to respond. The Senator would have that time to respond and then the SEC would make a decision based on the rationale.

Senator Sapeta - Is there a problem with people missing too many meetings or is it that we want to have a system place?

Senator Stanish- Yes and Yes. Yes, there has been issues with Senators sort of disengaging and missing meetings and people rightly so wanting to know what the practice in the past as well as in the future. It certainly has been an issue that comes up every year or every two years or so. As well as going forward we want to make sure there is some policy in place in case it does become a bigger problem. Thank you, we will reconsider that time period Senator Welsh and will bring this forward for a vote at one of the December meetings.

Also as we mentioned several folks got together, the Chair of the AOC, Rich Blatchly, the Provost, myself and the Senate Secretary to discuss what will happen to program review once the AOC is no longer. It is ending this year. We began discussions and have been brainstorming some drafts. We started a draft and will keep you updated on that. We hope to bring that proposal to you in one of the December meetings. We gave ourselves a firm deadline so that we get it done.

Speaking of the ASC we are working on some charges for you and I want to get these in writing so it is clear as to what the charges are and I will do that for you. Certainly a big one is exactly as we heard this idea of admissions criteria, gateway to majors, gateway to programs and that sort of thing. This is something the Senate has been hearing for several years. Our thoughts are the first step would be to kind of do an inventory of what we have. We can get a feeling of what is the Keene States philosophy is about this. What is sort of the trend and then see where we want to go next from there.

Senator Treadwell - I think the interest in this is that we get a sense of where the campus is and what some of the programs are. Then from my position and that of the administration is what the triggers are for this. Is it a resource issue and is that what is driving some of these decisions and therefore how do we address that? It is an inventory so we understand the scope and magnitude and perhaps the trigger points within the departments for this. The help from the Standards Committee to conduct that assessment will be incredibly useful.

Senator Stanish - Some other charges that we are working on, last year the Academic Standards Committee did a review of the grading system that we currently use and other potential systems. We sort of pulled information for the Senate but haven’t moved forward so we will make sure we revisit that so we know what that means.

We have sort of been hearing from the campus is looking at the withdrawal deadline in light of some of the research we have heard from Institutional Research about the importance of students maintaining academic momentum. So, is our withdrawal deadline at the right time? Do we have the right policy around the withdrawal design? Again, we will get some of those questions in writing.

The last thing, some of the Chairs in School of Sciences and Social Sciences are looking at trying to add an additional Monday, Wednesday, Friday time block to try and keep our schedule a little more efficiently and so we are looking at that and we will be bringing this to the Senate eventually.

I. New Business

Parliamentarian Weed- Can I make an inquiry? I'm not sure but it goes back to Senator Darby's report in which he called for tabling the report on the nursing program because of miscommunication. I always understood that if something is to be tabled from a vote but also it seems to me that the request might have been referral back to the committee and goes back in the report. Is that correct?
Senator Stanish - Yes that would be correct. I do agree. We certainly have had the practice that once a motion has been made we would need to vote to table. But your right, he never actually made the motion to table and it was probably the incorrect word. Yes, thank you.

Senator Darby - That's correct

VII. Adjournment 4:43
Minutes
for the 425th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, December 12, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:11
II. Roll Call

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 424th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.
Vote: Motion passes

IV. Courtesy Period
President Kahn - I am sorry that my attendance this semester hasn't been that consistent. My apologies and I am glad I can join you on the last meeting of the semester. I am thankful for a really good semester and I appreciate all of the work that the faculty and students have poured into this and I think we are having terrific outcomes. Students are feeling challenged, faculty are being worked hard and staff are contributing in many ways that are reaching deep so it is all good. I am grateful for the work that has resulted in a Collective Bargaining Agreement. The faculty has met and voted to approve the agreement and we will communicate further to the campus in the next day hopefully. I am grateful in that and it is an outcome of this semester. Grateful too for the gift that we announced yesterday from the Main Street America Group that would enable the college to follow through with its needs to provide a practical site, a recreation and intercollegiate site for indoor activities on Gilbo Avenue. The Health and Wellness Center will take programmatic shape over the next semester during the master planning process but there is great potential for helping the campus in different ways in our academic programs, recreational student life programs, and intercollegiate athletics and community partnerships. It really just hits a lot of these for the college and holds a great deal of promise for us. There is no approval of a specific program but the Board of Trustees did allow us to go forward and accept this gift at this time. I am grateful for that. The season of things to be grateful for but we have much to look forward to in the coming year. I want to extend to you again the invitation to the all campus holiday greetings next Tuesday at the President's house at 2:00pm. We look forward to seeing you there with your colleagues and the rest of our friends around campus. To all of you I wish you a very happy restful holiday.

V. Subcommittee Reports

Senator Stanish - I know we have a number of guests here for curriculum and various proposals and thank you for being here. We have a rather long agenda so I appreciate your patience in waiting until whenever your particular department comes up. We are going to start with the Executive Committee as it is listed on the agenda.

Executive Committee

Senator Stanish - If you look on the Executive Committee report which is [SD 12/13-17] Page 8 in your packet I am actually going to start towards the end where we have a motion about the Parliamentarian. Our regular Parliamentarian Chuck Weed let us all know that he wouldn't be here tonight so we asked Patrick Dolenc and he kindly agreed to serve as parliamentarian for this one Senate meeting.

Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate approve Patrick Dolenc as parliamentarian for the 425th Senate meeting on Wednesday, December 12, 2012
Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish - That was our only motion we are bringing forward. We will save any other motions the SEC is looking for until next semester. You can read through what's here but just to give you a couple of updates, We did update the policy on the Senate absences to Senator Welsh's suggested timeline of a 7 day turnaround for a Senator who had been absent to respond to the Senate Chair. We will bring that proposal for a motion probably in February or whenever we get time in a meeting. That won't go into effect until next year anyway. We have been working on the administrative process for program review and there are various pieces of that that are in progress. We will bring that forward as well next semester. Also, as many of you saw in the email I sent out today there are quite a few Senators with excused absences this evening and we had to cancel last week's meeting. There are various conflicts that seem to come up with the December meeting times and even though this year we did what we have always done in terms of scheduling the meetings during the last week of classes and then during finals, it doesn't seem to be working all that well for a couple of different reasons. So I apologize there was nothing we could do this year but we will be looking into that next year. We will be soliciting input from all of you about what would work well in December in terms of being able to get the important business that we need to get done this time of year and at a time when most Senators can be here is most helpful. That is the brief summary, is there any questions or discussion for the Executive Committee?

Senator Darby - Could you refresh our memory, what is the Kdig Archive?
Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Kdig is a permanent archive that the library supports so what we are trying to do is create a permanent archive for the AOC documents. We have given them everything from Biology as a test and what they have gone through and done is try to catalog and make it searchable in a way that would be most useful for the future. It's completed and right now what we have asked is for Biology to imagine that they have to do their self study that they are embarking on, whatever the AOC process is for the
future, and to go into those documents and make sure that we are cataloging and archiving works in order for them to get the information they need to do their next self study. The phase beyond that is then to try and get all the support documents. So we have the self study, we have the external reviewers report and we have the AOC's report but what we don't have is all their supporting documents. So the next phase will be to try and upload all those supporting documents so that everything is there. It becomes a complete record for program review in the future. So that they are accessible there will be a live link on the Senate website that anyone could go to and search those documents.

Provost Treadwell - Also, just to raise to the Senate's attention that part of the process we are looking at for archive is to lean forward toward our future NEASC Accreditation visits in a way that provides a comprehensive, well-organized summary of curriculum and program review. So we are being very mindful of that while we work with the Library and other resources on campus to be sure that we have done this once and done it well as we try to transition the program proposal process of program overview.

• Academic Overview Committee

Senator Sapeta - I can provide the Geology report to discuss but I don't have the report from Richard. The subcommittee for the review of the Geology department worked last year on the review program. We have a report that I am going to read most of it here today and we also have a response from the department.

According to the Geology Department's self-study, "Geology is the study of the Earth and its environs. It is primarily concerned with deciphering the processes, which have operated on and within the Earth in the past, shaping and forming the Earth as we know it today. Geologists study the Earth’s past history, as well as present-day processes acting on the Earth, in order to better understand what the future might hold for us. The Earth really is a dynamic, happening place, with continual and complex interaction among the Earth’s many systems, including those of the geosphere, hydrosphere, and atmosphere, as well as the biosphere and the external solar system. The relationships of these Earth processes to humankind are at the core of many contemporary issues. A full understanding of the Earth system and its processes requires an interdisciplinary approach based on detailed field observations and including the collection, interpretation, and application of quantitative geochemical and geophysical data."

The Geology Program has three main tracks: the Geology Major (BS - 64 credits), the Earth and Space Science Major (BA - 60 credits), and the Geology Minor (20 credits). In addition, the program makes a major contribution to the Integrative Studies Program, offering 4 courses that fulfill ISP requirements. Geology majors and minors receive a well-rounded interdisciplinary science education built on the foundation of a traditional geology curriculum (Physical & Evolution of the Earth, Mineralogy, Igneous & Metamorphic Petrology, Structural Geology, Stratigraphy, and Paleontology). The focus for the Earth and Space Science Major is to teach students about the methods of scientific inquiry and about the Earth, its materials, processes and systems, and thus about appropriate stewardship of the Earth and its resources. Currently, there are 11 majors (9- Geology and 2- Earth and Space Science) and 2 minors, but the department’s courses impact more than 400 students each year.

The Geology Department strives to prepare students to think critically and creatively, to engage in active citizenship, and to pursue meaningful work through level-appropriate, student-centered, inquiry-based, active participatory learning experiences that engage them in the scientific process. Since their last program review, the college has undergone a transition to a 4-credit class structure, which has allowed the program to address two major issues: 1. the nature and articulation of our introductory courses for both majors and non-majors, and 2. credit discrepancies among our upper-level courses. They want their students (both majors and students participating in the Integrative Studies Program) to understand the workings of the natural world and the process of science, to be able to read, observe and think critically, reason quantitatively, undertake research, and communicate effectively.

Faculty Qualifications and Staffing

At the time of the self-study (Fall 2011), there were two full-time, tenured faculty in the Geology department, 1 Associate Professor and 1 Full Professor, with diverse specialization areas and both with PhDs. Four adjunct faculty also teach courses offered in the Geology program and also cover a diverse range of specializations around foundational Geology concepts like Earth Science, Structural Geology, and Meteorology. Two of these adjunct faculty hold PhDs, one a Master’s or Master’s equivalent, and one a Bachelor’s or equivalent. Teaching assignments are determined by historical precedent, areas of faculty expertise, and mutual agreement of the faculty.

Dr. Nielsen has served as Department Chair for most of the past ten years, except for the times he was on sabbatical. From 2005 through 2011, Dr. Nielsen also served as Faculty Co-chair of the Integrative Studies Program with reassigned time ranging from four courses per year (2005-2008) to three courses per year (2000-2011). When Geology and Physics were merged into a single department, Dr. Wolf and Dr. Nielsen each received six credits reassigned time per year. The tenured faculty in Geology generally teach one section of either INGEOL-151 or GEOL-252 and one upper-level geology course each semester (total credits 21 1/3) and one additional four-credit course per year, for a total load of 25 1/3 credits, and thirty contact hours per year. Adjunct faculty were assigned twelve to thirteen credits per semester for both Fall and Spring terms in order to meet the demand for INGEOL courses at both the lower and upper-levels along with upper-level courses in the Geology major, or sections of IQL-101 and INMET-225. The major budget reduction experienced by the University System of New Hampshire for the 2011-13 biennium will have a major impact on the program’s ability to continue to deliver the courses they are committed to, according to the program’s self-study.

Program Strengths

A number of strengths of the Geology Program were noted in both the Geology Department’s self-study and the external reviewers’ report. In terms of teaching, both the self-study and the external reviewers agree on the value of the tenured and adjunct faculty members, and their very positive impact on the Geology Program and student outcomes. Specifically, the external reviewers emphasized the good academic credentials of the faculty and the positive comments provided by students regarding the quality of teaching by faculty in the department. At least part of this assessment can be attributed to high student morale, as noted in the external reviewers’ report, and the statement in the self-study concerning the ability of the program to “give students a good grounding in field
work and methodology’. A solid grounding in scientific method and field work is clearly linked to student success; as such, the fact that the external reviewers believe the teaching spaces to be well-appointed and the list of equipment adequate for a Geology program is a notable strength of the department. [Note: there is concern expressed over maintenance and renewal of existing equipment – see Program Challenges below]. Moreover, the external reviewers’ report and the self-study emphasize the inclusion of many field trips in Geology courses and point to the annual GEODES trips as excellent learning opportunities that other geology programs should envy. The self-study mentions that the GEODES trips (and other field trips) contribute "… to the goal of studying the real world to gain insights through careful observation and analysis of phenomena in the field". Given the success of trips like these, the Geology Department is planning to offer a required field methods course (Research Methods in Geology), a version of which was piloted in 2010FA and proved very successful in meeting many of their student learning outcomes. Lastly, the self-study acknowledges fluctuations in the number of Geology majors; however, it is noted that this is a reflection, to some extent, of "national trends in geoscience enrollments" as well as enrollment trends "across the natural sciences at KSC". Nevertheless, the external reviewers point out that enrollments in Geology courses has risen 50% since the last external review and that the department is a major contributor to the ISP curriculum at Keene State College.

Program Challenges
There is some agreement between the internal self-study produced by the Geology Department and the evaluation of the Geology Program by the external reviewers with regard to the challenges currently faced by Geology. However, there are also some notable differences in terms of challenges identified by both reports. Overall, the external reviewers’ report is much more vocal about the perceived challenges facing the Geology Program at KSC. Collectively, the main challenges to the Geology Program are:

- Low enrollment in the major;
- Only two tenure track faculty approaching retirement with substantial reassign time for other campus obligations;
- Heavy reliance on adjuncts for the delivery of the curriculum;
- Lack of updated equipment and little opportunity for undergraduate research for students.

Staffing
Both the self-study and the external reviewers’ report emphasize concerns with staffing issues in the Geology Program, with the external reviewers specifically addressing the lack of adequate staffing for a Major-granting program. Although the external reviewers recommend hiring full-time tenure-track faculty, existing Geology faculty make mention of a full-time clinical staff position. There are multiple components to this. The first involves the reliance on only two full-time tenured tenure-track faculty members. This is partly due to the loss of one full-time tenured faculty member (Tim Allen) to the newly-created Environmental Studies Program. The second involves a lack of staffing the Geology Program with incoming, younger faculty. The external reviewers note that both of the existing tenured faculty members have been at Keene State College for more than 20 years. Aside from the hiring of Tim Allen, there has been no other tenure-track faculty line provided to Geology in over 20 years. Both the self-study and external review discuss the need for additional full-time faculty for the Geology Department. Time is of the essence given the current full time faculty members’ time to retirement, and if new tenure-track faculty are not secured there is a threat of loss of programmatic cohesiveness and consistency, as well as institutional memory.

Although existing geology faculty expect to continue their reliance on adjunct faculty and want to “work with the College on building and retaining a pool of willing and qualified instructors”, the external reviewers believe this approach to be inadequate. The reviewers state that “[e]very discipline needs a regular infusion of new ideas and new fields that comes with new faculty members.” Related to the lack of investment in new personnel for the Geology Program is the external reviewers’ concern with the heavy reliance on adjunct faculty to deliver the curriculum. In their report, the external reviewers are very critical of this fact and note that some of the recent budget issues have affected morale within the department, which has been challenging at best.

Enrollments
Both the self-study report and the external reviewers’ report note that student enrollments in introductory classes are strong, which is in part due to the substantial contributions that Geology has made to the Integrative Studies Program. The external reviewers interpret this as an indication of the importance of geology to KSC students and as an important introduction to a discipline that typically does not get taught in high school. But, the number of students majoring in Geology is considered “modest” by the external reviewers. They believe that the there could be more majors in this program at Keene State, if comparisons are made with geology programs at similar institutions. According to the self-study, at least one factor contributing to the reduction of students in upper level Geology courses is the creation of the ENST program, which has drawn some students away from courses within the discipline of geology (i.e., fewer are taking GEOL prefix courses).

Research Opportunities
In short, the external reviewers feel that there is not much research being undertaken by undergraduates, specifically Majors, in the Geology Program. They provide what they see as the main reasons for this, which directly relate to other challenges previously discussed. Primary among them is that lack of adequate numbers of full-time tenured tenure-track faculty to supervise and collaborate with Geology Majors. The expectation that underpaid and overworked adjunct faculty members should be expected to supervise student research is untenable. Second, the research equipment currently available to Geology students is not given adequate staff support. Both the self-study and the external review highlight the need for support staff to facilitate the operation and the maintenance of existing equipment and mineralogical collections. The external reviewers specifically comment on the fact that expensive equipment (e.g., an x-ray fluorescence spectrometer and a mass spectrometer) purchased with grant money “are going unused” due to lack of staff support. They further note that basic equipment, such as balances and petrographic microscopes, does not appear to get adequate maintenance. Moreover, the self-study report notes that this basic equipment has not been serviced in 20 years. Although the
The external reviewers mention the possibilities provided by interdisciplinary cooperation. Although the Geology self-study does not address this point directly, some statements made concerning enrollments lost due to the creation of the ENST Program and the loss of a faculty member to ENST are indirectly related. The external reviewers note certain commonalities between programs such as Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Geography, Environmental Studies, and Geology, but believe that “opportunities for cooperation in offerings and in sharing the use of equipment are not being fully explored”. They specifically mention a “schism” between the Geology Program and the Environmental Studies program, and suggest that courses offered in both departments could benefit students in each of the programs.

Recommendations

Although we recognize the recommendations for numerous possible changes to the current Geology Program by the external reviewers and the self-study, we have summarized what we feel to be the more pressing issues below:

1. **The department and the administration of Keene State College need to work together to craft a vision for the future of the department.** This discussion and its result should include clarification of the role of Geology in supporting majors versus the Integrative Studies Program or other interdisciplinary programs (such as Environmental Studies and General Science) on campus. In addition, structures regarding faculty hiring and support need to be adjusted to reflect this vision.

2. **The department should explore strategies for publicizing themselves and their students’ work, whether that be through an updated website presence or actions such as posting photos of students during field experiences in prominent locations.** In addition, the department should promote the ways in which Geology applies in the field through the creation of more ways for students to see the job application possibilities, whether through internships or networking with successful alumni.

3. **Both reports agree that the program needs more full-time teachers, lab technicians, and mentors/research supervisors for students. The specific manner in which this should be addressed is clearly debatable, but minimally, the Geology program needs one full-time, tenure-track line to help address the concerns raised by the reviewers and the self-study, with the possible addition of a clinical staff position.** The tenure-track position is seen as critical to the longevity and vibrancy of the program by the external reviewers based on the fact that it takes 6 years for tenure to be granted and the existing faculty in Geology may or may not still be teaching at KSC in 6 years. This would also help to alleviate dependence on adjunct faculty.

4. **The administration should make a commitment to maintain laboratory equipment in Geology so that students and faculty have better research opportunities.** Toward this end, they should develop a schedule of regular maintenance (including funding) for geology’s equipment, such as balances and petrographic microscopes. This has occurred in other departments in the sciences and needs to be implemented in Geology as well.

5. **The department should take seriously the external reviewers’ advice about providing opportunities for both faculty and undergraduate students to engage in research.** This may require a reexamination of the curriculum of the major and/or require that other changes be made to make room for such research to occur.

Senator Sepata - The information in this sub-committee report was derived from the Geology self-study report and the external reviewers’ report of the Geology Program at Keene State College. Any errors or omissions are the responsibility of the AOC Geology sub-committee chair and the chair of the AOC.

**Motion:** The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Geology Program be accepted and approved by the Senate.

**Vote:** Motion carries

- **Curriculum Committee**
Senator Darby - Since the last Senate Meeting we have had 3 meetings.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Economics major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Mathematics Statistics minor be approved by the Senate.

Chair Stanish turned gavel over to Vice Chair Jean of the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Mathematics major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Gavel passed back to Chair Stanish

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Sociology major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IAMU 330 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IAMU 407 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IATAD 102 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that revision of the Theatre and Dance major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the Addition of the Multimedia Journalism minor be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Holocaust & Genocide Studies minor be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Music Performance major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Music Education major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Bachelor of Arts in Music major be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Music minor be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the ISCS 140 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the ISCS 150 course proposal be approved by the Senate
Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the INCS 160 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Discussion: Senator Welsh - I am just curious, they are both Computer Science courses that we just looked at and one is IS and one is IN. What is the difference?

Senator Hanrahan - In Computer Science it is typically software which deals with information and solving problems and also we have hardware. Hardware is more physical and physics oriented. The IN160 basically deals with the hardware piece of Computer Science and therefore more aligned with the discipline of Natural Sciences.
Motion: The SCC moves that the ISCS 350 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the replacement of IIENST 152 with ENST 250 be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the replacement of IIENST 150 with ENST 250 be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the replacement of IIENST 152 with ENST 250 be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Computer Science minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Computer Science major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Discussion: Provost Treadwell - Just one question for my colleagues in Computer Science. The one thing I noticed was the number of options or specialization tracks as you named them in the proposal. This is not a criticism per say on the floor but with regard to the department size could you help me understand better where your thinking is with regard to your specialization tracks in the curriculum that you have proposed?
Professor Elvis Foster - The number of specializations doesn't really affect our ability to offer the program because the courses remain the same. The specializations are just our attempt to package the same courses that we teach anyway so that students can make a better choice depending on their career objectives and we advise them accordingly.

Senator Hanrahan - Also, when students go to employers a lot times they will want specific things, database, web development, networking and it makes it easier for the employers to see if they are packaged in a certain way that students have met and taken these courses instead of having to go and search the course and ask if this course applicable to working with a database. It is also to help our students when they get employment to more subsequently and clearly show that they are specialized in certain areas.

Provost Treadwell - Just a follow up. I am curious if you considered the option for our students to pursue 2 specializations. I am wondering if at the time a student enters if they hadn't necessarily forecasted their career projection, because the major with its 28 credit specializations, are there anxieties with regard to students finding the lens for these options and tracks. Can they manage with a 46 credit specialization? Should they try the two together and be given a 62 credit major? You expect them to be focused at the point.

Professor Elvis Foster - Yes, two comments I would like to make. First of all the idea of specialization is natural for Computer Science so once our majors come because Computer Science is such a dynamic area there is no way that a student or even a professional can master everything. Once they have completed their first year in Computer Science already depending on their strengths or weaknesses they are thinking about areas that they want to specialize in and we advise them accordingly. I hope everyone understands that. The second point that I want to make is that we do have a general computer science area and that would address just in case we have a few students who are not sure what they want to specialize in. They could stay in the generalized area and even delay their decision until a couple days before graduation.

Senator Hanrahan - The way it is designed is that the electives of some areas they are all required to take them. Two to three courses in each specialization but the electives that they take can be specialized areas in another specialization. They actually can do two as long as they manage the elective piece. They are not all specific there are only two or three that are specific to each specialization.

**Vote:** Motion carries

**Motion:** The SCC moves that the revision of the Environmental Studies minor be approved by the Senate

**Vote:** Motion carries

**Motion:** The SCC moves that the revision of the Environmental Studies major be approved by the Senate

**Vote:** Motion carries

**Motion:** The SCC moves that the revision of the Health Science major be approved by the Senate

Senator Prosper - With this redesign, my question is, is this in conjunction or have anything to do with the nursing program?

Senator Darby - The answer is no. The only change here for the Health Science Major is that one of the ENST courses that we recently approved is a requirement within one of the specializations of Health Science. Specifically, in the Community Health Specialization require ENST120 Global Environmental Change and the Senate has just passed the replacement of ENST120 with IENST 150. The only change in the Health Science major is to compensate for the change we just made. That's all.

**Vote:** Motion carries

Senator Darby - That concludes the report but I want to say thank you to the SCC. Clearly there is a lot of traffic that passed our desk in the last few months and I want to thank them all very much. I also want to thank the Curriculum Committees of the Schools and the II Curriculum Subcommittee for their attention and collaboration. They are a very dynamic and wonderful group.

Senator Stanish - I would like to completely echo those thanks to the School and the II Committees as well as the SCC. Thank you all, you have put in a lot of work. I think the lack of discussion is not from a lack of interest. I think it's a faith in your good work and the fact that good work has already been done before we even see the proposals and that they are so well put together. All of the details are covered; the web site is very easy to navigate. Thank you all for that wonderful work. It saves us a lot work and I really do appreciate that. Thank you.

**New Business**

Senator Stanish - I did receive an email from the search committee for a new Director of the Honors Program. Peggy Walsh has done wonderful work for the past three years and her term is up. There will be a search for a new director. There was a request for a faculty member from the Senate to serve on that search committee. If you are a faculty member and think that that would interest you, let me know. I will send out an email tomorrow to all the Senate faculty members to have a call for self-nominations. If we have more than one self-nomination, we will go to having you write a statement of interest and then go to a vote. If we have just one then we will go
by acclamation. So if you are interested let me know. I think it is a very important search committee to serve on and it is important that the Senate have a role on that search committee so I appreciate that we were invited and hope someone will take up on the offer.

VII. Adjournment 5:08

Respectfully submitted by Cheryl Martin 1-10-13
I. Call to Order 4:08pm
II. Roll Call
III. Secretary's Report
Motion: To accept the minutes of the 425th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.
Vote: Motion passes

IV. Courtesy Period
President Kahn - Tomorrow at 10:00 Governor Maggie Hassan will be delivering her State of State Address. She no doubt will be addressing the funding issues and the University System requests to enter into a partnership about a tuition freeze for instate students. I have good vibes about it but we will have to wait and see what we hear from her. I will be sending a message to the campus. Each campus President has been invited to sit in the audience and I will get more word on that to you tomorrow.

V. Subcommittee Reports

- Executive Committee
  Senator Stanish - I would like to begin with the 2nd bullet where Chuck Weed our Parliamentarian did let us know he could not attend today's meeting.

  Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate approve Ockle Johnson as Parliamentarian for the February 13th, 2013 meeting of the College Senate.
  Vote: Motion passes

  That is the only motion that the SEC has for this meeting but a couple of updates. We do have a new Student Body President, Kelly Welsh but she has class at this time so we are working to find another Senator within the Student Government bylaws to sit and serve on the Senate and SEC. Kelly has been keeping engaged electronically with the Senate as we go.

  We were asked to just clarify the current Nursing curriculum which was approved by last year's Senate for the Nursing curriculum and what we eventually agreed on was the online catalog is what the Senate approved at the 419th meeting of the Senate last April. There had been a slightly different document in the actual packet of the 418th as part of the ASC report and that caused some of the confusion at least within the Senate but we did agree that what was on the Blackboard site is what we actually voted on and did approved and that is what is reflected in the current catalog. This did create a sort of philosophical discussion for us about using Blackboard as sort of our archive which it was never meant to be a as well as we really do trust each other for document integrity and I think that trust is well founded but it is a valid question to talk about that in any case. So, going forward the SEC will look at a more permanent archive for the curriculum so that we really have that in a better place.

  We were also asked to confirm Senator Darby's view of the votes in the SCC with respect to abstentions and we did agree with what Senator Darby had seen that in the two course proposals that will come up in the SCC report, there were not a majority of memberships voting in favor of the proposals. They did not pass and we did confirm on that going back to Robert's Rules of Order.

  That brought up another issue for us in that our bylaws talk about abstentions. I read them several times thinking these words don't make sense to me. Really what it is doing is referring back to Robert's Rules of Order and you need to read both pieces of that for it to make sense. We are going to work on clarifying the bylaws so you really just read the bylaws to understand what they are referring to there. The last 3 or 4 bullets here are again a few more updates about things that are going on but I will let you read those. Are there any questions or discussion about the SEC report?

- Academic Overview Committee

  Senator Blatchly - I can give a brief update. We do not have a report because we are still in the process of preparing our subcommittee reports. We expect to have a least one by the next meeting and we’ve got two more and probably in the meeting following that. We have all of the documents in and it’s just a matter of pulling the reports together and getting them through the required review period by all people who get to look at these before we send them on to the Senate. We are in progress and we thank you for your patience.

- Academic Standards Committee

  Senator Lucey - We have not met since last semester. I do have a protocol question however. We had some discussion with Tom Richard who has some issues that we think should come before ASC and so should I present them you and the SEC.
Senator Stanish - Yes, and we will probably turn around and send it back to you.

Senator Lucey - So forward those to you?

Senator Stanish - Yes that would be wonderful. Thank you

• Curriculum Committee

Senator Darby - Since our last Senate meeting, we met on January 30th to review proposals from Biology, Chemistry, ISP Interdisciplinary Studies (II), Nursing, Physical Education, Sociology. We were joined by Prof. Michael Antonucci (AMST & Interdisciplinary Studies), Prof. Debra White-Stanley (FILM & Interdisciplinary Studies) for their own proposals and also for Interdisciplinary Studies. There are a number of approved course proposals that are presented to the Senate as information and they are given on page 15 of your packet. The proposal to redesign the ‘Nursing major’ program was approved by the SCC. The SCC reaffirms its vote of November 7, 2012, deleting BIO 241 from the Nursing major and adding HLSC 240 to the Nursing major. A proposed change in chemistry requirements for the Nursing major was not approved by the SCC.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Nursing major be approved by the Senate.
Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the INCHEM 111 course proposal be approved by the Senate.
Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the II 322 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Senator Darby - As a note the II 322 proposal is co-sponsored by the Education Department and Psychology Department, and received the approval of Dean Gordon Leversee (School of Sciences & Social Sciences) and Dean Wayne Hartz (School of Professional & Graduate Studies).

Senator Welsh - This is a course proposal I find very interesting. I am very enthusiastic about it, and I’ve been to several political science meetings where political scientists are starting to study the neurophysiology of party affiliation and ideology and things like that. So it’s a course I have almost thought about doing with my discipline and I wouldn't do it without the help of a psychologist, but my question is this. As I was reviewing the packet today, I noticed this is not an IIPSYC class nor an IIEDU class. It is a II class, and I recognize that that's practice but it is not, as I understand it, officially adopted as something that is done in the guidelines, and I think that that practice raises questions that I guess I would seek answers on. For example, how will instructors, and I know we got two very qualified people team teaching this right now, how will instructors be vetted for this course in the future if instructors retire or if they are not any longer teaching this course and it’s still on the books, who reviews the qualifications? Who will look over which office oversees the course evals and even mundane things like how will credits for this course without a department affiliation transfer to other institutions or vice versa? I wonder since we are practicing what the answers to these questions? Are there answers to these questions?

Provost Treadwell - I have some of the answers, I think, but I am going to ask you to go through those again. There were a lot there.

Senator Welsh - How do we implement something like this? Question one if the current instructors decide no longer wish to not to teach or they got other obligations or they move on, who vets the qualifications of new instructors? Who decides we need new instructors.

Provost Treadwell - Can I answer them one at a time? Is that possible?

Senator Welsh - Sure

Provost Treadwell - I would expect, as is in the curriculum guidelines, that the co-sponsors of the departments that propose these curriculum be responsible, through our normal curriculum processes, to insure that the integrity of the course proposed, and in this case it was two departments. I don't know that the prefix necessarily designates relevant information, and I think that is important for us. I think are disciplinary prefixes and there is also our Integrative Studies Interdisciplinary processes. Those are important but they don't tend to distinguish the qualifications or the ownership of a course. I think it is important that we respect the departmental sponsors that they brought these forward and expect that they would insert due diligence. With regard to evaluation review, those would go through Dean's back through Department Chairs again for those Departments sponsor or hosting those types of courses.

Senator Welsh - Ok so the official sponsorship of this course at its point of proposal and approval therefore determines the official process?
Provost Treadwell - By our current processes, yes.

Senator Welsh - The future process?

Provost Treadwell - Exactly, and I think that as we look at our departmental and course proposal guidelines the Interdisciplinary committee is appropriate to evaluate those proposals that come from individual departments or come through collaborations between departments to evaluate the integrity. Those are the experts on campus to help us evaluate interdisciplinary and so the guidelines are quite clear. They are born from departments and through the departmental stage up through the Interdisciplinary committee stage.

Senator Welsh - I look to raise the question. I think that if there is confirmation in the minutes of the Senate meeting that proves this course then that confirmation stands as confirmation of practice that it will move forward on this course in the future and that I think is satisfactory. However, in general in the future I think it is a good idea to adopt some sort of official means by which these questions are answered. When those of us who understand the arrangement are gone in the future and others need to do these things and may not be privy to the history of the development of a course.

Provost Treadwell - We can certainly, if appropriate, attend to the course proposal guidelines and make any sort of notations necessary to assure that those sort of issues are clearly stated in the guidelines. I think many of these are. We can certainly work with the Interdisciplinary committee and insure that we've done due diligence with regard to notation in the curriculum guidelines if that will be helpful. I would be happy to work with the Interdisciplinary committee and the SEC to do so. Did I answer all of your questions?

Senator Welsh - The last was about transfer of credits. Does the lack of departmental suffix make it more difficult to transfer this away or for people looking to take this course here at Keene State say over the summer and transfer that back to their original institution?

Provost Treadwell - We did some research on this early on when we were looking at interdisciplinary courses or prefix changes with regard to the Integrative Studies program and the transfer ability of courses. Most course transfers are affiliated with syllabi that discuss course learning outcomes and objectives. So the title of the course and the prefix of the course in some instances make that a very easy decision. But in all decisions, either the transfer receiving institutions or when we receive credits from other institutions, we look to the syllabi. We seek to get that information so we can appropriately affiliate those credits, but I am happy to take a message and go back to the Registrar's office to confirm that that has not changed. That way we indeed do not have any unintended consequences associated with the disciplinary prefix has not been a gate to transfer credit issuance from any of the evidence that we have seen early on or what I have seen over the last three years. I will review that.

Professor Hottinger - I have served as Chair of the Interdisciplinary subcommittee you are referring to, and I can say that in the last 5 or 6 years that I served on the Interdisciplinary subcommittee, both as a member and as a Chair, I think once I was asked by the Registrar's office for a syllabus for one our II courses that didn't have a specific departmental prefix attached to it. I contacted the Professor, we got the syllabus and sent it forward and the course was accepted as a transfer. It did only happen once. So I think it is something that is fairly common to have these kinds of unusual or very institutionally specific prefixes at institutions and other institutions understand that and work to figure it out.

Provost Treadwell - To add to that, our articulation agreements we are working on with the 2+2 and with RSending agreements, all identify that there are institution specific prefixes, so it can be easily translated and so it doesn't become a barrier. I will confirm with very recent evidence and bring it back to the Senate.

Senator Darby - Senator Welsh brought something up I hadn't thought about. In effect does the college have a mechanism so that in our current practice if there is an II course delivery without a prefix to make sure the discipline or the program who’s, in effect, delivering or the faculty member delivering that program, to make sure that, and I do not know what the proper term is, to make sure that work load credit goes back to that discipline? Keene State College has a fact book and that fact book is a public record and within that record there is a notation around the workload of individual programs, and last year this body accepted retrenchment language that speaks of what happens when there are disciplines or programs that in effect aren’t delivering products for the institution or were restricted in the number of majors. So in effect I just want to make sure that thinking ahead whether it is Women & Gender Studies or Holocaust & Genocide Studies or the Music Program or whatever it is that ends up, shall we say, delivering II courses without prefix to make sure the college has a mechanism so that workload credit really does fall somewhere appropriate.

Provost Treadwell - If I might just respond to that. We have spent, for the past several years with our new Director of Institutional Research, significant time looking at various workload reporting methodologies that would insure both disciplinary and super disciplinary, if you will, ISP delivery where there is not a clear home. How do we insure that the workload for that faculty member is credited not only to them individually but to their own department so that we have clarity in those reports? I have much greater confidence that we are in a better place than we were even three years ago when we were relied upon the Delaware reporting process where it was very difficult to capture co-taught courses equivalently to individuals in two different departments and some other issues. I believe we have attended to that and what I will try to do for the next senate meeting is to bring forward the way that workload is
Senator Darby - I do very much appreciate that because there are resource allocations and very important decisions that are made that have a dramatic impact on a discipline and the delivery of credit hours as a number, as a numeral, and sometimes plays a very important role in that. So thank you. I appreciate that answer.

**Vote: Motion Carries**

Senator Darby - The proposal to add IIFILM 326 was not approved by the SCC. There was a typo and want to confirm that it should be IIFILM 362 - I do apologize. IIFILM362 Interdisciplinary Approaches to Film and as a note the SCC wishes to express the concerns about IIFILM 362 given in your document pages 15-16. The proposal to add IIAMST 391 was not approved by the SCC. IIAMST 391 is Interdisciplinary Topics in American Studies and the SCC expresses their concern on page 16 of your document.

Senator Fleeger - I think having recently been asked to join the Interdisciplinary Studies committee, I am aware that there are some different views on campus about the Interdisciplinary program and what constitutes Interdisciplinary work, and so I would like to make a motion for us to discuss this a little bit more at this body because I think it would be appropriate for us to get some guidance both through the Senate and the Curriculum Committee as well as to the Interdisciplinary Committee about what this body expects in moving forward so that we can make sure that we are meeting the guidelines that the Senate wants us to meet in our respective duties.

Senator Stanish - In our bylaws it does allow any Senator to make a motion to discuss a document or a course proposal. We could do these separately where you make a motion to discuss the IIFILM 362 and then another motion to discuss the IIAMST 391.

**Motion: Senator Fleeger moves that the Senate discuss the IIFILM 362 proposal be approved by the Senate**

Senator Stanish - Just to confirm it does say in our bylaws that any Senator can bring a proposal forward for discussion. We would also need another motion if we choose that we wanted to vote on this. The full Senate can vote on any proposals as well but it would take another motion as well.

Senator Fleeger - I would like to hear more from the Curriculum Chair about the reasons for not approving these courses.

Senator Darby - They are given on pages 15 and 16 of the document but perhaps I can go through them for you one a time. I am now speaking of IIFILM 362. Committee members agree that Professor Debra White-Stanley, the proposal’s sponsor, is qualified to teach this interdisciplinary course, but are unsure about the interdisciplinary qualifications of other faculty members listed on the proposal. The next item said that the course description indicates that this proposal offers a ‘topics course’ format, into which a number of courses could be offered. The SCC recognizes the need for more upper-level ISP and II courses, and prefers to have separate course numbers for each topic that would be vetted through the existing curriculum process. The third item of concern is that it is unclear to SCC which official(s) in Academic Affairs is responsible for assessing the quality of individual course offerings within an II topics course, the qualifications of potential faculty, and the budgetary feasibility of offering sections of the course. At the present time, a dean’s review and comment are not required by the II curriculum review process. The fourth item of concern was that the proposed course was developed and sponsored by a single academic department (Film Studies), whereas the original ISP proposal (approved by the KSC Senate in April 2006) states: III. Making Connections (4 credits) One course in Interdisciplinary Studies (4 credits). This category provides the faculty with an opportunity to collaborate across traditional disciplinary boundaries in designing and delivering challenging and innovative courses. The College supports having a percentage of these courses team developed and team taught the first time the course is offered. After initial offering, faculty will individually teach the course a minimum of three semesters over a period of three years.

Senator Lucey - I do want to make a brief comment on that. It doesn't mandate that the initial course offering must be taught by multiple faculty. Was there a question or confusion that there were multiple faculty members mentioned in the proposal? It does say that it may be offered after the initial offering by one faculty member. So I don't understand why that was a concern.

Senator Welsh - I can speak partially to that. Certainly I remember when we adopted the ISP proposal. The main point of discussion in the Senate around the proposal was that it was a work in progress and that it was certain to be amended in the future and actually the only thing we did to the ISP proposal as a Senate body was add an attachment that specified how we will amend the ISP. We knew that changes would be made. I am not certain how often that process that we specified and attached as an amendment has been followed, but it was the concern, and I think the general sense from reading the II section of the original proposal, which to my understanding has not been changed, is that this is a description of collaborative design, collaborative teaching, collaboration of faculty across disciplines and to the extent that is the description of what these class are in our guidelines. That's what these classes are. I fully understand that there is a more expansive way of looking at these things, but we had not designed that into our language so when bodies like the Curriculum Committee are looking to evaluate the appropriateness of a particular proposal to what we have specified, collaboration between faculty in different disciplines is sort of a theme that comes out and it is not present. It is something
that raises attention if people are paying attention to the proposal. Perhaps the thing that needs to be done since I know that now there
understands that disciplines are and that there are interdisciplinary disciplines on campus. Perhaps the thing that needs to be done is to
revise the proposal itself and come up with a list of alternative types of interdisciplinary classes and probably a list of the qualified
interdisciplinary programs that meet the requirements. I am certain that not every program would. In addition when we do that perhaps
to set up safeguards, mechanisms you know the kinds of things we were discussing. How do we vet instructors? How do we look at
evaluations? Concerns of that sort but to my knowledge those things have not been done. Now we have a faculty collaborating across
disciplines descriptions for what II is.

Senator Blatchly - I would like to ask the SCC if they are in possession of a syllabus for this course. My understanding is that new
courses and course additions are required to be accompanied by a syllabus. Do you have one?

Senator Stanish - I believe it is on Blackboard.

Senator Darby - There are sample syllabi, plural.

Senator Blatchly - There is one for American Studies but I don't see the one for IIFILM. Are you in receipt of a syllabus?

Senator Darby - The answer is yes.

Senator Blatchly - So that certainly eliminates confusion on my part. Was your decision in part based on the syllabus not being
sufficiently detailed or was it a more general concern?

Senator Darby - I don't think the syllabi per say were the items of concern. There was concern philosophically around the topics
course format and that seemed to increase the discomfort level among some in the committee. I apologize I didn't upload the syllabi.
Perhaps I could ask the cosponsor to make sure it’s all right with those others whose work is represented to make sure it is correct so
that it can be available for public view.

Senator Lucey - Just a comment. There is a little bit of history here as I recall being on the Senate for three years, taking a year off and
then coming back, and that is the SCC, of course different players, different time, and different course proposals, but the SCC tends to
react in this way to topics courses. There is something about this issue of the topics course that keeps coming up. A lot of them have
been II courses that I recall, and it just never seems to get resolved. Again different people, different times what is it about the topics
course format that we don't like and somehow that has to be articulated or discussed because it is recurring.

Senator Hanrahan - I think what we are seeing is kind of a permanent 399. Why don't we just make 399 permanent if we are just going
to allow people to put whatever they want in every semester in practice because a 399 is never a course. Typically you are only
supposed to have a 399 once and make it permanent but people keep offering 399 because they don't want to go through the process of
curriculum review. But when you have a topics course is almost like making a permanent 399 and that's what we were concerned
about.

Senator Bedell - I just wanted to reiterate the sentiment of some of the concerns in our meetings that we had seen the syllabus from
professor Stanley-White for this particular film class that she had talked about. We felt that she was qualified to be teaching this
Interdisciplinary course because of her interdisciplinary background, but by creating a topics course as opposed to the actual course
proposal for her specific II, we didn't necessarily know that other people had the interdisciplinary background to be teaching other
courses. They can come and just slide this into this II course if it's a topics course as opposed to having to go through the process of
being vetted and demonstrate their ability through their syllabus and credentials to be teaching something that is interdisciplinary.

Professor Antonucci - Just two things. Firstly, to speak to Senator Bedell, I am stunned that you would be in a position in the SCC to
question the Film Department's Chair, it's faculty, the Dean of Arts & Humanities and the Provost herself, the Vice President of
Academic Affairs who would oversee the quality because those course evals that you fill out run that gauntlet at least once maybe
twice in the course of a year. Those are very serious documents and we take those pretty seriously. On that level be assured that those
who do the hiring and do the evaluation of program curriculum interior to the department that that is a process that is serious and
sacred that is taken care of internally and for some reason, and this is my other question, is that the two votes on both of these
proposals, two votes, two votes, 2/7 of a committee have brought us all here and have us on the clock talking, preparing perhaps for a
vote to vote to push this forward. Two votes, three abstentions and in one case the IIAMST 391, the votes were...can somebody read those off?

Senator Darby - This is IIAMST 391 - 3 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention and 1 absence.

Professor Antonucci - I am not quibbling about being the co-sponsor of IIFILM 362 - Professor White-Stanley is not quibbling about
quorum or majority here. We are talking about two votes. 2 out of 7 do not make it a majority vote. 2/7 makes it perhaps enough of a
fearful cloud that would sway Senators to vote to abstain. There are fewer solid votes in this than not. I just want to bring those two points of information.

Provost Treadwell - I would like to address a couple of the issues raised about the process, specifically the Topics Courses in general on the campus and what our practices have been in the past, and I do think this may be an appropriate place for us to have a conversation, with the Senate body with the interdisciplinary courses, and then lastly to open the discussion that perhaps the more philosophical issues beginning from what was part of the original proposal for the ISP back in 2005 that we have referenced at the beginning. With regard to process clarity I would like it noted that the process does require a dean's signature. I do think it is important that I state for the record and call of our attention to the fact that at the departmental stage there is the requirement, and I will just read quickly I don't want to belabor point, but that there is a complete catalog ready course proposal or program proposal required, that the department approval or vote be recorded, notify affected departments or the programs give three weeks to receive advisory opinions, and consult the library liaison for course and then submitting copies to the Dean's office. From the Dean's office they obtain an administrative approval which would speak to the resource questions and some of those other issues, again, consistent with our processes, record any comments that are germane and then forward those proposals onto the School Curriculum Committee Chair or in this case the Interdisciplinary Integrative Studies Program Subcommittee coordinator. The process does provide for that and I think it is important for the SCC at least with regard to that question that the Dean's approval or some sort of leadership clarity it is required and I would question if we are not seeing that that's an issue we need to raise. I need to work through the Dean's because it is my expectation that these would go through that process that is a requirement. One last thing, it would go onto the coordinators, School curriculum or the Interdisciplinary subcommittees. They review these, record their vote and forward them onto the SCC. There are the checks and balances by a process that we would expect for our entire curriculum and it does apply for the Interdisciplinary courses as it would for any departmental offering. Reaching back to the comments that we had in the beginning, the second issue is in regard to topics courses. I do think this has been an issue to Senator Lucey's point that some of the conversation of what are these courses and the disciplines and what it has allowed for us. We have done this with our ITW courses. We have done this with our IQL courses, where unlike a 399 these courses must identify clear outcomes and clear objectives and so that you approve through the curricular processes the outcomes and objectives tied to the topic course itself. So the themes may change but any faculty teaching those must meet those same outcomes. That's the spirit of a topics course proposal. I can appreciate some of the discomfort that we are having tonight in regard to the topics courses. In the Interdisciplinary programs where we don't have disciplinary faculty all of who can easily move into these but I don't think it's a question of using topics courses. I think it's a question of how we would as a Senate body, with the council of the Interdisciplinary subcommittee think about ways by which we can assure the topics courses would allow that flexibility as we have elsewhere. These are not experimental where we need no curricular review and the topics framework is approved and the process. The themes will rotate, and therefore the faculty and I think that is where the question is surfacing. So I appreciate that and I do think we need more deliberation on that issue is something worthwhile. I will welcome the committee to speak to this as well if that is acceptable. The last thing I just want to state is that this is a long time ago but when we approved the Integrative Studies Program there were many many conversations within the committee and at the Senate floor about the fact that we wanted to try to enable and support transformation of our curriculum and so the invitation for team teaching was an effort to create that space. It wasn't a mandate. It was never expected that this would be the only way that these courses could be delivered. Having sat at many of those discussions personally I think we have many recorded notes that we haven't revisited. Perhaps there are some of the guidelines about how the science and national research with regard to Interdisciplinary has advance since 2005. We have many experts on campus who could help us and we have a task force that this semester is revisiting the entirety of the ISP to try and look at clarity and structure. I know the interdisciplinary element of it which Senator Welsh has served on is one of those key elements where we are seeking recommendations. This is an area of work but I just want to make it clear that from my position of having been involved in those early discussions and now as Provost having reviewed those records when I saw these comments come forward. This was never intended to be a requirement for all proposals. It was meant to be an invitation by the institution to commit resources for team teaching where that was appropriate for people that wanted to propose those courses. I think it is a distinction between a mandate and a must for every course and an incentive for creating new pedagogy on our campus. I just think that is important to note and I would open it up for committee members or anyone who wants to speak more to it.

Senator Stanish - We have reached the end of our 15 min discussion so to continue we will need a motion to extend discussion.

Motion: Senator Stanish moves to extend discussion for another 15 minutes be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Professor Hottinger - I just want to reiterate that all II courses live in departmental homes so oversight is by departmental chairs. The Departmental Chairs would insure that any instructor who teaches a topics course is qualified to do so and that their syllabi meet the requirements of the outcomes that are approved within the general curriculum process. There aren't any orphaned II courses that are just floating around out there without oversight. All II courses live in departmental homes and have continual oversight every time the course is offered.

Senator Welsh - I feel like my other point was that and this is really assuring and certainly courses living in departmental homes is a big piece of the quality control for all courses taught at the college. I think the main point in raising it is that the departmental home life of a course is significantly less clear if we do have II without a suffix. If there are informal protocols that we can follow now, I
think that is fine. However I think it is something the ISP committee can do. I think it is useful and necessary to find and implement some rules passed by the Senate about what it means for it to live in a home if there is not a suffix or prefix attached.

Senator Blatchly - Some comments encouraged me to go poking around to see I could find words for this distaste for topics course or a nervousness about topics courses or whatever the phrase would be. I found in the Curriculum guidelines, at least this version I am looking at an entry called “Topics Courses” and I thought it might be helpful to read part of this. They are useful, the section begins with a good use for a topics course which is to provide something that is not ordinarily offered in the catalog but it follows with a couple of important sentences. “However specific topics offered within these topics courses have not undergone the curriculum approval process required for courses listed in the catalog. Therefore, specific topics cannot be listed as either elective or required courses for a major or minor program.” This is still in respect to the II courses and this is still a little ambiguous because ISP is neither a major nor a minor program but it is an important coherent program with a specific set of requirements one of those which I believe is an II course if I am not mistaken. That may be some of the history whether it is applicable to this or not I think it is important to recognize the history and the nervousness about using these for required courses in the curriculum as opposed to a more purely elective offering. It is clearly appropriate for a topics course. It's not against topics courses it’s just a question of should they should be part of a required program.

Senator Lucey - However, topics courses do count toward major and minor credits in certain programs and long standing in the catalog.

Senator White-Stanley - If you think about it does that mean that if a topics course is going to be offered using 5 different subjects that one of those subjects cannot be required for a major because that subject may not be offered again for another 2 years. Is that the meaning of that phrase or is it that one cannot list the topic itself. Are we talking about a specific iteration which only X,Y&Z faculty member would be qualified to teach not being required for the major? So this rule is actually a logistical issue as opposed to a sort of blanket prohibition. Again, its topics classes because it would seem that way to me yeah, a lot of majors and actually in film we have a topics IA, topics IH classes and I am still trying to figure out what makes II's so much different than those

Senator Bedell - Just to answer that question, it says the exact wording is that these topics courses have not undergone the curriculum approval process and I think that is why that can't be required if I am not misunderstanding the specific language there.

Senator Blatchly - I believe this is from the SCC Curriculum Guidelines.

Senator Bedell - The other thing the SCC had talked about all semester, all last semester and especially towards the end when we were looking at some of the more difficult proposals that we were looking at was that we recognized in some programs there have been situations that other Senators before us have maybe let things slip by that aren't necessarily appropriate or that curriculum approved may have been questionable at times. We have kind of reached a point where we have to stand on more of a moral basis of what we decided, and well yes, this is the precedent but what is actually right for the curriculum. Do we move forward or do we look more at the way we are supposed to be doing them?

Senator Stemp - I think part of the difficulty associated with not just the assessment of the two courses or of the one course we are discussing, in addition to what Senator Blatchly just presented, is the fact there are existing guidelines that the College has written that are approved but there appears to be a very poor understanding of what those guidelines actually happen to be among the faculty themselves and others that are affiliated with the curricular process whereby clearly some things in the past have been permitted to happen that we have said in our own documents shouldn't happen. In the absence of clear documentation as it relates to how you're supposed to treat curriculum matters there is either a difference in interpretation of the particular guidelines in the form in which they are written or have been approved or there is the basic absence of recognition of the existence and of the following of the language that in fact has been approved by the Senate at this level that I suppose would be a blanketing of the process of how this is supposed to work. Intention and interpretation and a number of other ways in which we have been approaching our curriculum up until this point have at times run parallel to what is actually written down somewhere and at other times has strayed substantially away from our own documentation. Part of the difficulty in some ways for the Curriculum Committees whether it's at the school level or at the Senate level is to try to figure out what in fact are the guidelines that are being implemented or that are supposed to be implemented during the process of curricular review. In this particular instance in the absence of any other guidelines that exist, the portion of the document that was read out as point number 4 or 5 by Senator Darby that is what the SCC is aware of as the officially recognized version of how in this case these particular classes are being assessed. If there are other documents or other mechanisms by which they are being assessed part of the problem in communicating this between different constituencies on campus is that some of us know where these documents may be and some of us don't. Some of us recognize the authority of maybe one version of the document that others of us are unaware of. If there are other ways in which these particular courses are being assessed, the membership of the SCC is unaware of them or any kind of officiating adopted form. If we are being left to our devices to use what is written down as the official language by which we assess the courses, then this is essentially what we have to work with.
Provost Treadwell - I am struggling with the sense that our Curriculum guidelines are unclear. Many of us around the table have served on the SCC and I think the guidelines are quite clear with the departmental approval stage, the Dean’s approval stage and the interdisciplinary subcommittee approvals parallel with school curriculum committee and then moving it to Senate. I question the fact that our processes are quirky and unclear and I guess I would need more clarity with regard and perhaps Joe you could help eliminate that. If the processes themselves are unclear then we need to understand that further because they have been implemented for some time. The question about topics courses and this issue of not being able to be used for major or minor credit then I need to question the Registrar's office on this because that is antithetical to what has been the framework for topics courses for many many years. Topics courses have been approved by disciplines. They list the outcomes, objectives, and the criteria. The topics rotate thematically, but they are held to that same standard, and they are used in fact for major/minor credit all through our curriculum. So we need to clarify this issue. I have read it and checked the syllabi. So it's “the may be repeated as the topics change” element that is an issue here. There is room to evaluate but I don't think, and I can strongly suggest that for our President I wouldn't want to suggest, that our curriculum review processes are froth with confusion, and we don't have clarity with how to do this work. I think actually our faculty does a very, very good job. We live by these processes and we do quite well at it, and while I think it is areas where perhaps you may question the integrity of other groups that we have these discussions, and that's appropriate for us to have these conversations and to do so in a respectful way but I don't think that it's the processes are not there or not clear for us. The clarity of some of these issues like the topics courses and the respect for those committees that are empowered by this body to review these courses must be held. I think it is appropriate for our Senate to do so and I apologize Senator Gianno I didn’t know your hand was up.

Senator Gianno - To the extent to the interdisciplinary courses are straddling disciplines. I think some of us had a concern both on the SCC and off of it that at least it's not clear to what extent disciplines are represented in the process of approving II classes to the extent that these courses are not going through an evaluation process comparable to all other courses on campus. All other courses on campus have to go through the School Curriculum Committee which has a representation for each discipline in that school automatically. I don't really know and I would appreciate more information on how this works on the II subcommittee. Are all disciplines represented there as well as all interdisciplinary? I think part of the problem is what do we mean by discipline? What do we mean by Interdisciplinary? Does Interdisciplinary no longer include discipline? I am interested in hearing what other people think but it seems to me if you are interdisciplinary, the discipline should be part of the conversation and it's not clear if disciplines are part of the conversation or that all of the disciplines are part of particular conversations relevant to particular courses.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Just quickly to Senator Stemp the Curriculum guidelines are on the Keene State College Senate Website. They are clearly marked as 12-13 and all of the forms are there. Those are submitted to me and I post them along with the AOC guidelines and any other relevant documents and that is our active file of documents. So they are there and they are what are approved. After we are finished meeting I move those documents into a folder and then at the appropriate time I move them into the Senate Website so it's keene.edu/senate and they are all there.

Senator Stemp - I am not debating the existence of guidelines that we have that are publically available to faculty and staff and others. The issue is that if those are in fact the officially recognized mechanisms by which we access curriculum are we using those?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - That was the first point. That they are there and they are accurate and up to date. The second is that as we look at this statement about topics, it says here very clearly, ‘however specific topics courses offered within topics courses have not undergone the curriculum approval process which is required for courses listed in the catalog. Therefore specific topics can be part of curriculum.’ This is what I think Debra was trying to say. Topics can be listed as part of a curriculum but her specific class with its topic “…whatever” can’t be part of the curriculum packet. Topics as a category can be in the curriculum package. It's the specific label that can't be. I think that is the recognition of it hasn't been approved so specifically and it might change over time. That's how I read that.

Senator Welsh - May I just jump in with a quick clarification? I think there may be some confusion. Senator Stemp has been talking about guidelines, the Provost has been talking about guidelines and I think one of the things I have noticed since I have been sitting next to him is he is saying guidelines as he is indicating downward is a copy of the ISP proposal and the description of the various classes. He is not talking about curriculum committee guidelines or other kind of collegiate guidelines and protocols. He is talking about descriptions of classes, classes of Integrative Studies, categories, things like that, where there is indeed some ambiguity.

Professor Antonucci - I want to read something to you from the chapter called Interdisciplinary and Anxieties. Some thoughts from here that speak to what it is that we are having a conversation about. “There are few terms in 21st century Higher Education with greater buzz factor than interdisciplinary, the name for teaching and scholarship that brings together methods and materials from more than one academic discipline. Almost no one says a word against it and it’s evoked by professors and by Deans with equal enthusiasm and it goes on because the possibility is there and we have invested in this for the contemporary academy with all these possibilities hovering over it. Talks about Interdisciplinarity tend to have an anxious tone but it is hard to see how interdisciplinarity is an adequate corollary to anxiety. T The anxiety feels existential. Interdisciplinarity is a professional and institutional issue. Interdisciplinarity is attainable to the extent that professors are professionally motivated and institutionally supported to practice it”… and it goes on. So when we get to the idea of professors who are professionally motivated, we have those, we have those here. When we have an
institutions that is motivated to support that, we have that at Keene State College. In fact, where they come together to create the atmosphere to answer the kinds of questions that are raised here today about interdisciplinarity are through the II Subcommittee which holds two workshops per semester and has done that for the past seven years. You total that up and it’s over 20 pushing 25 different sessions that have been run during the semester, twice a semester to talk about just the issues that Senator Gianno raises here. It's a very good question. It’s a very basic question. You raised the question, is interdisciplinary necessarily multidisciplinary? For some folks it is but that's not how it's practiced here. That's not how we do it at Keene State College. That's not the purpose, that's not the point. Straddling sometimes but more of a fusion drawing on methods this is the stuff of interdisciplinarity as it’s practiced at Keene State College. I invite any of the II Subcommittee to compositionally we talk about that. The II subcommittee will be coming up with those dates for those 2 spring workshops coming up on Friday. We look forward of having one in March and one in April I am not sure when.

**Motion:** Senator Stanish moves to extend discussion for another 15 minutes be accepted by the Senate

**Vote:** Motion carries

Senator Gianno - I think I just want to add that it's more about fairness. If you have disciplines that are reviewing other disciplines why is it that something that is interdisciplinary is not being reviewed by other disciplines? Something that is straddling at this point is not under the same kind of oversight as all other curriculum. It seems to me simple fairness.

Professor Mallon - I want to say that I appreciate and I want to thank Professor Antonucci for his intention and I appreciate the interest on the part of the SCC members and other Senators to have the larger conversation about the nature of interdisciplinarity about the nature of collaboration and what collaboration looks like, about the nature of departmental ownership of, etcetera, etcetera, about our fields of study. I do think it's a larger conversation, and I do think one place to have it is through the committee that is the Interdisciplinary committee. Another place to have it is the hopefully the revised Integrative Studies program. There are ample opportunities. It's a big conversation. Our College engaged with it not so long ago and there are still issues to work out. That is a conversation that we should have as faculty, as staff and as students. I appreciate Senator Bedell’s comments as well. The other larger issue that we seem to be debating here is about the form of topics courses and what's in the guidelines and what's not in the guidelines and the how topics courses are used. It’s all well and good to have that larger conversation. Perhaps the Senate or perhaps the SCC is a place to have the larger conversation. I would like to point to the specific issue that is being raised here which is whether or not according to the guidelines that we have used before and according to the description and the definitions that we have used before these two course just as Professor Antonucci had said received just 2 negative votes that these two courses do not move forward. I believe that these two courses are being held hostage to a larger conversation that I know this College needs to have. Indeed the Integrative Studies program from the beginning welcomed. I would like to see that we have a conversation but I would like not have two courses that have been carefully put together by faculty in their departments and department homes that are contributions to the ISP and to the College curriculum. I would like to have those two courses not be held hostage for larger conversations. I believe they should go forward because they are courses that have followed the guidelines that have received the kind of vetting that other courses have received by departments and by individual faculty, etcetera. I would like see us trust that process as well as trust each other in moving those courses forward. Thank you

Senator Hanrahan - I will use my own discipline Computer Science. We have 490 topics in Computer Science class. My understanding was we had a game program one that was offered once, we had mobile computing, all these new topics. I thought it was three times but someone told me after one time if we wanted to make that a permanent course we had to bring it to the curriculum review process. I am just thinking and I sort of agree with Dr. Mallon, these two courses I think were designed and part of the SCC topics based course. We can have it there and have it as a category but after 1, 2 or 3 times, if the topic is being brought up over and over again, I think as any discipline it should be brought up as a permanent course. I don't know how the guidelines have to change to do that. That's my opinion.

Senator Antonucci - We did that with respect to the IIAMST 380. It was a course that ran as a 399 and then it became I think that was the topics New England Exceptionalism or something. It couldn't run. It had run its course as a topics course. As a topics subject it had enough play, people liked it, and it became a permanent number. This is just what that rule is trying to subvert, people making a career out of topics, have one topic done and create another. We have done that and our program knows that and we are trying to eliminate 399's, which are ineffective someplace else, it's called the Registrar's Office, right. Where else do you want us to go? That's my question to the SCC.

Provost Treadwell - For the good of the order what I would like request is that I have the opportunity to work with our Registrar's office and to review the Senate documents with regard to topics courses so we can separate that issue. I do believe as Professor Mallon has raised that I think these courses that are before us today have adhered to policy and practice of the campus. I think I will seek to clarify the 399’s, the topics courses and I will bring that to the Senate meeting through the SEC so that there is clarity, and I will share that with the SCC as well. As we seek some clarity for guidelines that are ambiguous in any way just so we can separate these issues.
With regard to the longevity of and the review of topics courses beyond that which is before us today is consistent with past practice with regard to topics courses in both disciplines and interdisciplinary offers. Just to try and separate the issues I can take that on.

Senator Blatchly- My understanding is that at the end of this we get to vote whether these courses pass the Senate?

Senator Stanish – Today, if a Senator wishes, can make a motion to vote on it. However with our 48 hour rule, today we vote to vote but will not actually vote on the course proposal until March.

Senator Blatchly - On the topic of topics with the risk of getting into a kind of Clintonian what is “is”. Let me just ask for the sponsor of this course what we really mean by the word topic? Is it fundamental the way we have used the word topic? Is it fundamental to the structure of the course or is it more of the motivation for getting to the learning outcomes? As I read the learning outcomes, we are still talking about the Film Studies course; there is a writing learning outcome. It seems to be fairly independent of what you’re writing about as long as it is broad enough, Cross disciplinary boundaries to reopen patterns and connections. There need to be at least two disciplines represented I suppose but apart from that it is not fundamental to this. Then there is a diversity recognizing the difference of how the shape approaches. What is actually meant by topic in this case? Is it motivation or is it something fundamental to the structure to the course?

Senator White-Stanley - The topics class means that a series of different interdisciplinary courses would be offered under that rubric. So if it's IIFILM 362 it could be offered as my course Politics and Adaptation or another course that is also interdisciplinary. This is something that is highly desirable for our program. Faculty speaking together have decided this is a real need in terms of pushing our students to connect film with other disciplines and to bring the skills that they have obtained in these cross disciplinary endeavors back into film making. As a group we have decided to pursue this. So yes the fact that the course is interdisciplinary is very integral to the vision of the entire faculty into proposing this.

Senator Lucey - It seems as though it is topic and theme. The word thematic, the way we use topics in the Art Department is based on content or methodology. It depends on what that sometimes can be. Sometimes it can be Feminist approaches Art History that’s the topic so the methodology sort of rules it. Sometimes it's the content or coverage that is sort of or region what have you. I think it is meant to be flexible and I think that theme is the word.

Senator Blatchly - I think that was my specific question for this course. Whether it is more the theme that is the motivator for the course or is it the, in case of the content that might be much more fundamental to the nature of the course and much more difficult to let it float the way this is proposing.

Senator Fleeger - My interest in this was trying to promote this conversation, and I think it is very important for us to have and get some clarity across the different bodies that are involved in this, and we can approach this in the future. But I don't think we are really going to resolve it tonight, and I also know we want to give some consideration to the second proposal as well. So I would like to make a motion to bring this up at the next Senate meeting for further consideration and vote at that time.

**Motion:** Senator Fleeger moves that we postpone discussion of IIFILM 362 and reconsider this at our next meeting for a vote be approved by the Senate.

The reason I am making this is because I think that there are other discussion that need to occur outside of this context which can be helpful and bring some clarity to the document, if necessary

Senator Hanrahan - Point of Order - would that allow us to vote on the specific proposal at the next meeting?

Senator Stanish - It depends on which way Senator Fleeger words the motion. If we are simply making a motion to postpone discussion till the next meeting, then we would not vote on this proposal at the next meeting. If we are making a motion to vote on this proposal at the next meeting, then we would. So is your proposal to postpone discussion?

Senator Fleeger - No, I would like to make a proposal to vote on this at the next meeting.

Senator Stanish - Ok, there will be discussions but also a vote.

Senator Fleeger - Yes

Senator Stanish - Would you restate the motion with the word vote in it?

**Motion:** Senator Fleeger moves that we vote on IIFILM 362 at our next Senate meeting.
Senator Welsh - Just for information only and will be useful for that discussion. One of the assertions that I have heard is that both of these proposals have complied with guidelines in process. I do have a question to clarify that. One of the points that I heard earlier is that Advisory Opinions were sought in interdisciplinary courses and there was some question about whether they were necessary, what the purpose was, etcetera, and so my question is have there been advisory opinions on these courses?

Senator Darby - The answer is no.

Provost Treadwell - I would just clarify within the guidelines that it is not required that advisory opinions be sought. It’s for affected departments so, for instance the way we've used this throughout the history of guidelines, if the affected department’s teaching load is effected’ the resources in another department are affected by the action of an individual department who is presenting the course for a program, then advisory opinions must be sought. That is how we have applied it. So it would be my interpretation and understanding of the guidelines that specific advisory opinion from all disciplines on campus, there is no direct impact on them, so I don't believe that under these guidelines that there would be a requirement for an advisory opinion from every discipline that might be named in an interdisciplinary course. That is not how I have read this as resource demand that has been the purpose of advisory opinions. Workload, resources what’s written. So that would be my clarification for regard to the guidelines about advisory opinions.

Senator Darby - Senators will notice that the issue of advisory opinions is not one of the areas of concern.

Senator Sapeta - I would like to ask for clarification. We have not been asked to vote on anything pertaining to this particular course.

Senator Stanish - Not yet, that is correct. Right now we are discussing.

Senator Sapeta - I am a little confused if we haven't been asked to vote on that report. Am I making sense?

Senator Stanish - Senator Fleeger made a motion that we will vote on whether or not we will vote and if would like to vote on the course proposal at the next meeting. We need to vote to vote today. We will not actually vote on the actual course proposal until next meeting assuming the vote to vote is affirmative.

Senator Sapeta - Nobody actually proposed to vote on this particular course. There was only a motion to discuss this topic.

Senator Stanish - Actually Senator Fleeger did just make that motion. Did I answer your question?

Senator Sapeta - No, that's ok.

Senator Lucey - Quick point, we've got nested motions here, and I don't want to lose sight that we have two course proposals here. We are technically only talking about one, and we can't talk about both because it wasn't actually part of the motion.

Senator Stanish - Right now we are discussing the motion to vote to vote for IIFILM 362 in mid-March.

Senator Sapeta - Shouldn't we propose to vote on it first and discuss it and then that discussion says we postpone to vote until next meeting?

Senator Hanrahan - We can't vote on it today.

Senator Stanish - Right and we didn't.

Senator Sapeta - Before we can propose to vote on it today and then we can say during the discussion let's postpone the vote till next meeting? I don't understand how I can vote on something that hasn’t been brought to the table yet.

Senator Hanrahan - Do we need a vote? There was a motion and seconded and then it just comes up next time. I don't think we need to vote.

Senator Stanish - Yes, we need to. On page 6 in our bylaws where we began, “if any Senator wishes to discuss a proposal, a motion and second are required to bring the proposal to the floor for discussion. “ That is where we began. Then “a majority vote is required to bring it to the floor for a vote.” We had that motion now to bring it to the floor for a vote. That was the second motion.

Senator Hanrahan - Effectively what we are doing is voting to bypass the SCC and vote on it as a Senate body.

Senator Stanish - It is within the Senate Curriculum Committee part of the bylaws.
Senator Bedell - I just had a question for Provost Treadwell. Earlier you had mentioned you could look into both the specific guidelines for what's appropriate for the idea of topics courses and also the precedent. Would you be able to present that before we vote at the next Senate meeting? Just so we have more clear information on both the precedent and what the actual guidelines state.

Provost Treadwell - I will make sure it is part of the emailed packet.

Senator Gianno - While it is true that according to the guidelines advisory opinions are not required that's true. The thing though that can be in the general process for the approval for curriculum proposals you have a certain disciplines there that are actually voting on the proposal whether they are going to be affected by that course change or curriculum change or not. The advisory opinions are only asked for among disciplines that may be affected outside of that group. In this case there are no disciplines that are automatically being involved in the curriculum decisions. I don't know if this clear or not, but this is an anomaly in terms of how the curriculum process works. It does not follow the curriculum process of the rest of the campus.

Senator Darby - We are discussing the consideration of whether to vote, should that pass, there will be a couple of technical things that would need to happen before we even able to vote if we decide to do so. Number one the record would have to be corrected around the proper number for the IIFILM course. I made a typo in the report and again the correct number is IIFILM 362. Next, I did find, after a little bit of scramble, find electronic versions of the IIFILM sample syllabi. However they are coupled on a PDF with an older iteration of the proposal. In my opinion it is in the Senators’ interest to have these syllabi on Blackboard. So a request to the IIFILM proposal sponsor to send me sample syllabi. Next, the proposals sponsors will need to secure the Dean’s signatures. I would be more than happy to walk them over to Dean Harris's office and have him review and sign, and I would be happy to pick them up.

Senator Lucey - Are you saying these didn't go through the Dean's office?

Senator Darby - I do not have a Dean signature.

Senator Lucey - We are talking about one proposal.

Senator Darby - Both of them do not have a Dean's review and signature.

Senator Lucey - And they should by the time they get to us?

Professor Antonnuci - Joe we had this conversation in September when I asked you specifically don't we need the Dean's signature? You said it varies.

Senator Darby - We did have a conversation...

Professor Antonnuci - I asked you when should it go to the Dean, and you said sometimes it goes before and sometimes it goes after.

Senator Darby - Yes, however...

Professor Antonnuci - This is precisely the lack of flow or direct process.

Senator Darby - I recollect the conversation slightly differently. However the point is the proposal sponsor is responsible to make sure the proposal has all components completed. However, as a Senate Chair it falls on mine, it was an oversight on my part.

Provost Treadwell - I would just ask that for both of these proposals we adhere to process. There should be a Dean's signature, and we should resubmit through the approval cycles in advance of that next meeting. I will attend to the issues that we committed in regard to clarify thematic and topic courses. That will help clarify the issue. So let’s make sure we adhere to process as we try to go through the next couple of steps. With all good intention and great respect to all of you but we are quite clear on this so let’s make sure we do that. Thanks

Senator Blatchly - Just for clarification, it sounds like your recommending that we vote “no” on Senator Fleegers proposal and that we ask that these proposals go back to the SCC with the proper signatures. What are you suggesting?

Provost Treadwell - My sense from the conversation was that there was some ambiguity about what is required. So these went through the processes already and my sense is that the Chair of the SCC and the Chair of the Interdisciplinary committee there was some lack of clarity perhaps on the signature cycle. So I don't know if the full review needs to occur again, just the need to be sure that the signatures are adhered. If either of those committees would tell me that there is something distinct about this then I am not suggesting that we don't move forward with the motion. I am simply stating from my understanding of what was just stated which was lack of clarity but not lack of full review in those steps but we need the Dean’s signature.
Senator Darby - I am fine with obtaining signatures. I think they can be obtained before the next meeting.

Senator Lucey - In the curriculum process is there a statement about who it goes to and in what order?

Provost Treadwell - Yes

Senator Lucey - Should it have gone to the Dean before?

Senator Darby - Yes

Senator Lucey - Just clarifying thanks.

Provost Treadwell - The action from my office would be to provide a communication back to faculty about the curriculum processes. I think it is helpful and its time based on the discussion. I will share those guidelines again.

Senator Welsh - My understanding with the conversation that has just gone around is if we vote “no” it will through the SCC, the SCC will introduce it, and we will discuss it. Is that correct?

Senator Stanish - I don't believe that is correct. I believe if we vote “no” the only way it can come back to the floor is if another Senator makes another motion and we go through what we just went through again. I believe if we vote “no” it would not go back to the SCC. Do you agree?

Senator Darby - I agree.

Senator Stanish - It's done unless another Senator makes a motion. If we vote “yes” then the whole Senate will vote on this next month. Does that make sense Senator Welsh?

Senator Welsh - Yes

Senator Stanish - Does everyone understand on what we are voting on?

Yes

**Vote: Motion Carries**

Senator Stanish - Next meeting we will vote on this course proposal which will also include discussion as any motion would. The original motion to bring forward for discussion, we were reading the bylaws again and it says that a motion and a second is required to bring forth a proposal for discussion but it doesn't actually say that a vote is required. How you can have a motion without a vote is a little odd. We could officially vote to bring forth for discussion but we already did that. So I think we are good on the votes.

Senator Lucey - I would like to make a motion that we also consider the second proposal which we have been sort of dancing around, IIAMST 391 with vote at the next meeting. So discussion and vote at the next meeting.

**Motion:** Senator Lucey moves that we vote on IIAMST 391 at our next Senate meeting be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I am sorry but Senator Lucey could you rephrase exactly what your vote on the motion is.

Senator Lucey - The understanding is that when we made a motion to discuss the SCC's votes here that we opened up a motion for discussion only IIFILM 362 and now we have voted to vote at the next meeting. I am asking that we give the same consideration in this motion to IIAMST 391.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - So your motion is to discuss whether or not to vote, separately? The motion that I wrote down that Senator Fleeger made originally was that he moves to discuss IIFILM 362 and IIAMST 391. We didn't actually discuss IIAMST 391 I think most of our discussion was IIFILM 362, I believe the original motion but I would have to listen to the tape to make sure that I got it right was for both to be discussed and then Senator Fleeger's motion right now was to bring just IIFILM 362 for a vote.

Senator Lucey - I was under the impression it was something that Senator Stanish said and that it had to be separate.

Senator Stanish - I agree with you. So your motion is to bring IIAMST 391 for a vote?

Senator Lucey - Yes
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Senator Stanish - Hang on, we need to find out if this is ok, give us a second. Our Parliamentarian has confirmed that Senator Lucey's motion to vote to vote is fine.

Senator Bedell - Did we include the requirement for the Dean's signature for this proposal like the last one. I just want to make sure we do that. I would like to ensure that the Dean's signature is completed on the IIAMST 391 proposal before we vote on it at the March meeting.

Senator Stanish - Excellent, thank you for catching that.

Senator Darby - The answer is yes to Senator Bedell's question.

**Vote:** Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion on the SCC report?

Senator Darby - We have a meeting in two weeks.

Senator Stemp - Point of clarification for March when we will vote. When evaluating or assessing both II topics courses, the criteria by which we are assessing them does that include the guidelines as they relate to topics courses?

Senator Stanish - Can you put an adjective in front of guidelines? Which guidelines?

Senator Stemp - The curriculum guidelines and the guidelines as they are provided by the ISP Curriculum Committee. So it's a combination of those two are the mechanism by which we're provided the ability to assess the proposals. Is that my understanding?

Provost Treadwell - I am just curious if it might be beneficial to invite the Interdisciplinary committee to discuss before the Senate the process by which they do review these proposals. The types of work that they do as a committee to try to support the standards within the curricular process. It might be useful to have them join us for that Senate meeting and perhaps to provide some pre-reading with their regard to the criteria for the Senate before that meeting.

Senator Stanish - I can do that.

Provost Treadwell - If that is possible it would be very helpful.

Senator Stemp - Just a clarification on that. So if the criteria by which that subcommittee evaluates II proposals differs from what is in the ISP document, is that the set of criteria by which the Senate as a whole, evaluates the proposals?

Provost Treadwell - Can you restate that?

Senator Stemp - If the criteria provided by the II subcommittee for the evaluation of the II proposals are different from what is in the ISP proposals, so the language that was included in the SCC document, which version of those…

Provost Treadwell - Ok so the quote that was shared today...

Senator Stemp - If it's not that and it's something else, are those the guidelines that the Senators are using to assess the two II proposals?

Provost Treadwell - These are not guidelines. This was the enabling document of the Integrative Studies program to invite engagement to this new type of pedagogy. This was just a statement along with all the categories of the ISP curriculum about what those types of courses were intended to provide on our campus and what the role for the faculty was to join in those various areas of curriculum. There is the ISP Committee which has guidelines that were established in the early years and has worked around what these subcommittees did for guidelines with regard to what this committee does. These are not guidelines they were just enabling language to try and get us thinking about interdisciplinary study. This is where the idea about two faculty across disciplines teaching together came from. These weren’t guidelines they were enabling welcoming language around the curriculum proposal itself. The guidelines that govern what the Interdisciplinary subcommittee does has come through the Senate and the Integrative Studies Program committee years ago and it's part of what this task force is looking at right now on behalf of the Senate. I will seek record clarity with regard to the guidelines and I think by inviting the Interdisciplinary Committee here, we can hear directly from them what are the processes by which they evaluate the integrity, and a number of courses are denied. There are many many courses that never get moved forward by that committee because they are adhering to criteria that they have been working with under the ISPC.
Senator Welsh - If I am hearing you correctly, this is Senate approved criteria. This is criteria developed per the guidelines and after the ISP program came together. We do have guidelines about what II courses are that are Senate approved that these bodies like the SCC can use to evaluate the pros and cons of particular II courses.

Provost Treadwell - I think the question of whether all the guidelines are proper for the Senate is part of why we have the task force right now looking at this. What the Senate approved was the creation of a task force, the ISPC that would implement the approved curriculum that the Senate did approve. There were guidelines of review. We adhere to the Senate criteria but I think this question of what are the nitty gritty details of what these subcommittees do typically hadn't been brought before the Senate and I think that is part of why the task force has been requested by this body to be quite candid. There are guidelines. They had been approved through the authority granted, the delegated authority of the Senate to the Integrative Studies Program committee, to live the spirit of the curriculum approved by the Senate, but there was not stipulation of all the requirements for those subcommittees. There were general guidelines and the Integrative Studies Program committee did establish expectations for what those committees do. That is what needs to be shared with the Senate.

Senator Stemp - I think that speaks to part of the issue of what we been having because if I am a member of the SCC and there are exiting guidelines whether they are officially approved by the Senate or whether they are coming through a different series of bodies. In the absence of my knowledge of what those guidelines happen to be it is extremely difficult for me to actually access the proposals that come to the SCC and if I mistakenly assume that these are what we are acting as the guidelines, then the application of what is essentially in spirit generally a proposal which was not adopted as official language. I think that is in some ways at the heart of why there is difficulty for the SCC to try to figure out how they are assessing.

Provost Treadwell - I think the distinction here is that we don't have clear explicit guidelines of what a Senate Curriculum committee body does. There aren't explicit step by step instructions on what the SCC does to review a course. We rely upon our School Curriculum Committees, we rely upon our departments and the Deans, and we evaluate the cohesiveness of the curriculum in ways that have become practice. I think as a campus this is new, and I think Professor Mallon's point is new and therefore appropriate for us to have these broad discussions. I think the concept that the rule and recommendation of a curriculum committee that has been regarded and recommended and acknowledged by the Senate for the SCC to question their inner workings is different for us. We wouldn't question a school curriculum committee that made a unanimous approval to the SCC unless there were clear issues that had to be addressed because the SCC looked at the requirements in the curriculum, meaning name, description titles, cohesiveness and that is where the dialog happens, but we don't often question to this level. That is part of why this discussion is so important for us to gain a sense of comfort and clarity around this. That is why I think this is appropriate, but the idea of a Senate approved explicit process that a committee of the ISP reviews has not been a part of our practice historically, and I think we should continue in spirit. We delegated that responsibility to the ISPC and that is why we continue with the task force. But I think to hold hostage these two courses because of that I think it is something we need to continue to discuss and why I think the nature of that committee is so important for the next meeting to talk about what is it that do and understand their authorities as granted by the ISPC.

Senator Stanish - I will say that Provost Treadwell has offered to pull together some of these pieces of information and present that as part of the SEC report at the next meeting. It doesn't totally answer your question but I think it will.

Senator Stemp - I think it will get us to the next meeting.

Senator Stanish - I believe that closes the SCC report.

VI. New Business

Senator Martin - The issue of guidelines is not unique to the committees we have been talking about tonight and I recall from serving on the ASC we were often uncertain of our mandate and uncertain of the criteria that we ought to be applying at the end of our deliberations. So we deliberate, I think, on many of the Senate committees in the absence of guidelines, and perhaps we can generalize the problem that we face tonight and engage in a comprehensive view of the guidelines that do and don't exist for Senate committees and possibly school committees as well. I also served on the school committee for Sciences and I think that those committees are operating in good spirit but the spirit isn't always accurate. I would like to make a motion if I can that this body constitute a review process of all Senate committees that they produce the guidelines that they are operating under.

Senator Stanish - If that is a motion under new business we wouldn't vote on it.

Senator Martin - I can just bring it before the body?

Senator Stanish - Yes and the SEC can take that. Will that work?

Senator Martin - That will be fine. I have a second item of new business.
Senator Stanish - Before Senator Martin begins we are officially at 6:01 and according to our bylaws the Senate shall adjourn at 6:00pm unless we vote otherwise. We need to have a motion to extend the meeting past 6:00. Do we have a motion?

Senator Welsh - So moved

**Motion:** Senator Welsh moves to extend the past 6:00pm be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl- Gagne - It has to be a ballot vote.

Senator Martin - My new business can wait.

Senator Stanish - Can you just email me?

Senator Martin - You bet.

**XII. Adjournment** 6:04

Respectfully submitted by Cheryl Martin
I. **Call to Order** 4:10pm

Excused: Senator Sapeta, Senator Gianno, Senator Welch and Senator Bedell

II. **Roll Call**

III. **Secretary's Report**

**Motion:** To accept the minutes of the 426th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Discussion: Senator Welsh - The only places where I think meaning is affected by a word, on page 3 second line from the bottom, the sentence that begins with “Who will look over which office oversees”, I think the meaning is more effective if it is “Who will look over or which office oversees”. So, between “over” and “which” should be the word “or”. On page 4, 3rd quotation line down if the current instructors decide “they no longer wish to teach” and it starts out as “not to”. It just makes the sentence flow. That's all I got.

**Vote:** Motion passes as amended

IV. **Courtesy Period**

Senator Jean - This coming Sunday, March 10th and Monday, March 11th there will be about 300 science teachers on campus from the New Hampshire Science Teacher Association. We are having a two day conference here so we are looking forward to welcoming our colleagues.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - The proposals for the 2013 Symposium were sent out last week and are due at the end of March. I just wanted to invite Senators to consider putting forward an RFP and we are having an open session tomorrow at 1:00pm in the Hale Conference Room. If you have any questions or if you want to talk through any ideas or if the forms aren't working for you, you can work through them there.

V. **Subcommittee Reports**

- **Executive Committee**

Senator Stanish - We will start off with the Senate Executive Committee. It is [SD 12/13-26], and it is on page 21 of your packet. We are actually going to begin with the Parliamentarian piece. We have been searching for a permanent Parliamentarian for the spring after Chuck Weed had let us know that the spring is not going to work for him. We have not yet successfully found a permanent Parliamentarian so Ockle Johnson has agreed to again help us out at this meeting. However we did not get that motion to you 48 hours in advance so in order to allow us to be able to vote to approve Ockle today we are going to need to temporarily suspend the 48 hour rule just for this vote only so that is the first motion I would like to make.

**Motion:** In accordance with Article X, Temporary Suspension of the Bylaws, the SEC moves to temporarily suspend Article VI, J, 8, Forty-eight Hour Rule, in order to make a motion to approve a parliamentarian.

**Vote:** Motion carries

Senator Stanish - This needs to be unanimous. Are there any abstentions?

**Motion:** The SEC moves that the Senate approve Ockle Johnson as Parliamentarian for the March 6, 2013 meeting of the College Senate.

**Vote:** Motion carries

Senator Stanish – That was the first item on the Senate Executive Committee report, we do have a few items so feel free ask questions as they come up. There are a few motions, so feel free to jump in with comments as we go. You do not need to hold your comments until the end since there are many items here.
Our first item was just a reminder around Senate decorum. We do have in our By-Laws Article VI about floor procedure. The first one; Order of Debate says that all discussion and debate shall take place through the Chair after proper recognition, not through direct exchange between individual senators or senate guests. The By-Law doesn't specifically address guests but we'll talk about that, but an exchange between individual senators is not in order. I will try my best to keep us on track. I know it is difficult; and it is more human to talk to each other. I think we understand that and we will try to keep comments to at least the Senate at large. The Chair may relinquish the gavel temporarily to the Chair of a committee or a special speaker.

The second item is that senators should adopt the standards of courtesy common to other legislative bodies when referring to each other and members of the college community, which I think we do.

The other piece that I will try very hard to keep us on track with is that comments should be limited to two minutes and I will try to give priority to those who haven't spoken.

Another point is that all of these articles do speak directly to senators and don't mention guests and we have a number of guests here today so as a courtesy we ask the guests to follow those same procedures.

Senator Martin - I would like to know if I could speak to this issue but will need 4 minutes. Would that be appropriate?

Senator Stanish - Yes.

Senator Martin - I have typed a statement so that I stick to some prepared comments in this statement I will pass around to my colleagues in the Senate. I am speaking today to finish an item of business that I had wished to bring to the Senate just before it adjourned its last meeting, on February 13th. Since the Senate had reached the end of its normal meeting time, and since a key party to this subject had left the room, I agreed to delay this matter.

Today, however, the person in question, Associate Professor Michael Antonucci, has been notified in advance of my purpose and message; and I believe that it is appropriate to proceed.

At our last meeting, in the course of a discussion concerning “II” courses in the Integrative Studies Program, Professor Antonucci addressed one of our student Senators—and my advisee—Ms. Allison Bedell directly and discourteously.

I have excerpted the direct address at issue, without editing, as it appears in the Draft Minutes to our last meeting.

“Professor Antonucci - Just two things. Firstly, to speak to Senator Bedell, I am stunned that you would be in a position in the SCC to question the Film Department's Chair, it's faculty, the Dean of Arts & Humanities and the Provost herself, the Vice President of Academic Affairs who would oversee the quality because those course evals that you fill out run that gauntlet at least once maybe twice in the course of a year. Those are very serious documents and we take those pretty seriously. On that level be assured that those who do the hiring and do the evaluation of program curriculum interior to the department that that is a process that is serious and sacred that is taken care of internally.” (Draft Minutes, Senate Meeting, February 13, 2013, pages 7-8)

I have three observations about this address:

First, as cold text on the page, the transcript of Professor Antonucci’s statement does not adequately convey the contemptuous delivery that people who were present actually experienced.

Second, the entire situation was conditioned by the asymmetry in power that exists between the tenured professor and the undergraduate senior. She is not well-positioned to confront or respond to the dismissal of her competence—which is part of the reason that I am speaking today as her advisor.

Third, since this college relies on students to serve as senators, and since Allie’s Senate Curriculum Committee is charged with the task of reviewing the courses at issue, no senator and no guest should be dismissing her work or the work of her colleagues on that committee.

I also have three expressions of sentiment:

First, I apologize to Senator Bedell. I should have spoken in a timely manner to uphold the dignity and competence of her position and contributions; but I was dumfounded into silence. I believe that I had company in that regard. I have been informed that she cannot be present today; but I believe that it is important to place a timely response into the records that are kept by this body. Although I wish that I could speak for the membership, I think that I am expected to be circumspect and convey my individual regrets.
Second, I would like to thank the Senate Executive Committee for starting to respond to this matter, in its reminder to members that the terms of Article VI: C: 1-3 should govern all exchanges in this body. However, that reminder—and most of the Bylaws of the Senate—is directed to the behavior of Senate members, and does not adequately remind guests of their responsibilities.

Finally, if I can offer this advice without poisoning it with sanctimony, I am sure that an apology from Professor Antonucci to Senator Bedell would contribute to a mending process that needs to take place.

Professor Antonucci, would you like to speak to this matter?

Professor Antonucci - Yes, last week I met with Senator Bedell and we had coffee and I found out what an extraordinary student she is. I apologized and we're happy to know each other.

Senator Stanish - Thank you to you both I appreciate it. Any other discussion on this topic? I will say since Senator Martin mentioned it in his statement you see toward the end of the Senate Executive Committee Report we will do our annual revision of the Senate By-Laws in April and one of the pieces we had been thinking about anyway was a statement that would describe the manner in which the Senate functions as a respectful place for discourse. It really is missing from the By-Laws so that is something we will take on. I would appreciate any feedback.

Senator Lucey - Can we also include explicit language that mentions Guests?

Senator Stanish - Yes absolutely yes excellent suggestion. We will move onto the discussion we had at the last meeting about interdisciplinary courses and topics courses.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Have senators all had access to the ISP amendment process that was sent late or should we pull it up?

Senator Welsh - I would be happy to talk a little bit about it if it is pulled up or even if it’s not pulled up.

Senator Stanish - Maybe I will ask you to speak to it when we get to it. Thank you. Some information that you received in your packet was for background information at the request of the Senate and the SEC thought would be helpful. We did attach the Integrative Studies Program Proposal as it was presented to the Executive Committee and the Senate back in 2006. What we were just referring to, Senator Welsh's memory was very good and mine should have been as well since I was involved with this. This was presented at the meeting in which this ISP proposal was finally approved, but before we approved the proposal, we did approve an amendment to the proposal about how the Integrative Studies Program would be amended in the future. We wanted to insure there was a process by which community members and members of the campus could amend the Integrative Studies Proposal since the intention was that it be a living document that would grow and change as the campus grew and changed. That was another important piece of background information and I apologize that we didn't think to include it in the original packet. I did email that actual amendment this afternoon and it's entirely possible you didn't see your email since then. Maybe I will call on Senator Welsh to speak to that.

Senator Welsh - I neglected to bring it with me but just by way of background; when the Senate was discussing the ISP Proposal it was in March, late in the year, and there was a sense of urgency. We had two meetings in April where we discussed it and eventually passed it but we weren't in position to amend the proposal itself. It was a really sort of an up or down time so it became one of the sources of assurance to the members of the Senate to have this amendment. At the time, everyone acknowledged the proposal was a work in progress, a fluid thing. The Senators, if I am characterizing correctly, just wanted an official statement on how the campus would amend it because there was nothing to the process of amendment in the text itself. The only thing we added was the language on this amendment.

The language is, it's fine, it's a little clunky and it refers to an old committee: “Any individual or department may propose an amendment to any Integrative Studies or General Education Program approved by the Senate by submitting in writing to the General Education Program Committee said amendment. If the wording of the amendment is unclear, the GEPC will return the amendment to its originator. Once the wording is clear, the GEPC will provide an advisory opinion and submit the amendment to the School Curriculum Committees at which time the amendment will follow the usual curricular approval process”.

There were two things that I think were reassuring in this amendment. One is that we were assured there would be College review and approval of changes made to the ISP program. That they would see the light of day and the general College would talk about them before we implemented them. Two, that there was College wide ability to amend the program and that anybody from the College could send language and eventually it would get considered. It wouldn't be held up in a committee to clarify and it might have an advisory opinion from the ISPC along with it but it would follow the curriculum process. This was something that was accessible to everyone. These are sort of reassuring points to the amendment. In hindsight and in context when asking questions years later like, “Has this committee of the ISP been constituted by the Senate?” it's a question that goes back to this amendment. It's a question that says was the program proposal amended so that this committee is an official body. If there is change to practice does it have words to frame it? That's a question that goes back to: Has the process been amended? Was there Senate approval? That is why I found this
important. I also thought it was important, just in general because we approved the document plus amendment if we are going back to
the original thing of what's approved it's not a complete picture unless you copy it entirely.

Senator Stanish - Thank you Senator Welsh. I will commit to working with Provost Treadwell to make sure that that process is
publically available and is part of the document. I think it is something that just fell through the cracks and we can easily fix that.
Thank you for reminding us about the document that I think Senator Hanrahan and I wrote.

Also, you received with your Senate packet a copy of the 2012-2013 Curriculum Guidelines. Since that was another bit of information
that we were referring to last week, we wanted to make sure everyone had the exact same copy, and thanks to the Senate Secretary for
highlighting some of the pieces of information that were requested by the Senate. So you have all of those.

Senator Darby - I know that at the last meeting there was discussion about a need for revision of the guidelines for all Senate
Committees and the SCC in its most recent meeting discussed that and we are committed to do so.

Senator Stanish - Thank you Senator Darby. The Curriculum Guidelines apply to Interdisciplinary courses in terms of the curricular
process. II courses should follow the curriculum process and the guidelines also give clarity to the issue of topics courses. In addition
to the topics courses, as promised, Provost Treadwell did have a conversation with the Registrar to confirm policy and practice and
you can see the transcription in the SEC notes.

Provost Treadwell - Just to confirm that for clarity sake, I think at our last meeting there was some merging between the topics and
the experimental courses. I think it's an important distinction to note in the minutes that the topics courses do observe the guidelines
that are provided in the excerpted summary in the SEC meeting notes. I will just read briefly to give a sense of where the Registrar and
I were able to create an understanding of the topics courses. Specifically, with the regard to the departmental faculty who propose
topics courses, they are expected to identify learning outcomes and expectations for the topics course being proposed. Individual
themes to be offered within the topics course are not identified in the course proposal. Departmental approval, School Curriculum
Committee approval and Dean's approval are then progressively required. So these are departmental courses that are developed in the
topics course format. That is the approval cycle.

With regard to the Interdisciplinary topics courses, the course proposal process above is used but the Departmental approval, Dean's
approval, and Interdisciplinary Subcommittee approval are all progressively required prior to advancement to the Senate Curriculum
Committee. So there is an additional step with regard to Interdisciplinary topics courses that goes beyond the departmental course
review.

Again, with regard to individual thematic offerings as we discussed I believe we have confirmed that an approved topics course are
not separately approved but are offered by departmental faculty with expectations that the thematic offerings will meet learning
outcomes and other expectations defined during the original course topic shell approval. That's the practice that we have been using
for departmental courses as well as the II category courses that we discussed and the Registrar reconfirmed these processes. There are
some questions with regard to the administrative registration processes and clarity of these courses within the curriculum, those are
things I think I will be working closely with Registrar on and report back to the Senate. With regard to the courses themselves, the
themes versus the shell, this is the process that is used in approval cycles. I was grateful to be able to work with the Registrar and
present that to the Senate.

The II experimental courses, the 199, 399 and 499 levels, those are course shells that are allowed for a department to experiment
without any curriculum review process and they are to be a one-time only offering. They are distinct and dramatically different from
the topics courses. I would like the minutes to reflect that the 399 or the 199 courses that we discussed are really a different category
course than the topics courses that are germane for the discussion this evening and the last meeting.

Senator Stanish - In addition as there was request from the Senate to the II Subcommittee to prepare a document or to explain their
procedures and as you see there was a document submitted to the Senate Executive Committee and I thank the II Subcommittee for
doing this. It was included in your Senate packet and it is [SD 12/13-27] on page 23. I will ask Senator Fleeger to speak to that
document.

Senator Fleeger - Thank you Senator Stanish. I just want to speak briefly to the rationale that the II Subcommittee used to respond to
the concerns brought forward by the SCC about these two course proposals. I will not address the topics course question because it
was addressed by the Provost.

However, the other points that I am concerned with expressed by the SCC is about the quality and qualifications of the course
instructors. Our view is that on both the SCC and the II Subcommittees they are not the appropriate place for evaluating faculty
qualifications. Those are handled elsewhere in the College. That is the departments’ and Dean's responsibility. The Curriculum
Subcommittee should vote on curriculum proposals and not faculty qualifications. Same with the budgetary questions, those are also
handled elsewhere in the College by the departments and Deans and are not necessarily something that the Curriculum Committee should concern themselves with when approving or denying course proposals.

We also wanted to put forward our perspective that interdisciplinarity and interdisciplinary classes at Keene State College come from a wide variety of approaches. One of which is team teaching, and it was mentioned in the ISP program guidelines that a percentage of II courses were expected to be team taught but that is certainly not the expectation that all II courses be team taught or team developed.

Lastly, about the specific objections to the IIAMST 391 course the SCC had concern with number of subjects within a single course. We believe it is just a misreading of the language that was in the course proposal. This was intended to provide some illustration of the topics that might be covered within that course but was not intended to claim that one professor or one course would cover all of those disciplines.

Those would be the specific responses we would have to the Senate Curriculum Committees concerns. The II Subcommittee also wanted the opportunity to speak to some of the other issues regarding the process but this is far beyond my experience on the II Subcommittee and Ann Marie Mallon would like the opportunity to do that if she is so inclined.

Professor Mallon - I wanted to turn your attention to page 3 of the document created by the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee. Here we listed some of the resources that we all on the subcommittee make use of and that are publically available to anyone who is interested. Just some context here, when we began to talk about interdisciplinarity at Keene State 6 or 7 years ago the first thing we did was turn to the national conversations on interdisciplinary research and pedagogy that had been happening since about 1970 and we turned to the literature to have those conversations. We read through key literature regarding definitions and outcomes for our interdisciplinary courses at Keene and you can see those resources on the interdisciplinary page of the ISP website. The address is included on that document about our workshops.

There was a series of workshops where we developed guidelines and criteria for the work we do on the II Subcommittee. Those guidelines and criteria are meant to evaluate II course proposals. Those guidelines had been sent to the SCC and as chairs of the II Subcommittee, Dr. Antonucci, Dr. Hottinger and myself-that's current, recent and ancient chairs-have met with any faculty who have expressed interest in proposing an II class over the course of several years. We have gone over the guidelines with faculty, reviewed syllabi, course proposals and extended invitations to our twice a semester workshops and have met with faculty during our regular meeting times.

About those workshops, they have been taking place every semester for the past 6 years. We have workshops on interdisciplinary syllabus creation, we have shared and discussed interdisciplinary assignments, and we talked about interdisciplinary pedagogy and shared best classroom practices. We have read scholarly articles together and discussed them and we have shared our own interdisciplinary scholarship. We talked about the relationship between our own research and our pedagogy. Each semester the Chair of the II Subcommittee issues a campus wide invitation to the workshops. We encourage anyone interested in teaching an interdisciplinary class here at Keene State to come to one or both of those workshops that are scheduled for the semester. In addition to faculty led workshops that occur every semester, we have also brought in two past Presidents of the Association of Interdisciplinary Studies, an organization out of Miami University in Ohio. It has been around since 1979 and publishes a journal and holds an annual conference. It provides another resource about the scholarship of interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Both of those workshops were well attended and about 20-25 members of Keene State faculty participated in 2 day sessions. At the bottom of that page you can see that we included a few scholarly resources that we have drawn upon for discussion as well as planning for the workshops. I have also been told by Professor Hottinger, who couldn't be here today that she would personally open her own current library on scholarship on interdisciplinarity if anyone would be interested in looking further. Thank you very much for hearing us out and of course we are happy to answer any questions.

Professor Mallon - The guidelines that were constructed back in the beginning discussions.

Senator Stanish - I think this would be a good time to see if there are any questions for the members of the II Subcommittee today about this document or about their process.

Senator Welsh - I am very interested, and if I am not mistaken, that a new set of guidelines was sent to the SCC framing interdisciplinarity at Keene State? Did I hear that correctly?

Professor Mallon - The guidelines were sent to a prior SCC as those course proposals began to go forward.

Professor Antonucci - I am speaking to Professor Darby. In September I met with Professor Darby in my office twice and we went over the procedures with the Chair of the Senate, Professor Stanish as well. We went over the coming storm and I exchanged at that
time information, whether it got caught in web land or not regarding the II tip sheet, where the II Subcommittee Blackboard site was and where the II Subcommittee current curriculum guidelines for submission of course proposals are stored.

Senator Darby - I don't recall receiving those.

Senator Blatchly - I went poking around and I have something that maybe will make this a little more specific about a couple of the items. I guess I have questions about when things changed. One of them is for procedures for approving interdisciplinary courses which in the original ISP documentation that we got seems to suggest that the interdisciplinary course interestingly enough starts with the coordinator of the interdisciplinary area. I don't know if that is still even relevant on this. It then goes to the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee and they are supposed to include the Integrative Studies Program Committee in that discussion. I don't know if that is done or not. It seems to be different. This is from the ISP manual and it seems to be different from what I am hearing. I guess the question is, is it really different or is it just my imagination and if it changed when did it change? That is part one of the procedural program process. Is the ISPC included in this?

Professor Antonucci - I am trying to gather how to best answer these questions. These questions are generally considered on alternate Tuesday mornings at 8:00am by the Senate Subcommittee, the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Group. That group is trying to extricate and untangle the difficult situation that has emerged after fall of 2010. I think that is the year that we as a campus stopped having a faculty chair of the ISPC. That is when the ISPC became the ISPAB because the board evaporated, merged with the committee without a faculty chair. This is a very serious situation. You are very perceptive in recognizing that this is a major change and it is currently under consideration by the Senate in its working relationship. We are on that question, we're on that case but I would say to answer your question directly, changes in the fall of 2010.

Senator Stanish - I will speak to a bit of what I know. From the ISP manual that we did not include in the Senate packet, speaks to an II Coordinator. I think it is different terms but I believe that is what we would be calling Professor Antonucci's position at this point.

Professor Antonucci - Point of information, I think that the transfer of terminology goes back to the change in the faculty contact.

Senator Stanish - It is.

Professor Antonucci - All Coordinators became Chairs after 2009?

Provost Treadwell - The one issue I want to bring us back to is the Senate process. In the beginning, I think that some of the reasons for establishing the taskforce that was looking at the ISP throughout last academic year and the working group that is now moving to next steps of deliberation for comprehensive consideration were the curriculum approval processes. The other issue that I would raise is that the historic documents, both the ISP handbook and the original Integrative Studies approved program with the amendment, that we would be sure to add them to the record.

I think the enhancements to that process have been reflected in the most recent curriculum guidelines. When we call our attention to the recent 2012 Curriculum Guideline updates that are the genesis for courses no matter what department courses are from. The interdisciplinary courses do go through the same process and the guidelines reflected this Interdisciplinary Program review and observe those processes. I think those most recent Curriculum Guidelines were developed in an effort to provide explicit clarity from the departmental proposal process through approval. I expect that the working group would bring greater clarity of some of these other issues that we are going into as well but I just want to make sure that we call our attention to the most recent Curriculum Guidelines which I think should be the operating guidelines by which curriculum proposals are approved and moved forward through departmental process.

Senator Stanish - I think in reviewing the documents, I did look at the ISP manual. It was several years ago, I think 2010, and it is not a Senate approved document. It was an idea just as Provost Treadwell is saying. It took the Senate approved document and tried to put it into a digestible form. I agree that looking at the proposal and the guidelines are what we have as a Senate to make decisions.

Senator Blatchly - Part two relates to the interdisciplinary outcomes. Again, I went back to the ISP program proposal for 2006 and we looked through the outcomes. There are four, there is a bunch of text that I won't read but the outcomes are interesting. Students will be able to cross disciplinary boundaries to reveal new data and set up connections. Analyze the assumptions and actions to society from multiple perspectives and examinations through a whole bunch of different lens. I won't read them all. Assess their own roles and responsibilities as members of a diverse community.

It looks great and I then went to the ISP web site and the outcomes are different. I have to confess I like the new ones better. I like these but I am wondering when they changed. What the process was and I wanted to highlight one of them. I think there are five of them. One of them specifically is synthesize connections between multiple disciplinary perspectives. The limited reading that I have done seems to indicate that this synthesis is really crucial for something to be interdisciplinary. I am kind of curious about when that
changed. I think the relevance is when you look at the Film Studies proposal that at some point we are going to get to it seems to use the old outcomes and not the new ones. So what is current? How did they change?

Professor Antonucci - The change occurred through the Senate. 2009 – 2011, I don’t know what meetings; however, for the timeline for the revision of II outcomes was the spring of 2009. That was a grand moment, reorganization for outcomes in and of ISP across the board. For perspective areas and ITW, I don’t know and I don’t know about IQL or II. That was a 2 or 3 day event that took place in the conference room of the Library.

Senator Stanish - Was this the ISPC?

Senator Antonucci - No, we were a subcommittee that I guess working under the auspices of ISPC, I would imagine. All that work honestly got hung up because it was poorly distributed to the Senate. Rather than each discrete, distinct area of ISP having its own set of outcomes and having its own curriculum, they were bundled together and they were some major issues including even just simple titles. Those were held up for like two years, possibly, I am searching. Yes they were held up. They were approved in maybe 2011 or 2010. That's the discrepancy and then on your sheet those are the current guidelines the synthesis those were the ones that were produced in 2009. They came forward when they were approved by the Senate. Those are the ones that we have been using. Those are the ones that are being used and the first tip sheet that went out in the fall mistakenly didn't know whether the Senate had approved the new guidelines or not. We amended that the corrected guidelines are available. Those are the ones that we use. Those are the ones that we submitted to the SCC this fall.

Senator Stanish - Thank you, this is very helpful.

Senator Hanrahan - I am not clear on what Professor Antonucci just said. Who approved what in 2011? Was it the Senate approved something? Did it come before the Senate? It seems to me that the amended process says that it should go to the SCC. Was that in fact done? Is there a step that got bypassed? Was it the ISPC that approved it? I am not clear.

Senator Stanish - Just a point of order. Our Secretary is searching the minutes from those years and it may take her a bit. We are talking about 3 years potentially to search and we are searching so let’s just see if she can find anything. I was not on the Senate during those years.

Senator Lucey - Because I worked on ISP with assessment sort of actively and within the past five years I have been here, I remember changing and readdressing this fluid and this kind of openness for the language in the proposal because of that ... changing these learning outcomes for perspectives courses for instance. I do think it is an issue with communication that things are not communicated as clearly that learning outcomes have changed for reading or writing or thinking. We might get one email but if you miss it and hit delete, it's lost and you don't know. I remember being on the School Curriculum Committee and seeing old learning outcomes coming through frequently because that update machine wasn't operating properly.

Senator Jean - I just want to say that the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Group is meeting regularly. We know that things are absolutely not the way they should be and that is a result of the task force report from last year. There are 5 or 6 tables in the ISP original outcomes. We need to simplify and we know this. I think we are talking around and around knowing that we have a broken system here and basically what our charge has been is to try to see if we can to make more sense of this. To bring it together, to simplify it, to make things clearer and to communicate, this has been one of the very big things on the task force. Communication wasn't there. These are all things that we will be discussing and talking about. Right now the ISP is really not very functional. I am trying to put it nicely. We're going to get there but it’s going to take us a while. Senator Welsh and myself are the two Senators in the group. He can speak to for the group and it's going to take time. There is going to be some interesting discussions about this but one of our things is going to be transparency. We are going to be transparent we are going to vote to bring all these things to light and we are going to try and simplify this process.

Senator Stanish - We have reached the end of 15 minutes of discussion on this topic.

Motion: Senator Stanish moves to extend discussion for another 15 minutes be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Provost Treadwell - I think I would echo Senator Jean's statement. We do have a task force that is looking at these larger issues of communication, structure and role of Senate and clarity in process with regard to the Integrative Studies Program Committee. What is germane for this evening’s discussion I believe is that the two course proposals that we will be moving forward later in this agenda did name outcomes that are consistent with our current Senate Curriculum guidelines and the approved Integrative Studies Program Proposal for 2006. Regardless of whether those outcomes have changed or we have some confusion over the communication of these and I would agree I think these new outcomes are a bit more captivating but with regard to these proposals the outcomes that are named making connections across disciplinary boundaries are indeed the outcomes in the Senate approved Integrative Studies
curriculum from 2006. I think the issue of named outcomes from an approved document is certainly relevant and appropriate for course proposals before the Senate.

Senator Darby - In fairness to ISP and ISPC on the issue of communication, I do hold in my hand a document that was sent to all faculty. It has my name on it, it appeared in my faculty mailbox and it does sit in my bookcase in my office. It is called Teaching Integrative Studies Program at Keene State College 2010-2011. I refer to this document and while I agree there are communication issues involved in what is a very complex problem. I also think that sometimes faculty need to take the responsibility of receiving the communications that they get whether they are transmitted electronically or a hard copy format and that they read them, they review them and that they present questions to the ISP Council.

Senator Lucey - I will speak to that. I absolutely agree with that. We do have to take ownership of this program and we are all a part of. Unfortunately the outcomes in there are already outdated.

Senator Darby - It is still helpful.

Senator Welsh - Just to add a little bit to it I don't want to underscore the importance of communication that we have and we do have a great deal on our committee but I do think process precedes communication and I think a great deal of legitimacy of the items that get communicated to faculty are going to be taken seriously when people understand that the process behind them was legitimate, open and transparent. I want to, in an effort to talk about communication, not emphasize the importance of good transparent, open and a legitimate process.

Senator Stanish - I will just reiterate Senator Jean’s point that both the governance, which I think we were talking about with the idea of coordinators vs. chairs and the ISPC, as well as communication are both charges to the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Group.

Senator Welsh - I will return to my original question on the ISP proposal in its description of II courses. The language that the Senate has approved is the language in the original proposal. The language that now stands is not the language in the original proposal, that language the Senate has not considered it or approved it. Is that correct? That question can hang.

Senator Stanish - In terms of what we have, we gave what we have, these are the documents. Yes. Unless there are other points we can close the discussion on the report and we can get to the actual course proposal in a few minutes. We will close discussion on the report. Another bit of information specific to the course proposals, thank you Senator Darby for doing this work, Dean Harris has signed and added supporting comments to both the IIFILM 362 and IIAMST 391 course proposals. I believe Senator Darby has those comments and I see that Dean Harris is here tonight as well.

Senator Darby - I would be happy read them and I would also be happy to defer to Dean Harris. I am now going to read Dean Harris's for IIFILM 362. “I approve this course. The budgetary impact is acceptable, and the institution needs more such courses to meet ISP needs. An upper division topics course is appropriate for the field of Film Studies, which draws methodological approaches from several disciplines. The SCC also notes the need for decanal review of faculty qualifications. The department chair is competent to undertake such review for full-time faculty interested in teaching the course. Adjunct faculty credentials are also reviewed in the dean's office prior to contract issuance. I trust that this allays part of the SCC's concerns about the development of a legitimate course for both Film Studies and for the ISP". Next I will read from Dean Harris's comments for IIAMST 391. "I approve this course. The budgetary impact is acceptable, and the institution needs more such courses to meet ISP needs. An upper division topics course is appropriate for the field of American Studies and for the nature of American Studies staffing, which draws from faculty from several disciplines. The range of potential methodological approaches is likewise is appropriate to an interdisciplinary inquiry. While the SCC interpreted this language as meaning a single faculty member would incorporate all five fields of study in one course, the proposal language suggests rather the range of potential disciplinary approaches viable in an American Studies course. The SCC also notes the need for decanal review of faculty qualifications. The program chair is competent to undertake such review of full-time faculty interested in teaching the course, whether or not formally part of the AMST program. Adjunct faculty credentials are also reviewed in the dean's office prior to contract issuance. I trust that this allays part of the SCC's concerns about the development of a legitimate course for both American Studies and for the ISP".

Senator Stanish - We will hold off on discussion to that as it is related to the course proposal that we will make a motion on in a minute. We will have all that discussion at that time. We did have some motions at our last meeting to bring these course proposals forward and the SEC will do that on behalf of the Senator's.

Motion: On behalf of Senator Fleeger the SEC moves that the IIFILM 362 course proposal be brought to the Senate for discussion and vote.

Discussion: Senator Lucey - Point of clarification, what are we voting on?

Senator Stanish - We would be voting on approving IIFILM 362 course proposal.
Senator Lucey - The Senate is voting to override the SCC?

Senator Stanish - Yes and it is in the Senate Bylaws, Article VII which is about the standing committees of the Senate. These speak to the Curriculum Committee and in there is the provision to do that.

Senator Welsh - We are about to vote on this course?

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Welsh - This moment has made me fairly conflicted. If I thought my vote in the negative direction would hold the course up I probably would reconsider that choice but I think it is important to continue to place on the table certain issues that I think deserve to be considered. Therefore, when I look I think about the definition of interdisciplinary as we have at the college currently in the writing of the ISP Proposal. I don't see that these courses are necessarily consistent with that. Although we have heard alternative explanations it is very explicit about the faculty collaborating across disciplines to design and deliver courses. These are very competent, very interesting, very skilled faculty but there has not been collaboration across these disciplines with design and delivering these courses.

I think also that these courses are at the 300 level, and outside the disciplines of the faculty delivering them. I do think the evaluation of competence is something that the SCC and the Senate are not in a position to do but I do think chairs are in a position to do so. I do think chairs in all the disciplines involved in these courses are privy to seeing a syllabus and evaluating teaching that topic at Keene State College.

The other thing that gives me pause for concern is the issue of advisory opinions. It's just the process by which these proposals have come forward. Looking back at the curricular guidelines I see it is very explicit, it’s clear on page 4 by saying that II proposals need to have advisory opinions. It is my impression that these do not have advisory opinions from the affected programs. I can see the need for opinions from two disciplines if a couple of professors are team teaching and there is a need to evaluate the work load of those professors then there are resources and things like that. I can see good reasons for needing that advisory opinion but also I can see just the benefits of asking for an advisory opinion. If you are going to propose a course in math or something like that and it’s not your discipline, it is in the interest of those disciplines to know that that's happening. They might be able to say we have a course we are already teaching that is very similar to that or we have someone who is working in that area and it would good for you to collaborate with them. I don't see the harm and I see much of the benefit in asking for advisory opinions. I also note that these advisory opinions are purely advisory. They do not hold or bind or commit to evaluating one way or the other. I therefore think they are a value and I think that the faculty curricular guidelines asking for them is something to standby. In any event it is for those reasons, just to be brief, that I feel that I am more compelled in this situation of likely passage to register my vote in opposition of this proposal.

Professor Velasco - Thank you for letting me speak. I just wanted to speak to the topic of interdisciplinarity; I am a little concerned that it is being construed as if something that should be taught between different faculty from different disciplines. As someone who is the first full hire in Women and Gender Studies and received and interdisciplinary Ph.D., our entire department is built around interdisciplinarity. Three out of the four faculty have interdisciplinary Ph.D.’s. There is a very, very long, rich history of interdisciplinarity graduate training including the program that I went to which is the History of Consciousness and Rhetoric at UCBerkly, or Modern Lit at Stanford, or the Humanities program at Johns Hopkins. So this is not something that is sort of an outlier within academia. So my concern is if doubt is going to be cast on these courses, will doubt be cast on the entire curriculum in Women and Gender Studies? I just wanted to put that out there in terms of the broader understanding of interdisciplinarity in academia.

Senator Hanrahan - Historically when II first was approved there were certain topics that were considered the II disciplines, Women and Genders Studies was one, American Studies was the other. I know this first hand because when we were initially going to ISP, Computer Science thought that we would be one of these II disciplines like everybody. But when we applied, I had a nice conversation with Professor Mallon who very politely told me “no,” in our opinion you are a science and on the science path and we were not allowed at that point to advance an II course. That since has changed, I think, but I don't think it has officially been approved by the Senate. There were certain subjects; I think Holocaust and Genocide at the time was another one. So, those are the official II courses. I don't see that these courses are necessarily consistent with that. Although we have heard alternative explanations it is very explicit about the faculty collaborating across disciplines to design and deliver courses. These are very competent, very interesting, very skilled faculty but there has not been collaboration across these disciplines with design and delivering these courses.

Professor Mallon - I just want to communicate a point that we need to keep separate and distinct what is a discipline and what is a department. Nobody who proposes an interdisciplinary course is stepping into another department and asking to teach a course in that department. As Professor Hottinger said in our last Senate meeting all of these interdisciplinary courses have a departmental home. There is no orphaned interdisciplinary course out there arbitrarily grabbing a department from another school and saying I will locate myself here. That distinction is really important and we can't keep interchanging a discipline and a department. The department is how the course moves through our system but the interdisciplinary field is not an interdepartmental field it is an interdisciplinary field. Professor Velasco can speak to that for interdisciplinary degrees better than I but it is a very very important distinction that needs to be made here.
Senator Lucey - Just a couple of comments that were brought up by Senator Welsh. In terms of the official language, again that Senate approved document from 2006 it talks about Interdisciplinary Studies, there is absolutely no mandate about team teaching. It says the college supports having a percentage of these courses team developed and team taught the first time the course is offered. After the initial offering, faculty will individually teach the course. There is no expectation that every course that goes through II will have faculty teaching from separate disciplines.

Advisory opinions, I know some sort of language as I am looking through it and it goes back to what Professor Mallon just said about programs or terms. What do we mean by program? Here it is advisory opinions are required whenever a proposal effects the curricular of other programs. II belongs to ISP. The ISP which is a program, it doesn't belong to departments. Am I correct in that? So an advisory opinion need not be sought because it doesn't effect a department, it lives in its own program.

Senator Welsh - I think that my objection, if I may display my interdisciplinary credentials also I have a Masters degree in Environmental Studies which is an interdisciplinary major. I understand interdisciplinarity and I am very much in favor as it has enriched my education. Coming to this point; but I think my objections, that are the basis of where I might vote, are much more mundane. I do not see the language of the existing ISP proposal or a permissiveness about courses where faculty have not collaborated across disciplines. That is not team teaching, that's just collaborating across it seems to be the main phrase that keeps coming back again and again. I think that as long as we have that as our definition at Keene State that is how we judge whether it is an interdisciplinary course or not. I would be fully in favor of reexamining that definition, putting in new guidelines, opening the door to an array of new courses and clearly defining what they are. That's a fine thing but I think our current language is fairly explicit and I think also that the advisory opinions for better or worse, they are asked for. At least the process of asking is something that is required and pertinent to the guidelines. I think they have potential benefit. I can see where they could constrain the courses, but again it's a process question. Ignoring process is bothersome to me and that is why I am conflicted.

Senator Darby - I think Senator Welsh raises a very good and interesting point and I want to thank him, and we have had some good conversations around this. I will be blunt, I wasn't there when the proposal was sponsored or developed so I have no idea to what extent of what across disciplinary collaboration took place. I wasn't there and I dare say that there were a lot of people in the room who weren't there either. The proposal sponsor was there and I will just say that we should be careful about presupposing the level of collaboration that does or does not take place when a proposal sponsor is going through developing a course. I think we should be careful about presupposing what did and did not happen. Number two along the same lines, I received a very kind invitation from Professor Antonucci and the II Subcommittee to attend one of their workshops last semester and what I observed is exactly what is in the ISP Guidelines. I observed faculty from all three schools in the room and I observed faculty who were collaborating and discussing very seriously and very thoroughly the idea of interdisciplinarity, its impact on course development in all three schools and looking to find collaboration at Keene State College.

Professor Mallon - I want to thank Senator Darby for his comment and just reiterate that collaboration occurs across disciplines and frankly it occurs in English because we do work together across our borders and across our boundaries, I hope consistently and happily. I would also reiterate that that is what the workshops are about. In terms of the workshops that have been offered every semester and what they have been about and I would put into the record again these workshops are a valuable opportunity for critical conversations to help faculty develop their understanding and train their approach in interdisciplinary teaching, collaboration.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I apologize for the length of time it took me to find anything about the changes to the ISP Guidelines. I have looked through 5 years of Senate minutes and I cannot find revised ISP Guidelines. What I have found is a statement by Senator Clemenson from the 407th meeting which occurred on December 15, 2010 which I think reflects what happened and I remember this conversation. Senator Clemenson stated “Two years ago, the ISP made changes to their guidelines and the whole controversy started over the ISP changing their guidelines and skipping the SCC because the SEC was the one that approved the changes to the guidelines. Would the governance piece of that end up back on the SEC because that is how we have done it in the past? Are we going to be looking to changing that as well?” I believed that what happened was that those guidelines never actually came to the Senate and that they got lost in a discussion.

Professor Antonucci - That is really important information and this really gets to due diligence that the II Subcommittee has kind of carried out in the midst of all this turbulence. This subcommittee, we are not the ISPC. The II Subcommittee has continued to do the work of evaluating courses, following guidelines, getting the word out and passing along materials to guests as charged whether we are receiving word from ISPC or not. This is just a point of information I wanted to make.

Senator Stanish - Thank you for the information and we will continue to investigate the governance piece of it.

Senator Darby - I'll be quick, I was the lone supporting vote coming out of committee of the IIFILM proposal under consideration today. It was my opinion that the proposal had sufficient merit for approval. I will be very honest there is an aspect, not so much on the syllabus that Dr. White-Stanley had provided, but I did have some pause over one of the other pieces of supporting documentation and I think it is an issue that maybe gives Senator Welsh a similar pause, although I don't want to presuppose that. But none the less I feel this proposal has the merit to be approved by this body.
Senator Stanish - We have reached the end of 15 minutes of discussion on this proposal and I see that Senator Blatchly still has a comment.

**Motion:** Senator Stanish moves to extend discussion for another 15 minutes be accepted by the Senate

**Vote:** Motion does not carry

Senator Stanish - As we said in the Senate packet since this a course proposal and these motions involve the reputations of individuals, the SEC will conduct the vote by ballot as allowed in the By-Laws (Article VI, D.4.)

Provost Treadwell - For the purpose of clarity may you instruct us?

Senator Stanish - The motion is to vote to approve IIFILM 362 course proposal. So a “yes” on your vote we will be a vote to approve the course proposal. A “no” would be a vote not in favor of approving. By not turning a ballot in you are abstaining.

**Vote:** Motion carries 16-5

Senator Stanish - We will now move on to our next motion

**Motion:** On behalf of Senator Lucey the SEC moves that the IIAMST 391 course proposal be brought to the Senate for discussion and vote.

Senator Blatchly - I will raise my point and I am really happy to hear, just parenthetically, Professor Antonucci realizing that the responsibility to move these new outcomes forward through the curriculum process. I really look forward to that because I think they are an improvement and it is an indication of a lot of hard work and a lot of discussion. We would like to see that and make it official, but I wanted to talk about topics which are not really interdisciplinary per say. It's really the use of topics on campus and I was kind of poking around a little bit today so I did the following; I went into the catalog to look at majors and I looked at most majors and found any use of the word topics in a course title and courses which were required by a major or part of the major description. So I am not looking for topics courses that are sort of floating out there, but something that is required by a major. I found a lot of 290's and 490's so those seem like pretty obviously placeholders or someone shows up they have an interesting topic and they want to do a run off course, this makes a great opportunity for that.

This seems very standard and very uncontroversial. It doesn't seem to fit these proposals. However, there were six other courses and I just want to name them ART 455, English 208 and English 308; I've got titles for them if you need them, Geography 216 and Holocaust & Genocide Studies/Sociology 427. Those are topics courses and they seem to be from what I could tell, it's a little hard from the course description, the focus of the course is really kind of on a methodology and they can change the topic without really altering that fundamental focus. The topic is there to support that. It obviously needs to be appropriately chosen so the topic fits with the methodology that is used. It's a rich topic that can support the courses and so forth but the topic is not so fundamentally entrenched that it can't be changed with lots of effort on the part of the instructors but without really changing the fundamental methodology.

I am kind of curious. As I look at the course description, it looks like people submitting both the Film Studies course and the American Studies course are really in a way applying for membership in this second group. I understand that this course would be taught on a regular basis. The 290's and 490's are not really taught on a regular basis as far as I could tell but this would be something taught on a regular basis as the six that I just mentioned are. I am just curious if there is enough methodologies for you, for example, to say no that doesn't fit if something comes up. Am I right in suggesting that this is a more methodologically oriented course and the topic serves to support the methodology or is it looser than that? If it is loose, then I find it more difficult to figure out what it is we are voting on. That's my problem and I would be happy for an interpretation because I don't pretend to know the answer to the question.

Professor Antonucci - The course formally known as IIFILM 352 now IIFILM 362 is approved and goes off the table. That discussion is completely out of it, but if we are talking about IIAMST 391, I think to speak to your question that it is in the shape of or is a matter of method in approach especially at the 300 level in the ISP where students are receiving their introduction in some cases into Interdisciplinary Studies so yes, this would be a regularly scheduled course. I think, although I haven’t seen the proposal in in quite some time, because I have been writing other stuff for the Senate, but I think it should be listed as occasional. Is it spring or fall? It just says occasional?

Senator Blatchly - I don't see it.

Professor Antonucci - Ok, which is not a requirement. I would say it is going to be an occasional class. I did submit or we did submit, I sent to SCC the II Subcommittees a document where we agreed to the catalog and found a wide range of topics courses. Maybe your topics courses could have been classified as Women's Lit, but the topics courses did not define in any sort of way that if you want
them. To talk about the courses I've submitted, sure it's a methods driven course. It's an intricate interdisciplinary course. We read American Studies material or subject matter approaching that subject matter from possibly five examples of disciplinary perspectives. I say disciplinary and not departmental. It does specifically say methods from the description, so you are correct.

Provost Treadwell - Just one quick clarification with regard to the topics course. I worked with Brendan Denehy recently on course scheduling and, as we all appreciate as we look through the curriculum, there are a number of departments that propose topics courses, as you've seen and they vary in structure because they are under the control of department purview as far as what the focus might be or the structure behind them. But the idea that they’re one-off actually doesn't play true if we look through the course schedule over the past few years. A number of departments use the topics course sequence of 290 or 490 level for routine offerings of lower and upper level topic explorations within a discipline. In a number of disciplines they'll list actually in the catalog fall and spring offering or use the topics listing. They are quite frequently offered by departments but there is no hard and fast rule. Again, I think this is departmental control but the idea that these are one-off’s again are more likely experimental course offering or any one-off that is outside the curriculum topics courses are a shell by which departments can explore different disciplinary themes. In a number of our departments, many I would say, these are offered regularly as part of the regular curriculum. I just offered that to frame how they have been used in other departments.

Professor Mallon - Again communication issues are important here. What exactly does regular mean? I call your attention to the topics course in bullet one in response to the SCC. Take a look at those examples of what curricular offerings are for topics courses; occasionally, fall, spring, summer, annually, fall, spring, fall, spring, occasionally, offered occasionally, offered occasionally. If we want to standardize our language around our topics courses at the college level, I think that is a fair discussion to have. Now we have a very irregular set of definitions for regular.

Senator Stanish - I think looking at that discussion it is something the Senate could do in the future. Any other discussion on the course proposal IIAMST 391? Seeing none we will do a ballot vote. The same situation applies; a “yes” is a vote to approve the course proposal and a “no” is a vote to not approve the course proposal and not turning in your ballet is an abstention.

Vote: Motion carries 17-4

Senator Stanish - Continuing with the SEC report, we are almost done, as you can see we are going to take on our annual bylaws revisions. We have a few items here that we know of. One of which is about Senate absences and we already brought that to the Senate for discussion and we will bring that forward for a vote. A few other things we will bring forward first for discussion in the April 10th meeting and then for voting at the April 17th meeting. If there is anything else that you see as you continually read the bylaws you can tell me right now or you can email the Senate Secretary.

Senator Welsh - If I just may just weigh in, one thing that strikes me in particular in preparing for today's meeting which I did not do adequately, is that the 48 hour rule can be pretty constraining when the agenda is large and the attachments are many. It is difficult for a Senator exercising due diligence to actually take it all in and teach classes. May I possibly suggest that we consider a 7 day rule or some backwards extension of the time so that there is more time to consider documents? I know there are implications to this but something to think about.

Senator Stanish - We can definitely discuss it. I think we will have to rethink how our timing, our subcommittee reports, and our votes but we can definitely discuss it. I will say this personally, this year my goal was to try and get the Senate packet out on the Friday to really beat the 48 hour rule. I apologize, it was completely my fault that we didn't. It was no one else's fault. Everyone got me their material well in advance and we didn't do it this time. We were really trying to make sure we had the minutes correct in the short turnaround time. Cheryl goes through as Senate Clerk and types them up and reads them, Kim listens and edits them, I listen and edit them so that process just took a long time and I am the last one in the process. It took a long time, we made the 48 hour rule, but I have tried to beat that. I think we can discuss that and maybe find something that will work for everyone. We'll try, thank you. Anything else anyone has at the moment for bylaws?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - We forgot to put it on the list but clarification around the language of abstentions.

Senator Stanish - It's there.

Senator Blatchly - I would just like to add subcommittee reorganization.

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Blatchly - With the AOC sun setting out there is a requirement I think to do something with the people who are on the committee and one would hope be a little more ambitious than that.
Senator Stanish - Yes, in fact that is on our agenda and I forgot to put it on the list so thank you for reminding me to add it. There may be some work with the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Group in terms of governance. Their recommendations are coming forward in governance and those recommendations may effect that discussion and hopefully those pieces will come together for us but yes, the SEC has been discussing this and thank you for continuing to remind me. Anything else on this? If you do think of anything please email the Senate Secretary by March 29th so we have time to review in the Senate Executive Committee meeting. We need to bring it forward to all of you to have discussion at the April 10th meeting and then vote on it at the April 17th meeting in terms of our bylaws.

As we have mentioned a couple of times, the ISP Facilitation and Discussion team continues to meet and currently they are working on governance, so we look forward to their recommendations to bring to the Senate on that. Lastly, also in relation to what Senator Blatchly had said, we continue to work on the program review process given that the AOC will no longer exist and Provost Treadwell has been working very hard on that. We hope to bring new guidelines to the Senate in April on how that process will work and a way in which the Senate will be involved. Unless anyone has any questions, that concludes the Senate Executive Committee report. We now move to the Academic Overview Committee.

• **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly - I will just highlight as best we can as you see from the report we are hard at work completing the Film Studies and American Studies program review and we hope to have that by the next Senate meeting. We have finished a review on the Sociology/Anthropology Program and you see in your report that there was a full process. Outside visitors came in the fall, we got reports from everyone we needed and we used that material to put together a compilation. So before the Senate approves that I am going to ask Senator Fleeger do a brief summary of the contents of this.

**Motion:** The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Sociology/Anthropology Program be accepted and approved by the Senate.

Senator Blatchly - I am going to ask Senator Fleeger who was the Chair of that subcommittee who worked on this to give some highlights of the report.

Senator Fleeger - The Sociology major was established in 1971, and instituted a Sociology minor in 1984 and the Anthropology minor in 2003. The department officially changed its name to the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and the department is introducing a new Criminal Justice Major which should be online soon.

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Keene State College currently consists of nine tenured or tenure-track faculty, all of whom hold a Ph.D. In addition, there are four part-time and adjunct faculty currently teaching in the department. Outside reviewers noted the strength of the Sociology and Anthropology which includes its faculty. They engage in collaborative research with students; take students to academic conferences. They are productive scholars and active on campus. It is a professional community. It is also focused on international perspectives and Community engagement. Another strength the external reviewers noted was the support for other campus programs including the contributions to the Anthropology and Sociology department with ISP. They also thought that the curriculum was described as “robust and rich.” They also felt that the new addition to the Criminal Justice Studies and Anthropology-Sociology majors were a strength as well and also the collegial relationships. The challenges that were noted was the lab space and the increasing programmatic demands provided by expectations for assessment as well as helping students in making career choices. They also expressed a concern that the addition of the new criminology major may bring some different types of students into the department with different expectations and that may be a challenge. The reviewers also felt diversity and engaging communities of color was also noted as a challenge in the department as well as related to strengthened sequencing in the learning outcomes for the major. The recommendations that were followed were developed by the reviewers and forwarded to the AOC were to encourage the department at looking at their sequencing and explicitness of their learning outcomes and objectives. A specific suggestion was to examine and make the Capstone course consistent across different instructors as well as being explicit in the types of theory that were expected to be used in capstone courses. Career advising the formation of services provided to students and that assessment learning outcomes specifically for the Anthropology major and minor programs to bring them into step with the Sociology learning outcomes. And what AOC report would not be complete without a recommendation for consideration for facilities and faculty lines.

Senator Stanish - Thank you Senator Fleeger, any discussion on the Sociology/Anthropology report?

**Vote:** Motion carries

Senator Blatchly - I don't have anything else except to just remind folks, because it has been a while since we have heard an AOC report, of the procedure that follows the passing of this, this is not a report that goes to die. The review of the program goes off to the program and the Dean. The program and the Dean are expected to sit together and make a specific action plan that comes out of the recommendations that were made in this report. I think they have a year or two to deal with the action plan but they are expected to make that action plan and then try to make some progress on that and report that progress to the Provost. It's a process and I think it
has been greatly strengthened in the past few years and I think is consistent with the goal of the review process which is improvement of the programs and college. Thank you.

Senator Stanish - Thank you Senator Blatchly and we look forward to those other reports.

• **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Lucey - we have nothing to report

• **Senate Curriculum Committee**

Senator Darby - Since our last full Senate meeting the SCC met on February 27th, 2013 and we had a full complement of committee members and were joined by Professor Nigel Malcolm, Chair of Communication and Philosophy. At that meeting we met and reviewed a few proposals: Communication & Philosophy, Holocaust & Genocide Studies, II Interdisciplinary Studies, and Management. In your Senate, packet you will see three courses from the Management department which were approved and presented to the Senate as information.

**Motion:** The SCC moves that the revision of the Communication major be approved by the Senate.

*** Note to readers - This program proposal would replace an earlier Communication program proposal, approved by the KSC Senate on 14 November 2012, and would be included in the 2013-14 KSC Catalog.

**Vote:** Motion carries

The proposal to replace HGS 356 with IHHGS 356 was approved by the SCC (7-0-0-0):

HGS 356 The Holocaust and the Christian World
IHHGS 356 The Holocaust and the Christian World

**Motion:** The SCC moves that the IHHGS 356 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

**Vote:** Motion carries

The proposal to change requirements for the ‘Management minor’ program was approved by the SCC (7-0-0-0):

**Motion:** The SCC moves that the revision of the MGT minor be approved by the Senate.

**Vote:** Motion carries

The proposal to change requirements for the ‘Management major’ program was approved by the SCC (7-0-0-0):

**Motion:** The SCC moves that the revision of the MGT major be approved by the Senate.

**Vote:** Motion carries

The proposal to add IIGEOL 340 was not approved by the SCC (3-3-1-0):

IIGEOL 340 The Environment of Adventure - The vote reflects a divided committee opinion about the proposal. Concerns about the proposal include: 1) the sample syllabus makes reference to many academic disciplines, and it’s unclear whether a single faculty member can effectively teach all the disciplines and content listed in the document; 2) the sample syllabus contains an old iteration of the course description; and 3) the SCC is uncertain about the criteria by which II course proposals are to be evaluated. I would also add that in the interim I did receive an updated revised sample syllabus from the proposal sponsor and I did upload the new version to the SCC website. Quite frankly we are not sure on what to do if something is rejected and then a revised documentation is submitted afterwards but quite frankly once it hits my email plate I consider it to be Senate business and quite frankly I didn't feel that it was right to just simply sit on the revised syllabus and that is why I uploaded to the SCC Blackboard site

Senator Stanish - I think that is appropriate, thank you.

**Motion:** Senator White – Stanley moves that the IIGEOL 340 course proposal be brought to the Senate for discussion.

Senator Stanish - We ran into this last month with the two course proposals we just discussed. This motion to discuss according to our bylaws does not require a vote. So it is a motion to discuss and to remind us we have two minutes before 6:00 so I will open it for discussion. A Senator could also move to do what we just did with the other course proposals and make a motion to bring this IIGEOL forward for a vote in April. That is a motion we would vote on and would require a majority.

**Motion:** Senator White-Stanley moves that the IIGEOL 340 course proposal be brought to the next Senate meeting for discussion and vote at the April 10th meeting.
Senator Stanish - this is just to bring it forward to vote at the next meeting. We will discuss it at that time.

Senator Blatchly - May I ask if it would be more appropriate for the Senate Curriculum Committee to take the proposal up in light of the discussion we have had now which hopefully make it a little bit more clear what the standards are for interdisciplinary. It really does feel like an SCC matter and so essentially I am arguing for return to committee. Because now you have new material to work with, you got a new syllabus, and you got new information from this meeting so it might be more helpful and better use of our Senate time.

Senator Stanish - We are looking to see if you can make that motion to refer.

Senator Blatchly - Not while there is a motion on the floor.

Parliamentarian Johnson - While there is a motion on the floor you can move to refer that item to committee.

Senator Blatchly - Point of information, what would that do to the motion that is on the floor?

Senator Stanish - You could withdraw your motion. That would work too.

Senator White-Stanley - I would like to withdraw the motion I just made.

Senator Jean - We made two motions.

Senator Stanish - The first motion was for discussion but she can withdraw or she can withdraw the second one to vote.

Senator White-Stanley - I withdraw the second one.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Let's hold for a minute so we can make sure we are able send it back to committee. I am guessing that if we withdraw then it would go back to committee.

Senator Stanish - I believe Senator White-Stanley has withdrawn her motion to vote. We do need a motion to refer the course proposal back to the Senate Curriculum Committee.

Motion: Senator Darby moves that the proposal be referred back to the SCC be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stanish - It is debatable and we are at 6:00pm.

Senator Hanrahan - Call the question.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Darby - Our next SCC meeting is TBA and we will be talking about IIGEOL 340 and the SCC guidelines. End of report.

Senator Stanish - We did not get to new business so I would look for a motion to extend the meeting if anyone has new business or a motion to adjourn. Alright, meeting adjourned.

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment 6:05pm
I. Call to Order 4:06pm

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Jean, Senator Warder, Senator Ditkoff, Senator Prosper, Senator Welch

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 427th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing to report

V. Subcommittee Reports

• Executive Committee

Senator Stanish - We had asked Andy Robinson to serve as Parliamentarian for us at the next two meetings but Chuck Weed was able to come today and since Chuck has already been approved as our Parliamentarian we can ignore this motion for now but Andy has agreed to serve for our next meeting.

We are in process of holding Senate elections for next year. We realize we are a little behind the deadline as set in the bylaws. Senator Jean and I forgot to get going on that so we are doing that now.

We also have some By-Law revisions being presented to you and we can do this a couple of ways. Presenting them to you tonight for discussion as you can see there in senate document 12/13-33 starting on page 23 in your packet. According to our current By-Laws the way to amend bylaws is to present them to a meeting and they can be approved at that same meeting tonight if we have a unanimous vote of the members present tonight or we can just wait and vote on them at our next meeting in which case we will need a 2/3 majority vote of the members present to be approved. Right now I would just like open it up for discussion about these 4 proposed bylaw changes and we welcome any feedback that anyone has on them.

Senator Blatchly - I'll bite. I was looking at the By-Law change that talks about courtesy and one of the phrases in that about how we should follow a model.

Senator Stanish - You certainly can see that that language is currently in the By-Laws. Up for discussion.

Senator Blatchly - I have no interest in changing the motion.

Senator Darby - I want to thank Senator Blatchly for the point however I would state respectfully as it does say common to other legislative bodies whereas the excerpt was from an uncommon situation.

Senator Blatchly - I take the correction

Senator Martin - I see a slight editorial change at the end of the long first sentence in the proposed Article 6. in section C. Floor Procedure under Courtesy. Because peers are equals, because the dictionary definition is peer is equal so this is redundancy.

Senator Stanish - I agree. Thank you, Senator Martin.
Senator Martin - And then under the rationale, I don't know important it is to have a rationale for that, it's grammatical so I don't know. I would propose an amendment to the sentence where it says states the value that all Senators are viewed equal within the Senate. I propose the following language treated as equals. I am sorry for being picky.

Senator Stanish - No, that's ok. I think in my mind I had written “as equal” and didn't type the word “as”.

Senator Martin - I propose to add the word treated.

Senator Stanish - Yes treated, yes. Thank you. Any other discussion on the proposed By-Law changes? Shall we vote on them or wait till the next meeting?

Senator Lucey - I move that we vote on them

Senator Stanish - OK - we will start with one motion at a time. We will go with the first motion.

**Motion:** The SEC moves the Senate By-Laws Article V Meetings be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-33].  
**Vote:** Motion carries

**Motion:** The SEC moves the Senate By-Laws Article VI Parliamentarian Rules, E. Voting Positions be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-33].  
**Vote:** Motion carries

**Motion:** The SEC moves the Senate By-Laws Article VI Officers, D. Parliamentarian be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-33].  
**Vote:** Motion carries

Senator Stanish - I think I will hold off on the 4th motion taking into account the edits submitted by Senator Martin. I will present that to you edited. Thank you.

We did also consider the request made by Senator Welsh and others about extending the forty-eight hour rule and while I am certainly very sympathetic and applaud the desire to be better prepared for the Senate meetings, I think that is fantastic, our difficulty with it really is trying to find the balance between time to review the packet and having the most current information on which the Senate can base their deliberations. So given that we couldn't find a better balance we did not propose any By-Law changes and we are going to stick with the forty-eight hour rule. There is nothing that a Senator could propose a By-Law change for the future however. Any other questions about the By-Law changes?

We also discussed the Program Review Process that will be handled through the Provost's Office with the AOC no longer existing at the end this year. The Provost has been working on new guidelines and really talking about accredited and non-accredited programs. She is trying to make the process as easy as possible and also giving the college what we need to have there too. She is going to share some of the new guidelines with the AOC for feedback and then with the Senate at the next meeting. Anything you would like to say about that?

The ISP Facilitation and Discussion Team have been working on a proposal about ISP Governance and I believe Senator Welsh, one of the Senators on the committee was handing everyone a handout. We just want to offer just for feedback. We are not doing anything tonight but just getting feedback.

Senator Welsh - Right. I wanted to give a status report and update on what the committee has been doing in Senator Jean’s place. I wanted to have two voices here to help me answer questions and I urged Professor Antonucci to come, so he is also here to answer questions since he is on the committee too.

Just for review, a big big part of our charge was to offer a way of streamlining ISP governance and finding a way to sort of improve transparency, communication and accountability for the program. We talked about that for a while at separate meetings and I realize that the Academic Oversight Committee sunset was an opportunity for us to put something new into that position. We plan to use the committee space that is being vacated and put a new one in that addresses non-curricular ISP issues.

This is fairly consistent organizational structure that we observed when we looked at committee structures of other Senates from data that was gathered in the past. Practices at other colleges and their Senates have general education committees and it is quite common.
We have put together an idea for a new Senate subcommittee that is sort of patterned after the Academic Oversight Committee and that is item number one in the handout. That's our big new thing, it is modeled after the AOC it's got sitting Senators, it's got non Senate members, There is efforts to seek balance among the schools on this committee. That is one of the things we have come up with compositions similar of AOC.

Also, we thought it was necessary and useful to have an organization that we are calling a working group now but I think that is a working title we are looking for a way for better titles. People who are sort of responsible for the day to day application of the program the II Coordinator, the ITW and IQL Coordinators, the people from the perspectives that count the seats and make sure there are enough sections and things like that. That is an array of people that is in part two of your handout that we are calling the working group.

If you want to compare to the existing structure that is sort of what the ISPA the ISPC sort of looks like now. The bridge between these two committees, the personnel bridge between these two committees we thought might be a new ISP Coordinator or Chair. It's an idea that has been around for a year since the taskforce did its work and it was the ISPC that suggested hiring someone. We thought this someone might be able to serve both on the Senate Committee and sort as a convener, listener etc. of the working group. The relationship between these two down the road would one where the working group is administering the program on a day to day basis and they notice issues coming up. They might notice a policy that is not working or a policy that is absent and they take a suggestion for that policy to the second group via the coordinator to the Senate subcommittee.

Curricular issues would go to the Curriculum Committee. The Senate Subcommittee would look at it, they would look at it, and they would hold hearings, discuss it and seek information. The same thing that other Senate subcommittees do and either revise it or pass it on as is to the main body of the Senate for ultimate approval. That is sort of on down the road and it is hard to say how busy both of these committees will be with that kind of task in the future. For the first few years though we imagine quite a bit of business on the part of both of these committees. We imagine both groups would be sort of tasked with updating the programs books, revising and updating guidelines, making revisions to outcomes.

We have looked at the outcomes and thought they could use some updating and modernizing or popularizing revisions of that sort. It sort of brings it all up to speed and get the records up to date and get people on board. That is a fairly work heavy task for the first couple of years as we see it. We've got a couple of meetings to go before the end of the year and just to describe what we will try to accomplish during that time. I have got three little items at the bottom.

We would like to suggest terms and possible reassigned time and a selection process for members of both committees and we just sort of let you know people we are going to replace or how we are reassembled through internal offices and things like that and that there is a possibility of assigned time.

We would also like to look and suggest specific words that would charge both committees. The verbal description I just gave you is loose and fluid and it's something we would like to nail down obviously.

Lastly, we are sort of not complete in finalizing what we would like to use as a process for getting faculty input on this structure. It being a month before the end of the school year we are not really sure how we would hold meetings or something like that. With the time that remains we may get poor attendance because everybody is busy but we were thinking that perhaps having a couple of slots during Professional Development Week and holding discussions during then. We won't have this finalized before the end of the year but I think we would like to have it at a point where discussions are far enough along that we know that it is something pretty close to this is going to be what we do next year and if that is in place then the players involved can start to prepare for next year. Gather the information you know make sure we hit the ground running in September when the Senate reconvenes and they can do these things. That is my review Professor Antonucci; would you like to add anything?

Professor Antonucci - Just maybe right now the Director position is a big giant blank.

Senator Welsh - It is.

Professor Antonucci - Giant blank, open space, we can't say anything about it but at this time given the II Committee and the IQL Coordinators, this is where what we are calling the Working Group can begin to work starting in the fall of 2013. Then we can go and discuss the Director at some point, I don't know but so long as the Senate is moving along as these people are filtering work in then some of the tangles and some of the briars that we have encountered will be cleared and in the spring we can move forward. I think its working.

Senator Welsh - I would entertain questions.

Senator Stanish - Absolutely.
Senator Lucey - A question about numbers, are there enough Senators to go around? I don't want to spoil the surprise of the future of program review but will there be a Senate subcommittee that will sort of replace the AOC that will need seven members and how will that work with the fact that we are adding a subcommittee to the Senate?

Provost Treadwell - There will not be a committee that replaces the AOC that was the agreement last spring. The AOC has been doing it this year to conclude and the process that will be brought forth in the May meeting will describe a continuation of our program review board but a new process by which those documents are moved through administrative structures to insure that issues are attended to and resources are placed. I think that's what we'll see so we don't anticipate two committees needing twice the Senators. That is an excellent question.

Senator Stanish - So the numbers will work out very much the same as they are now. Other discussion?

Senator Bedell - On the Senate subcommittee, I know you guys have some non Senate faculty listed and I am curious as to what the rationale was and if you were also considering non Senate students. I know that I will not be sitting on the Senate next year but I would love to have input and I am sure there are other students who would be interested in running for a position to serve on the subcommittee and give input on what some changes might look like. I don't know if that would be considered or possibly taken into consideration.

Senator Welsh - I will try to field that and have Professor Antonucci back me up here. One of the original concerns that we had was that if we had non Senate faculty, well the reason we wanted non Senate faculty members was to make that the schools were covered because we were not sure that you could cover the schools and represent them by necessarily drawing from members of the Senate. We had student representatives also outside the Senate and we hold them into the Senate group, that being a policy making group, I think we would be open to the idea of a student not coming from the Senate and your interest certainly makes sense. Can I take it down as a suggestion?

Senator Bedell - Absolutely, I think that it is no surprise that across campus from the administrative and from the student side that there are frustrations sometimes with the ISP Program. From my perspective I think it might be productive to have more than just the one mandated student Senator but to have a couple of other students who might be able to give some input particularly if they were from different places across campus. The student who sits on student Senate and is in this committee is very involved but to get input from students who are maybe on Student Gov or a different major it might round it out a little bit so you can see how the ISP effects different types of students.

Senator Welsh - Sure, what about the possibility of working membership of students. I don't know.

Professor Antonucci - That would be interesting.

Senator Welsh - The reason I suggest it is because that group is the place where we envision many of the ideas for changes and policy would come from. The Senate group is involved in sort of putting the stamp of approval and making sure there is public review and things like that.

Senator Antonucci - Immediately I went to the line 1 non-Senate faculty member of the campus community designated by the Provost. I thought oh it's backwards, maybe if it were a campus so Senator Bedell could be that person in this first round and then who knows and that becomes a rotating position that is at-large campus figure rather than an at-large faculty figure because it seems to me that the working group is conceived of or imagined to function more like that of a department. That is to say department with distinct large department with lots of programs subprograms so kind of having that student voice. I think the student voice should be the Senate maybe the revision should have the campus the appointed person be campus wide and not just necessarily faculty.

Senator Stanish - I think that is an excellent suggestion that we certainly welcome as much student involvement as we can. So I think exactly as Senator Welsh said I would suggest just taking it back to the team as feedback and see how we can integrate that in. I think that's wonderful, thank you for expressing your interest. I think we all want students involved in groups we are very thankful to have all of these students here who are extremely involved and passionate about what you do. I am thrilled to hear this so we will definitely send that for consideration thank you. Not to cut that off but other thoughts and ideas?

Senator Fleeger - For someone who is still trying to understand the ISP Program and how it works, I would appreciate perhaps having a more functional definition of what these groups might accomplish. You mention tasks associated of what they might be focused on but I am thinking more of what sort of function would they carry out within the program and also within the campus. That would help me understand what sort of responsibilities the groups would have.

Senator Welsh - I think that over the long run the function of the working group is just to implement the program and the function of the Senate subcommittee is to deliberate when there is a need for new policy or the old policy becomes nonfunctional or if there is a need for some sort of public discussion or something like that. That is sort of the function that I envision or if there are people outside
the working group that say petition and want some sort of modification that would be the Senate subcommittees function. I think the working group is just a group that day to day implements this thing. I think in the short term we have sort of come to the point where there is an understanding that there is a need for more information, there is a perception of a curtain that things are behind. We would like to spend a couple of years getting rid of that perception. Increasing public awareness across the college and getting greater match between existing practice and program has written. Those kinds of things and to make sure the Senate has been involved and deliberated where it's necessary. I hope that clarifies.

Senator Fleeger - I am thinking of in terms of moving forward.

Senator Antonucci - I wanted to say that one of the flaws of this current structure that doesn't exist anymore and what we have tried to work to do, and Senator Welsh was very instrumental in this process, was not making the same mistake, sorry if we're here in 2006, making the same mistakes twice. What you'll see here in some way is a two prong general education delivery system which is reminiscent of the ISPB and the ISPC which were just absolutely indistinguishable from each other. With this program they are distinguishable they are distinct in that the Senate subcommittee is located in a campus wide body. They are not invested in themselves in one space called ISP land. You do have here an administrative what you might want to call a steering committee that involves a faculty or a director and then the coordinators and these people are charged to do just that. Not determine policy, not sort out, but to run the program and then there is a common way of getting materials and information and receiving feedback from the participants in the program. Students themselves. This opens up the dialog which will hopefully end the confusion of Senator Fleeger and others about what's actually going on and what's behind the curtain.

Senator Blatchly - Thank you, I feel like I can move forward from both of the previous comments. I share a little confusion still about exactly how this committee would work, and wanted to bring a couple of specific concerns, serious ones this time, but also I think I want to add my voice to Professor Antonucci voice in suggesting it is a good idea to bring ISP to the level of the Senate somehow. Whether it's this way or some other way but bringing ISP to the level of the Senate is a great idea. Now we are talking about how we do it. My specific concern with this is I think we are possibly making the path of someone proposing a change a little more confusing and also how this is dealt with. Supposing someone comes up with an idea to change some curricular aspect of ISP. It goes to the ISP working group the ISP working group says yes, ok let's bring this to the ISP Senate Committee, and now does the ISP Senate Committee take that curricular thing and send it to the Senate Curriculum Committee? Do you report to the Senate Curriculum Committee or if its changing standards are you in a way reporting to the Standards Committee which I think is appropriate. I think we may have to go a little broader with the reorganization as we think about this. Perhaps curricular issues that have to do with ISP should go through the ISP Committee and not Curriculum. Again, I am thinking out loud here but I worry about people getting very confused as they are already. When you have a program change and you try to coordinate the actions of the Senate Curriculum Committee and Standards Committee you got to go to two places. Better perhaps that people are more likely to have to go to one place and get some fairly coordinated relief for what their problems so I really worry about sort of who this committee reports to and as others say exactly what the charge is.

Senator Welsh - The charge is something we are figuring out. We have considered potential overlap and I guess I would describe it as a preliminary decision of the group so far that we are not interested in moving responsibility away from the Curriculum Committee or the Standards Committee with issues that are very clearly one of either of those that would arise that they would still go to the existing committees responsible for them but it strikes us that there an array of other kinds of issues and big ones and fairly regular ones that still require some sort of discussion and examination. Just as an example, Caps on ISP classes, descriptions of the outcomes those sorts of things that don't really fall into an existing committee structure but that warrant a close examination by a committee that is familiar with the issues.

Senator Antonucci - And, or, but I can't remember which it is better to have some place to go rather than not. Right now there is none because of the structure and the way it is played out and the way that it exists currently. This provides two sites for those who have frustrations, for those who have questions or those who have proposed those changes to move towards. You go through the Senate or through the Director when it's feasible.

Senator Lucey - I was going to suggest as simple for an acronym, the IOC which means ISP Oversight Committee but then this came up and I realized that it sounds as though it will function as kind of a Senate driven program review committee. It is going to have issues that deal with Academic Standards and I don't know how you can do the work without being involved in the curricular process. How could you separate that out from all of these other decisions? So it seems as though the newly adopted IOC would really sort of combine all of that oversight specifically for the ISP Program. So ISP for instance we don't have a review committee anymore but Academic Standards would not be asked it would be the specialized group if it was something that dealt with the ISP. The SCC would only look at department changes, program changes and curricular changes as long as it wasn't ISP. It's a lot of work.

Senator Welsh - It would involve reconfiguring existing charges for existing committees. I think we did not want to give this committee too much work. This is a lot of classes, this is a lot of these kinds of issues nor did we want to overstep boundaries and so for that reason we were thinking about keeping responsibilities of existing committees as is and just creating something that can answer questions that have come up in the past now.
Senator Sapeta - I am wondering if you had any discussions or thoughts about when you add a director position to this and you start reading this kind administrative layer or ISP is this something that may actually become another school? A school of ISP that leads to something much greater. Was there a discussion about that?

Professor Antonucci - In name there is a Director of ISP both on the administrative and kind of a banded faculty position. This would actually locate this labor and this charge into one body in person. So it is not creating a layer. All the kind of managing and administrative that needs to come to this program. I said briars before and I really do mean it there is just a lot of underbrush that needs to be cleared so that students can move through the program as efficiently as they can and the program can move and develop as efficiently as it can. It would have been easy to say that in two semesters we going to get this but this is a four semester project it's two years that's how we are thinking of it.

Senator Stanish - I will say and correct me if I am wrong I think there is a change in title here but I think currently at least the Associate Provost and the faculty or Co-Chairs of the ISPC that is sort of called Director but functionally they don't currently as a director.

Senator Welsh - I think what I envision and I have experienced being Chair as all responsibility and no power and I don't think that we envision much different in this iteration of the term Chair. It's a person that implements a program and make sure things get done but doesn't set policy or move forward in a school kind of way.

Senator Stanish - We do have precedence with a Director in the Honors program, perhaps. Other discussion?

Senator Martin - I think Senator Separta actually raised an interesting question and it wasn't something that I had thought of but now it is something I am thinking of. If you look at sort of the description of this Program Director's full time position certainly an issue for Provost it has the veneer of a Dean position in terms of this kind of description and the assumption is that we don't need a person like that unless you then construct sort of an organization around that particular person. I am not suggesting that this in fact is where the working group is intended to go but it does create the potential or the possibility of it going in that particular direction and if it does there are clearly some issues about how curriculum is overseen in relation to right now for example with the IN, IS, II and IN courses are generally vetted by School Curriculum Committees. In the event you created another school that is essentially an ISP school. Does that then mean that any course designated as an ISP course takes a different route in terms of how it is vetted or how it is overseen? In some ways that drastically changes the way which curricular matters are dealt with on campus. I am not saying necessarily that it is going there but if it happens to go in that direction suddenly a course that has an IS designation or an IN designation may go to a substantially different group by which it goes through the curricular review process.

Senator Welsh - We are not considering that and that is something that I think we are aware of and certainly cautious about. Again, this is a coordinating and implementing structure as introduced and not a governing or policy making structure. The policy still resides in the Senate same as curricular review still resides in the same curricular review process and bodies and standards still exist in standards bodies.

Senator Stanish - Could I make a suggestion to the committee? It may not make sense to write charges for other committees maybe just put down any of these thoughts that you are thinking in terms of this group. It is just your thought we will continue to follow the path but just to make sure that we have that down.

Senator Hix - Senator Welsh you did just respond to what I was thinking about and it seems to me the idea behind the Integrative Studies is that it is generated from the different disciplines so the school and the department and program would need to have oversight of that curriculum. Then there is that other piece of how you are going to approve integrative courses so thinking that Integrative Studies is the basis within other departments and programs and I was just reflecting on that.

Provost Treadwell - I would just to offer before we get to far down the road of concern to all of the faculty on behalf of my office I appreciate deeply the commitment of the faculty with the proposals and I am not sensing that it was your intention in any way to undermine what I think is the true strength of our ISP which is the curricular process. The springing forth from all our disciplines and the interdisciplinary collaborations that we see on campus nor would it be within the resource structure that I can foresee in the next year or two by any stretch that we would create another school to administer a program such as this.

I just want to be very clear for the record that any suggestion to create a school of ISP is not on the horizon in any way from my office or from the Academic Affairs Council or for this body. I don't think that is where this committee was going. I think we need to be cautious about the way the charges are structured so that we continue to seek the power of the curricular committees existing processes which we all feel comfort with and the clarity on policy and transparency could exist to help us move the program forward. For those pieces I am deeply grateful for all the work the body had done but just want to dispel the main concern around the table there is certainly no intention from myself or the office that we would create a separate school. I think it is beyond the scope of where the strength of this program actually exists and would undermine that great strength. Just to be clear moving forward.
Senator Lucey - Just a brief after thought I was just thinking we should stop thinking in terms of Director or Dean and maybe start thinking in terms of Chair or Coordinator. That is somebody being pulled out of faculty to serve and have release time or whatever in some sort of rotating position maybe.

Senator Welsh - That is something we have discussed.

Provost Treadwell - One point of clarification. I like that model I think we have other precedent with the Director of the Honors Program. It is an issue however that we will need to be discussed with the KSCEA. I just want to be clear with regard to process and workload and release time. Any recommendations from this committee will be reviewed at this level and certainly be delivered with consultation so that there is clarity amongst the KSCEA leadership and membership as well so we don't create an unintended consequence for that Director whoever he or she might be. I think it is a very appropriate and that we have parallel structure and precedence on campus that has served us quite well. The curricular programs like Honors. ISP could have the same future.

Senator Stanish - Any other feedback for the discussion team on this? Thank you both for your service on the committee and please pass along the thanks to the entire committee for the work on this. I think it's an excellent place for us to get going to deal with a lot of the other issues. It is very helpful, thank you. That brings us to our next item on the Executive Committee Report in terms of the committee structure for 2013-2014. The SEC does feel that we need to put something in place in the By-Laws to replace the Senators that would formally serve on the AOC. If we leave the By-Laws empty we are going to have a bunch of Senators who are not on a committee and we don't want to do that and will not fit our model. So given what I am hearing from Senator Welsh the desire to get some more input on this proposal before we sort of go forward with a final proposal and I completely support that. I think I will have the SEC work on some maybe general language that will kind of be a placeholder for the Senators that we could update in the fall. I think we will find a way to do that so we do have some sort of group going on with not a whole lot of specifics but that can change. That's my thought unless folks have other ideas.

Senator Welsh - That sounds like a good idea.

Senator Stanish - That brings us to our next item that I wanted to get feedback on from you in terms of our next Senate meeting. We were originally scheduled to meet today which we are as well as next week and that's it for the year. As you can see there are several items that are still ongoing. Because Senator Jean and I were behind on doing the faculty elections those will not be completed next week so that is a large number of Senators that wouldn't be able to attend because they have not been elected yet. Also we are still working on another program review process and not that that is a necessity we thought that it would be nice for the Senate to approve that process this year so we can bring that to closure and have the new process implemented if possible. Also, we need to work on this language for the committee structure so between all of those things we felt next week was just not enough time to get all that work done and looking at the calendar we propose a meeting of Wednesday, May 1st which is the last week of classes. I wanted to get a little feedback from all of you on how you felt about that idea. I noticed the SCC was scheduled to meet then but perhaps we could flip flop some meetings.

Senator Hanrahan - That's the week before finals.

Senator Stanish - That's the week before finals. Not the week of finals we didn't want to do it then. So unless there is no screaming objections. Alright we will go with that change; we have already reserved the space for May 1st. We will update with a meeting request.

The next item on the SEC Report Academic Honesty Policy. Thank you Senator Schmidl-Gagne who remembered that part of the policy itself is that the Academic Honesty Policy should be reviewed every three years. It is written right into the policy. It was last reviewed in 2009-2010, and so it should happen this year. Senator Schmidl-Gagne did go through the document and at least update any name changes. Names of committees had changed; different offices had changed names so she at least updated those so we had accurate names. We didn't change anything of substance there just the names and that is what is included in your packet is the revision to go through and change those editorial type pieces. We wanted to bring that to the Senate for information any discussion and if there is no objection we will at least have that part uploaded to the website as the Academic Honesty Policy as it stands. We were thinking we would charge the ASC in the fall with actually doing the substance of the policy. Any discussion on that?

Senator Stemp - It's a follow up to item number 5 on page 27 and I bring this up because it has current applications for this semester. The feigning illness, the ability to somehow confirm or deny that there is or is not illness seems to be a process that is somewhat subjective and then departments may have policies that they attempt to implement. It is problematic. I don't know if feigning illness occurs or doesn't occur in some of the instances.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - That was designed because faculty were able to find instances where students forged signatures and things. That is there because in a circumstance where it was already proven there wasn't another place to put that. There were a couple of instances where students obtained forms from different doctors and there weren't what they appeared to be.
Senator Stemp - That is more forgery than feigning illness?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Right but altering college documents is separate so if they got some of Gail Zimmerman's stationary and tried to do something that would fall under there.

Senator Blatchly - Would you like an example? We had an instance in one case when someone came back from spring break quite thoroughly tanned but came back late and said well I couldn't come back on time because I was sick. We said well what were sick with and she said Mononucleosis and we said OK give us a note. We got the note and it was on a prescription pad. I think what had happened was this person had taken a prescription Xeroxed on this thing and misspelled the word mononucleosis. We thought that is probably not accurate so we had to call the doctor’s office and they said no no that is the most interesting thing we have heard all day today was this little forgery. It was actually possible to validate in that case that there was a pretty clear forgery of a claimed illness that had no basis in the documentation.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - That was what it was designed to address.

Senator Stemp - Yeah, I understand that and I guess it does get covered in here but there are also circumstances where faculty requests proof of some kind and then there are a series of unintended owner kind of consequences that then erupt because you had requested documentation for illness. Again, I am thinking of a specific example but how you validate or invalidate I think is to a degree problematic. I think the expectation of documentation of some kind is valid for the perspective of faculty member to the institution but when other factors get pulled into it it starts to become entirely much more complex than it should have been in the first place. Without going into the specifics it sometimes is not easy to implement in a way that doesn't turn to be much more work and effort than it warrants in the first place.

Senator Stanish - Senator Lucey has a comment and he may say what I am going to say but I think this is something we can bring to the Academic Standards Committee and they could review the substance of it. Excellent point.

Senator Lucey - Some of it is very simple and it's just that students lied and that has happened to me more than once. You have to a bit of pressure on them in terms of where their grades are going and then it becomes a question of truthfulness and lying and talking about that as an expression that if you lie you don't get credit too for someone else’s on their idea or work and you are supposed to have certain types of behaviors. I would hate to see it go because I think it is important.

Senator Stemp - I am not saying that it needs to go I think maybe there is something of an issue of clarification. Perhaps is there a specific expectation that goes with that in terms of what a faculty member can do?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I think what you are looking at is just a list of possibilities that are there. Maybe that needs to be edited in a different way. I think if you discovered that a student has feigned an illness as Senator Blatchly did then you would go through the normal process. It sounded as if Senator Blatchly was able to have the documentation to attach to the form to give to the Assistant Dean and it could just go through like any other like if you caught student plagiarizing or anything like that. It would be the same but I agree that it could be challenging to get the documentation we need to support a number of things. A lot of times there are hunches that we have and it's hard to find the proof when it comes to some of these issues.

Senator Stemp - Part of it simply the request for the documentation. It is not the actual documentation itself but it is the potential trickledown effect of asking for the documentation in the first place. Illness is an example here and it has it potential pitfalls but others that are problematic are things like deaths in the family. You would end up being Professor Morbid if you request proof when a family member has passed away if it happens to coincide with an exam or a due date for an assignment or something like that. It is not particularly this bullet point but I think there is a slightly larger issue in trying somehow to deal with this in a reasonable way that doesn't somehow to get to be entirely too much work in terms of what the consequential value should be.

Senator Stanish - So really Senator Stemp I hear you talking about discussion maybe perhaps a policy of what sort of documentation you would require for various absences.

Senator Stemp - Yes, on one level that's it and the second is the delivery of that documentation. That there is some sort of knowledge that if you are away for reasons that you are required to provide that documentation if a professor is not necessarily a bad person by hounding you about this issue. If there is more of a blank policy in place that is fairly likely to be understood by faculty and students maybe it alleviates the individual instances again and again and again.

Senator Stanish - So I hear maybe more of a standards issue rather than an absence policy which I believe is a policy in the student handbook I haven't any idea what it says but that maybe another place you want to look.
Senator Lucey - It could very clearly be stated in your syllabus. That becomes the contract. So if you say documentation required and here are examples of excused absences, family emergency, health and that sort of thing. It's a struggle to get and it's a case of whether or not you believe the student or if they show up and says I don't always look at the obituary but as long as it is there and if find you have an offense in theory you could follow through.

Senator Stanish - Thank you. Any other comments on the Academic Honesty Policy? We will charge the ASC with review of that next year.

The last item on the SEC Report we just wanted to give you an update and perhaps get a little bit of feedback for the meeting dates for next year. Many of you are returning not all of you to the Senate next year and you can certainly give us feedback. More or less except for the December, this is the usual way we have done Senate Meetings and basically meet the second Wednesday of every month during the academic year avoiding spring break if that happens to fall strangely but what we did look at was the December meetings.

We had a couple of issues this year some of which I am surprised hadn't come up before. It was really a two prong thing so first of all with the first week of December is when the NEASC meetings are usually held in Boston so our Provost, whether it is Provost Treadwell or any other Provost is usually away attending that and often in the December meeting lots of curriculum proposals are coming forward and it's important to have the Provost at that Senate meeting. We found it difficult to juggle around the NEASC meetings to allow the Provost to attend the meeting when we are talking about curriculum.

Second of all what arose this year and I was surprised it didn't arise earlier was the final exam schedule. As you all recall by having the Senate meeting at our usual 4-6 Wednesday time during final exam week caused some conflicts because if you are taking a class Wednesday at 4-6 your exam time was actually Thursday at 3:30 so you may have had another exam Wednesday at 3:30 and I know that that has happened to several Senators this year.

We wanted to try and solve both of those problems and we also realized looking back at the past couple of years there wasn't always a need for two December meetings. I think historically that went back to when those were really the last meetings for student curriculum before we moved to an online catalog. Lots of Senators are shaking their heads, I remember getting these giant photocopied packets full of all curricular proposals and we would be for 3 hours in the last two weeks of the December going through them but then we would be done with curriculum. We have moved away from that and little bit more like a continuous cycle now so it seems like we could get away with one December Senate meeting. Our suggestion was to hold it on reading day still at the 4:00 time there is no exams going on reading day because there are other responsibilities that are happening that day but that was the best solution we could come up with and we certainly welcome feedback and other suggestions.

Senator Bedell - The only question that I have is would it potentially post a problem for exams that start at 6 on Monday?

Senator Stanish - We did look at that and yes they start at 6:00 and you are absolutely right. In our By-Laws the Senate is to adjourn by 6pm unless we vote to extend that time. I suppose there is a possibility that we could vote to extend and then there would be an exam that started at 6:00. Certainly Senators would be welcomed to leave if they had an exam at 6:00 and maybe a little before 6:00 so you could get there on time so there is a little bit there. I don't know how many exams we actually have at that time Monday nights at 6:00 I don't know the numbers if there is many it is very few. The chances are of that being a conflict I suppose there is a slight possibility of that. We didn't want to start at 6 instead of 4:00 because that was my original concern because if they started at 4:00 then I would really be worried.

Senator King - Is there a possibility to move the time up on reading day so it would start at 12:00pm and finish up 2:00pm because when there are no classes at all I don't know what faculty have.

Senator Stanish - We could certainly entertain that. I was not really tied to 4:00 although there are two reasons why we picked 4:00. One was to keep it consistent so we all remember to show up at 4:00 and suddenly we throw a different time in that is not the greatest reason I think we could handle the change and we can remind ourselves and get over it. The other is that we were thinking if we had work towards the end of the day it still gives a whole day for students and faculty to meet and students to study and faculty to be in offices and be available for students rather than chopping it up in the middle of the day. I would really be interested in hearing from students about how you use that day. If the middle of the day meeting time would fit your schedule better we can certainly entertain that possibility. I know Senator King will be hanging out in the Math Building a lot on Reading day.

Senator Lucey - More than anything it seems to more a question of the quorum and so the balance would be potentially how many student representatives versus how many faculty representatives because I always teach at 2:00 in the Wednesday block which has the final at 3:30-5:30 and I have missed lots of Senate meetings as a result of that so I think if it's the quorum being compromised then we do have a real problem.

Senator Stanish - Right, we did have poor attendance but we were pretty close. We had to count so I think that Wednesday 4:00 time is one we want to avoid for that very reason.
Senator Lucey - But in terms of shifting it you are potentially freeing up all of those faculty members.

Senator Stanish - That's right

Senator Lucey - It's just a numbers games that's all I'm saying. A number of Senators could potentially be missing for very valid reasons.

Senator Stanish - Senator King Do you feel students in general whether personally or the future for us would have more of a conflict on Reading Day at 4:00 than noon or is it to just get things done?

Senator King - To me, personally I would say a two hour break would be nice because if I am studying all morning but then there are others that would say they want to study straight through and not be interrupted. But for me I would say that I wouldn't mind coming in at noon for this but that's just me.

Senator Bedell - I guess I am a little concerned and I know that obviously Senators could leave if they had a 6:00 exam and but doing it right before the 6:00 exam so I don't remember what the 4:00-6:00 Wednesday class final time is because usually finals are back to back like that so I wonder if we either would be leave the final after that time and I don't know what day of the week that falls on.

Senator Stanish - We did look at that as well so if you do have a class on Wednesday 4:00-6:00 which none of do because we are here but the final exam is scheduled for Thursday 3:30-5:30. We did consider that as well and again we continue to consider that. My concern with that is that it gets later in the week and so my fear is that students would be leaving already if their exams are done. Many many exams are finished by Thursday and there start to be less and less students on campus. Again, it's a different day of the week and a different time than we would expect so other folks may accidentally schedule other meetings not remembering the Senate is at that time. So that was my concern but it is a consideration.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - If we are concerned about hitting that 6:00 time we could do 3:00-5:00.

Senator Stanish - We could

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - It would still be late in the day.

Senator Stanish - We could and it would give an hour.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I think I could manage or the Secretary could manage to send out a few reminders.

Senator King - I know we all have Wednesdays 4:00-6:00 free for the final for that period Thursday at 3:30 but are there any Monday or Tuesday classes that are taking place where they're final would be the Wednesday 4:00-6:00 slot?

Senator Stanish - Yes. So if you have a class Monday Wednesday at 2:00 your final is Wednesday at 3:30. That is a conflict that we ran into this year.

Senator Lucey - How many of you have a final at 6:00 on Monday this semester?

Senator Bedell - We have at least one.

Senator Stanish - We can certainly look at some data and find out how many classes are offered and potentially couldn't attend.

Parliamentarian Weed - May I have courtesy of the floor?

Senator Stanish - Sure

Parliamentarian Weed - This is really out of place I'm sure but it seems to me that we reserved Reading Day for reading or for academic pursuits. We can't schedule an athletic event and I think what we are doing is watering it down and taking faculty away from the students. I am not sure we should be doing that but that is just me.

Senator Stanish - How would everyone feel about a quick little poll? We could put together a quick online poll you could kind of give a preference and feedback. Would people be willing to do something like that? I know its one more thing to fill up your inbox. We could also give you some data on the number of classes that happen at certain times and you could make an informed decision based on number of Senators and looking at number of classes. Any other thoughts on that? Will try and make the final decision hopefully
by our next Senate meeting so we can plan for the fall semester and we can schedule those. Unless there are any other questions or discussion that concludes the Senate Executive Committee Report and we will move on to the Academic Overview Committee.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly - Given the hour I am going to move right into our business. We have our two final reviews to present to you. The first one is the American Studies Review. We went through the entire process and were visited by our outside reviewers, they wrote a report. A little bit of feedback from the program and the Dean and have a written report to reflect all of that documentation. It was approved by the full committee on March 22 and you have seen a copy of the AOC report attached to the Senate documentation.

**Motion:** The AOC moves that its report on the review of the American Studies Program be accepted and approved by the Senate.

Senator Blatchly - By tradition I would like to ask a member of the subcommittee to present the major strengths and recommendations from this and American Studies is Senator Sapeta. I am going to turn it over to him for presentation.

Senator Sapeta - The external review process was also efficient and resulted in a very positive report. The program is very healthy with a growing student body and diverse faculty with wide ranging experience. One concern that the External Reviews stated and I want to mention revolves around the lack of faculty members for that program and I am going to read a little from the report of that study and talk about the recommendations. “At present there are five tenure-track faculty members who teach core courses in American Studies. Professor Michael Antonucci has a 67 percent American Studies appointment and a 33 percent appointment in English. Professor Richard Lebeaux holds a 50 per cent appointment with both American Studies Program and English Department. Professor Patricia Pedroza is 67 per cent in Women’s and Gender Studies and 33 percent in American Studies. Professors Mark Long and Sally Joyce also serve as Core Faculty. Much of the course offerings for American Studies majors are provided by affiliate faculty, both tenure-track and adjunct, from various departments. As you can see Professor Antonucci is the Chair of the program however he is not fulltime in the program and this was a situation in both studies actually presented to us. Our recommendations are as follows and there are five of them: 1) The College should consider the needs of American Studies when tenure-track lines become available. 2.) The College should consider options for how best to fulfill the service obligations of the program. Currently, these are done mostly by the Chair of American Studies. Options include -- but are not limited to -- making the Chair of American Studies a 100% American Studies appointment and/or making release time for chairs an issue at the next faculty contract negotiations 3.) More effective communication between American Studies and appropriate departments is needed, including larger discussions on when cross-listing courses can be mutually beneficial for various programs on campus 4.) The program should develop a robust plan for faculty development, including the possibility of overload banking and better management of service requirements 5.) The program should consider enhanced student support for the program’s IT needs and other tasks. That is basically the report.”

Senator Stanish - Thank you, any discussion on the American Studies Program report?

Provost Treadwell - Just one question what is overload banking as you describe it.

Senator Sapeta - For example the contract requires 12 credit hours in one semester and 12 in another one. You could do a swapping for example you could have 16 in one semester and 8 in another one. That would allow you to maybe use your time in a different way. Its only part of the solution but it is actually happening on campus in some departments.

Provost Treadwell - Yes, I just wanted to make sure thank you.

Senator Martin - I have a question on a paragraph on page 42 the second to last paragraph. I didn't understand how the paragraph was written could you elaborate on it informally. Specifically, I don't understand the passage that says another troubling point is made in the self-study: “faculty members are senior enough to say no to chores and tasks that are necessary to maintaining the program’s viability, including, organizational efforts with students, promotional efforts during orientation, advising, co-curricular initiatives, assessment, trans-departmental outreach, and administrative communication and collaboration”. Then it goes on to elaborate that the situation is likely the result of faculty being spread thin by their joint appointments. I guess I am not following.

Senator Sapeta - This quote was directly taken from the self-study and was not addressed by any of the other review committee so we felt it was important to actually include that in the report. The five people who are in the department but are in different departments they may be spread way to thin to actually be able to help the Chair with all the usual chores that are required and some of them being more in one department than the other department. This was our way to underline and underscore that there is a resource need for more time and faculty members to do this work.

Senator Martin - Can I ask to clarify the question?

Senator Stanish - Please
Senator Martin - Is the implication that the faculty are short changing American Studies in favor of their other commitments?

Senator Sapeta - I don't know it was not in the report but the quote was directly in the report and so we found it interesting that it wasn't responded to by or addressed by either the Dean or by the reviewers.

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion?

**Vote:** Motion carries

Senator Blatchly - Item two is a Film Studies Program Review to present. Again visited by outside reviewers in December and the time of receipt of the report from them and we have also received some communication from the Dean and the program and we incorporated that in the AOC Report which is attached to the Senate documentation.

**Motion:** The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Film Studies Program be accepted and approved by the Senate.

Senator Blatchly - Again in standard fashion here I will ask Senator Hix to present the summary and recommendations from this report.

Senator Hix - I did want to point out the review of the self-study for the Film Department was very lengthy and we thought extremely thorough and extremely thoughtful. We were also extremely impressed with the external reviewers who were at a high level of technological expertise and showed a lot of professionalism in their review.

The self study states that the Film Department offers a B.A. in Film Studies and students select one of two options: Film Production and/or Film Criticism. The program’s approach and core considerations require film majors to immerse themselves in the reciprocal relationship between these complementary areas of study. The external reviewers noted the film department has quickly become one of the largest and most desirable majors on campus. It also fills both a state and regional niche in providing a relatively affordable and strong media arts education alongside a robust liberal arts curriculum.

The Film Studies Department at Keene State College is a vital and unique program with promising aspirations to develop a comprehensive, practical, and engaged plan of studies integrating film production, film studies and social awareness. With intellectual breadth, the curriculum incorporates the fundamental concerns of a liberal arts education into a thoughtful, media specific interplay with film theory and filmmaking. The self study points out that: the film program embodies the mission of Keene State College by connecting critical thinking, creative production, and public service. According to the Keene State College Factbook, between 2006 and 2011 the program more than quadrupled in size, growing from 42 majors in 2006 to 180 in 2011.

The Film Studies Department is proud of the work of its five tenured/tenure-track faculty members. The external reviewers concurred, indicating that “it's talented, accomplished, and dedicated young core faculty” is one of the programs most salient virtues. Film Studies students have a strong sense of community that demonstrates mutual cooperation and participation in which they assist one another with filmmaking projects and become involved in extracurricular student organizations.

The Film Society screens 35mm films for the campus and local community. Keene Television has students producing TV programming for the local community and recording campus sports and academic events. The department makes clear that it holds a unique position in providing a balanced education in Film Studies as well as being a unique repository for rare and historically significant films. It is only one of two such departments in the state of New Hampshire. After construction of the new Visual Media Arts Center, they feel that the department and its programs will become of even more import and significance to the local community through such events as continuous film programming and organizing screening and appearances by filmmakers. There is a clear need for more non-contingent faculty lines and to convert a valuable and highly contributing adjunct faculty to a 3-year clinical contract line. The service and advising load for current non-contingent faculty is unsustainable and additional student advising support should be made available until new faculty are in place. Regular reviews of teaching should be implemented for all adjunct and tenure track teaching staff.

The equipment management process and associated staff responsibilities should be completely redefined. The vending of production equipment should be closely coordinated with course needs and course rosters to improve student access to production equipment. A standard of professional production tools, including digital equipment, and related practices must be established. In addition, the creation of a staffed Media Infrastructure/Digital Warehouse must be given full consideration. The Film Studies faculty members should continue envisioning their space needs in the new VMAC including such issues as extended access and the concept of a Communal Media Lab to promote collaborative and interdisciplinary learning opportunities for students across the campus.
A KSC Film Archive should be considered in order to provide a repository to house this important collection which would also provide an area of study for students. The department should develop a plan that balances the essential curricular concerns: Film Theory, Film History, Motion Picture Production, and liberal arts/humanist values, and the subsequent efforts to mold, evolve, and expand the curriculum. The plan should include “a unified pedagogical experience” for first-year students and a capstone experience for each individual student. The film faculty are urged to implement their suggestion to cross-train their Production faculty. The department should consider planning for a BFA component which includes developing more intensive, higher level courses. The department needs a website presence for the program including the achievement highlights of current students and alumni. I have summarized a lot. It was a wonderful study.

Senator Stanish - Thank you Senator Hix. Any discussion on the Film Studies Report?

Senator Darby - I have a question based on the statement under facilities and there may not be the answer considering the recent budget constraints but what is the latest on the VMAC and when it is being built? Where is it in queue or is there a queue?

Provost Treadwell - Thank you for the question as you are all aware that we under a master planning process right now and there are three options that are being discussed at the public sessions to gather feedback and include various versions of how the VMAC or the creative processes of the departments effected by the VMAC and its virtual conception will be addressed. So it is in existence and in with regard to placeholder or process we also had a capital request that is pending at the University Systems and this is part of our biannual budget request for capital infusement for the VMAC project. That placeholder has been in existence since last spring and continues to be carried forward but it is part of the state budget process that we all know. So it is a placeholder and there is financial commitment and also master planning commitment but the ultimate decision will be part of this master planning deliberation that is underway right now very actively and will continue over the next few months but it is a key capital investment and commitment for the campus. Does that answer?

Senator Darby - Yes

Senator Stanish - Thank you. Any other discussion on the Film Studies report?

Senator Darby - On the same point on page 46, under facilities the first sentence, A Visual Media Arts Center (VMAC) is planned to be built in the near future and faculty from film, art, music, theater arts and creative writing need to start collaborative discussions and I would submit to say that this is a little unfair. I think that there have been conversations about this in the past. We haven't had architects here but there has been a process that all these programs I think did participate in. Just to be fair I think conversations started to maybe to develop the composition might be a fairer way to say that. Thank you

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion on the report?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Blatchly - Really just had a third item and that’s an item of thanks. As you see Senator Hix and Senator Sapeta presenting the results there is really the tip of the iceberg. There is a lot of work that is behind that not only by our committee but of course by the programs and Dean's involved in the process to carefully review and what they do to produce the self-studies so there is an enormous amount of work in that. There is a commitment also by the college to do something about this. To take the recommendations that we have made and try to process them. There will be recommendations both from the Keene side and outside the college try to access those and to the best extend possible make an action plan to address various suggestions within the program. It's an enormous amount of work and it's work that has been done for the last decade or so and so there are a lot of ghosts of the AOC members past also in the room here and I want to sort of thank everybody that has been involved in this process because it is quite a big deal of work. Thank you to everyone, thank you.

Senator Stanish - I want to add my thanks as well. Thank you Senator Blatchly for chairing the AOC the past few years. I want to thank the others as well and to all the members of the AOC this year and in the past years. I agree there are many around and extended thanks to those on campus too. I think too as the committee ride off into sunset, I do not think at all that it's a reflection that we don't value the committees work but I think we value the committees work very much and that the committee has done such an excellent job over the last 10 years of developing this process you almost put yourself out of job. We can now take these processes and have them handled more in an administrative way because they are functioning so well and use the Senate's time to look at other issues. Thank you for all your hard work on the AOC over many many years we really do appreciate it. Any other questions for the AOC? We will move on the Academic Standards.

* Academic Standards Committee

Senator Lucey - There is nothing to report.
Senator Darby - Since our last meeting as a Senate the SCC met and reviewed IIGEOL 340 course, this proposal was not approved by the SCC in an earlier meeting, but the proposal was referred back to committee by the full Senate at its most recent meeting.
Following a discussion with the proposal sponsor (Dr. Edward Pokras) and a lengthy debate among committee members, the proposal to add IIGEOL 340 was again not approved by the SCC by a vote of 3-3-0-1. IIGEOL 340 is titled The Environment of Adventure. The vote again reflects a divided committee opinion about the proposal. Concerns about the proposal include: 1) the SCC is uncertain about the criteria by which II course proposals are to be evaluated; 2) the course has been successfully offered three times as an INGEOL course (INGEOL 399), and it’s unclear to SCC why the course is to be designated as an II interdisciplinary course; 3) SCC is uncertain whether the course meets the rigor of its proposed upper-level designation.

The next item is something to be amended since we have moved our meeting but the SCC began taking up the issue of revisions to the curriculum guidelines, and will finalize the revisions at its final meeting of the academic year. At the present time, the SCC has no plans to overhaul the curriculum guidelines; we will undertake revisions that provide additional clarity and guidance to the campus community on the following issues: curriculum development; the approval process for all curriculum proposals; and clear, open, and collegial communication among academic programs at the college. Our next meeting is next Wednesday.

Senator Stanish - Great, thank you. Any comments or questions on the SCC report?

Senator Blatchly - Does the committee have a sense that the sponsor of the IIGEOL course has a clearish path to correct where you perceive as a deficit in the proposal. I am kind of curious and maybe this is just my curiosity but I am just wondering where this meets the sponsor of the proposal if they have an avenue to correct this. It seems like they could go in a number of different directions. They could continue to offer it as an INGEOL course so I am just curious where that conversation is.

Senator Darby - It is my understanding that the proposal sponsor is in advisement with his home program, Geology.

Senator Blatchly - Thank you

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion? Seeing none that will conclude the committee report.

VI. New Business
Nothing to report

VII. Adjournment  5:42pm

Respectfully submitted – Cheryl Martin
Minutes
for the 429th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, May 1, 2013
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:06

II. Roll Call
Excused: Senator Hix, Senator Prosper and Senator Welch

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 428th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Discussion - Senator Sapeta - If there is a chance to correct my name on page 9 at the bottom.

Senator Stanish - Thank you, any other changes or discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Lucey – I just have a quick question, do we have any graduating seniors?

Senator Stanish - Good question, thank you and good luck.

VI. Subcommittee Reports

• Executive Committee

Senator Stanish - The meeting notes are [SD 12/13-40] which is on page 22 in your packet. We will begin with a motion dealing with our Parliamentarian. Thank you to Senator Robinson who has agreed to serve as our Parliamentarian for this meeting in addition to role as Senator.

Motion: The SEC moves that Andy Robinson as Parliamentarian for the remainder of the spring 2013 semester

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish - We will now move on to By-law revision that we had brought forward at the last meeting and did a slight edit to about Senate Courtesy, as you can see in the next senate document on page 24 [SD 12/13-41]. We are talking about senate discourse in the first piece and Senator Martin had a few suggestions for an edit last time and I think we incorporated those.

Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate By-laws Article VI Parliamentary Rules, C. Floor Procedure, 2. Courtesy be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-41] be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish - We just wanted to give you an update on December Senate meeting that we have been talking about. Thank you to the Senate Secretary for putting together a survey about when people think it would be best to hold the December Senate meeting. Thank you to all that filled out that survey. I believe it is still open and if you would like the chance to fill that out please do so. I did it and it took me 5 minutes. It doesn't take very long at all to fill that out. We have taken a preliminary look at the results and it does not seem to be a uniform consensus but we will try to piece through this and make a decision about when the December Senate meeting will be. Our next piece we talked quite a bit about the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Team. Senator Jean, would you like to talk a little about this?

Senator Jean - Sure, basically what has happened in our ISP meetings is there has really been no consensus in our group. We had proposed that there be a Director for the ISP program and this particular Director would be the Director of an ISP council. The council would consist of various members, the II Coordinator, the IQL Coordinator and the ITW Coordinator. There would be a faculty member from each of the different schools. There would be a Library Liaison and there would be the Assessment Coordinator. It would basically be a representation from the campus for this particular council. We weren't quite ready to make that recommendation to the Senate and so when I brought this up to the SEC basically a compromise was reached and you can sort of read that in here. What they had suggested instead of a Director because this has been going on for a long time as you all know so we really want to start pulling the ISP Program together so the compromise was that there would be two Co-Chairs and not a Director beginning in the fall including an administrator and again a faculty member. The rest of the committee would pretty much be what our ISP Facilitation
and Discussion group had agreed on. The ISP Facilitation and Group Discussion Committee will be meeting with the SEC on the 7th of May to talk about these proposed changes and definitely this will go out. The Provost has agreed to put this out to the entire faculty. It will go to faculty again the transparency because we really need it for this particular group. I think that was one of our main concerns in our committee was the communication piece. There needs to much better communication regarding ISP and the transparency. Before I sign off here I would like to thank Mike Welsh and Mike Antonucci for speaking for me as I was not able to be here last week. Mike is there anything else that you would like to say about that?

Senator Welsh - I apologize I have taken the Senate Agenda package and read it quickly the day of and a little bit the day before. There is a piece of the report that I think I would like to ask about and that is in the report it says the support for the creation of a Senate ISP Committee among our group is mixed. My impression was that we all feel that ISP or that ISP Gen Ed Senate committee is a decent idea and where the difficulty was was the composition and the charge. The charge did overlap with the charge of the existing committees and those kinds of things. Where we were having difficulty was those details and it is in that that we were not ready to make a proposal to the Senate at this point. The idea of the Senate having a committee, a committee responsible for the ISP which I understood our group was comfortable with that.

Senator Jean - Could you repeat the last part?

Senator Welsh - The idea of the Senate having a committee that is responsible for ISP.

Senator Jean - I think there was some dissension.

Senator Stanish - I will say this was my take on the report that Senator Jean gave, and I will take the credit for what is written here. This is why I think it would be very, very helpful to meet with the group on the 7th. This is exactly why the SEC isn't rushing I think to institute an ISP Senate Committee. Personally, I like the idea and in support of the idea, but I don't want to go on my personal feeling. I want to make sure we do this thoughtfully and carefully and the best way forward. Absolutely there are ideas still on the table but we just didn't want to rush through it right now.

Senator Jean - I felt that every single member of the group is totally committed to the ISP program. I think there were issues which is why we really were not, I feel, able to come up with something absolute. We had seven charges that were put to this group and we barely got to do the first one and were able to come up with some type of governance that we thought would work for this ISP Council. When I say disagreements, it wasn't so much arguing it's just that there were different opinions on the committee that did not allow us to come up with a definite plan.

Senator Welsh - I would go along with that.

Provost Treadwell - I think I would just add that as we discussed this at the SEC, and we really wanted a chance to hear from the full committee, to work over the course of the summer on a charge statement, on membership as recommended by the committee, and to bring before the Senate next year a proposal for the council, a proposal for the recommendation and then guidance with the Senate around what those steps may be. Let's not rush in to solve during the last two weeks of the semester but in fact ensuring deliberate discussion and then making sure that there is transparency and clear communication back to the Senate at our first meeting in the fall. So that we continue to move it forward and I think that the report as Senator Jean presented to us was quite compelling to say that there were fantastic ideas on the table and what that broad agreement with regard to the council and how that work can continue. I think the goal here is to have a deliberate conversation and come back to the full faculty before the summer begins with what the next steps would be and then to the full Senate with regard to the charge that we'll develop over time this summer. It's not ended, it's just beginning and this is the bridge.

Senator Stanish - I would reiterate another piece that I didn't put explicitly in the notes. Any reconfigured structure of the Integrative Studies Program Council would come to the Senate for vote. We have voted on that structure several times. That will continue, as well as the charge. What I would really like to see is an explicit statement in the charge of how other pieces of the ISP come to the Senate, even within the existing structure that we already have now. Some of the debate that we have had this year, new outcomes what is our models for teaching. Those things could come to the Senate next year. Even without an ISP committee next year it would come to the existing structure so I would really like to see that as part of the resolve.

Senator Gianno - The reason for not having the ISP Committee on the Senate or at least make a space for it? The reasons for exactly why it might not be on the Senate?

Senator Jean - There was a lot of discussion in our group. The issues are policies that might come up to this ISP Council. They were concerned that it would overlap with the SCC and the AOC. In other words what would this subcommittee do if many of the issues are really curricular or standards based decisions? It was just a discussion. We weren't ready to answer those questions.
Senator Welsh - That is precisely my memory too. It wasn't a discussion about whether it is good to have an ISP committee but it was a discussion of what is the charge and how can that charge be structured in such that it doesn't overlap with existing standing committees and their current responsibilities.

Senator Stanish - Other discussion? I think that was the lack of a clear charge even in the minds of the SEC was part of our hesitation with moving forward quickly with a committee that wouldn't have a very clear charge right away. It may be confusing for that committee, it may be confusing for the Senate, it may be confusing for the entire campus body and so we didn't want to add to that confusion and rush to something that maybe wouldn't work as well as it could. We would rather have it work well. Are there any other questions or discussion on that?

That brings us to the next point of what do we do with our committee structure? We have already voted in last year’s Senate that the AOC will no longer exist as of July 1st so we have seven Senators who would normally have sat on that committee. There are many many options, and an option that we had talked about throughout the year in SEC, although maybe not exactly in this way, is this idea that there are academic policies on the campus, some of which come to the Senate sometimes through the ASC sometimes through the SEC and some which don't really come to the Senate. There is confusion about what the Senate should consider and what it shouldn’t. So an idea that we had was to create an Academic Policy Committee that would be distinct from the Standards Committee. That is the next item in [SD 13/14-41]. At the moment I would just like to bring that forward for discussion and hear what people think about that as an idea of itself and also in conjunction with the idea of moving forward with an ISP committee eventually how would that play in. All those pieces are welcome. So any discussion.

Senator Martin - I think there are three considerations that we are dealing with simultaneously and I think we need to keep them as distinct as possible. From least important to most important having seven unassigned Senators seems to be weighing on this more than it need to. We don't need to try to construct a committee to give these Senators a place to land administratively. The first and second concerns in terms of priority have to do the fact that I can't actually understand what the distinction between academic policy and academic standards would be in practice. Very often policy is standard, policy is regulation and the substance of policy takes its meaning from the way that implementation of policy is specified in some kind of written regulations and practiced in some kind of body of experience. My concern is that this Senate this year, and next year if we are contemplating an Academic Policy Committee, clarify what the distinctions would be between curricular matters, standards and policy. The final consideration we are simultaneously thinking about Integrative Studies and the review of the review. We do not have yet have in our hands the report of the committee that has spent a year engaged in this analysis the seven plus charges, and I think it would be important for us before we make a brand new committee on the Senate that might take over some of the tasks of Integrative Studies to have the full report in our hands with time to digest it, discuss it before we construct a new committee in the Senate. I will be responding to the SEC's motion that we adopt a standing committee. I make the motion moving to table until fall semester 2013.

Senator Stanish - We are discussing at the moment.

Provost Treadwell - Just to offer a few thoughts in response to Senator Martin. The distinction between the policy and the standards committee are outlined on page 25 in the packet. Part of the genesis behind this idea is that there are some very timely issues the travel policy, the building access policy and some other issues that genuinely I have deep concern that the Senate is not engaged in some of those deliberations. This was a process by which policies that are created by the institution that have impact on the academic life of the campus would have a process by which it would have a committee to review and approve any changes to those or improvements to them. I will charge a committee this summer to try to look at more pragmatic policy with regard to travel and building access but I would like whatever that recommendation to be to come before the Senate before approved. So part of the genesis behind this proposal was to create a committee for next year that would attend to issues related to campus policy that impact the academic experience on campus in similar ways. What we discussed at the SEC is that these committees that we create could also be changed over the course of next year. We could attend to some of the critical issues, such as the issues of academic honesty, travel and building access. Those would fill the early work of this new committee. But as we were to meet with the task force and charge the ISPC for next year, work would be done to pick up where the discussion group has left off, work to advance the seven charges that were offered, and then report back to the Senate for deliberation during the next academic year to determine structure with a full charge. That was really the stage and the concept behind it. So the timeliness of attention to some of these important issues certainly are given the time necessary, but that the Senate is consulted at all steps when we finalize committee structure. The Policy committee was really to help attend to some and the concept behind it. So the timeliness of attention to some of these important issues certainly are given the time necessary, but that was the stage back to the Senate for deliberation during the next academic year to determine structure with a full charge. That was really the stage.

Senator Hanrahan - Because it is possible that this might be a temporary committee would it make more sense to make it an Ad Hoc committee just for next year until the ISP decision has been brought forth for a vote?

Senator Stanish - I think that is definitely a possibility.
Senator Welsh - If I may that would increase my comfort level enormously. A one year Ad Hoc Committee whose permanent charge is yet to be determined per discussions that we would be having during the year among other things. One other area of concern and this is just a note the new Policy Committee is most like is the Standards Committee and the Committee's whose turf or whose tasks this committee would be taking. Many of them are currently delegated to the Standards Committee by the Executive Committee when they come. It strikes me that I have been on the Standards Committee this year and it has been a wonderful experience, we have never met. I wonder if we necessarily need to list an array of tasks for the new Policy Committee. Or do we just leave these and give the Ad Hoc one year Policy Committee charges that the SEC chooses as it meets and sees things.

Senator Stanish - I am writing that down.

Senator Lucey - Chair of the not so busy ASC which has been quite wonderful. Since nothing was really handed down there were no pressing issues. I have always thought, and I think I have mentioned this maybe in an email toward the end, we need bylaws of some type. We are very impressed with what the SCC drew up here, but that doesn't exist for the ASC. What exactly does the ASC do? Maybe this is that moment to begin to have that conversation. It always seemed like a jumble with a lot of varied different things and sort of pulling apart of well this really belongs to all those frantic emails from Tom Richard versus those things that potentially reside in the Provost's Office. I do see there is a sense of separation. It made sense to me in the first read. I don't know if it is going to stick that way, but I think the dividing up of that potential work and defining it within bylaws would be a really great task for the future.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Part of our discussion about these committees and workload was that one of the things we still need to do from the time to graduation strategies is that we still need to take a look at all the programs and gateways and those sorts of things and we have never done that systematically. I think part of the idea of separating this was because that task is a daunting task. To look through every program and compile entry and exit and all of the other gateways that exist and try to make sense of it all in some way and I don't even know what that means. I do know that it is something that we committed to the Board of Trustees that we would do and we haven't yet. So I think that was part of the idea behind this. We also need to review the Academic Honesty Policy; maybe it's a big task, maybe it's not. There's probably a couple of calendar things that need to be looked at. The travel policy, the room access policy that seemed like that was a fairly significant amount of workload in and of itself amongst other things that might come up as we look at curriculum. Yes, this was a quiet year, but we were thinking next year would be quite busy.

Senator Stanish - Other discussion or thoughts? I am thinking about how to go forward and I am wondering if I could ask our new Parliamentarian. I am thinking back to Senator Martin's first point that was the least important point and I do agree with that, do we need to assign these seven Senators? I am wondering if we did nothing and left the Senator's unassigned at the moment, would we be violating our bylaws. Moving forward we could make the motion as it stands, but I am hearing there are other suggestions that we could attempt to amend the motion, or we could do nothing and send it back to the SEC and ask them to continue to think about this.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Just to look at this the way we wrote the motion for the next Senate meeting, which is where we would actually vote on it. We left it so we could edit the motion or the text of the committees here, and approve whatever we leave this meeting with in the next meeting, the 430th meeting.

Senator Lucey - Can we vote to violate?

Senator Stanish - We can vote to suspend our bylaws.

Senator Schmidl-Gage - We can, we can do that.

Senator Stanish - Yes, if we need to.

Provost Treadwell - The one thing that I would offer is that if there is the ability to conceptualize the idea of an Ad Hoc Committee and give the authority to the SEC to develop a charge that would come forward with a narrow purpose, then we could easily as we go through next year. We can then move and create an ISP Senate Committee, if that is the will of the Senate and the Facilitation team and the ISPC, as we work through next year. This buys us space and the ability to review entry and exit criteria. Just to put a fine point on that, we have a number of variable admissions criteria and it has created difficulties with regard to student admission and student registration. So it is creating an impact, and I think the discussion of the Standards Committee next year focused on that issue as well. This will consume a tremendous amount of discussion, so this would give space for that.

Senator Welsh - I entirely endorse that and I am a terrible motion imaginary on the fly but let me offer something up. Where it says D under proposed revision on page 25 the one year interim academic policy committee and the description could remain the same basically the description of the committee is charged by the SEC which is what we are looking for. That would specify this item D is in existence for one year and shall be replaced by something more permanent to be determined.

Senator Stanish - We could do that. That would certainly work for me. Any other thoughts on that?
Senator Blatchly - You would probably want to make sense about next year’s Chair.

Senator Stanish - Yes. Can I ask a different question on the proposal just to get some feedback? In addition to creating the committee, we also attempted, as Senator Lucey pointed out, to clarify the charges although I think there are many things that are still being worked on and I agree. But in addition to that we attempted to think about the membership. We did add an ex-officio member who isn't currently in the current structure. A representative from the Registrars’ office would serve as ex-officio on the Academic Standards Committee. That's a change and I wanted to hear feedback from folks on that. In my experience in the Academic Standards Committee, Senator Brendan Deneny served for a long time and he sort of served that function just because he happened to be a Senator assigned to that committee but it wasn't written in the bylaws. I wanted to get some feedback on a potential Academic Policy Committee ex-officio member. The idea is for a Provost appointee as ex-officio since so many of these policies are coming out of Academic Affairs.

Senator Darby - Just a real quick look at the Senate By-laws. I don't see anything that necessarily states that every Senator has to be assigned to a standing committee so an Ad Hoc Committee might be a consideration.

Senator Stanish - Thank you

Senator Darby - The question came up and I don't think there would be a need to suspend the By-laws at all.

Parliamentarian Robinson - As Parliamentarian I agree that there is nothing in the By-laws that I can see that states that every Senator needs to be assigned.

Senator Stanish - Thank you

Senator Martin - I would just like to say that if there were an Ad Hoc Committee and if it were sunsetted with a one year term of existence, I would support that as an amendment to the proposal. My concern was from my inability to distinguish standards from policy practice. I strongly suspect that a year from now we will be talking about an Academic Standards and Policy Committee and then a standalone Integrative Studies Policy Committee or something like that. I didn't want the Policy Committee to become a repository of all things ISP.

Senator Blatchly - Can I just ask a question about why things didn't get to the committee? There are a number of reasons that matters are not picked up by a committee, say as the Senate for example, there is no such committee. That's what this seems to address. Or people are kind of standing around waiting for someone to give them something. So I was trying to look through the charge of the committee to see if there was some clarity about how proactive the committee could be. In other words, are they supposed to go looking for work? Are they supposed to wait for the SEC to give them something? What is the sense from your expectations out of your conversations and then we can take a look and see if that matches the language.

Senator Stanish - That is an excellent question and that is a question that is continues to be asked through the Academic Standards Committee as well. I agree we need to answer that for either of the committees.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Some work of the Academic Standards Committee comes from the curriculum proposals as they come in. The rest yes, should be charged to them. I think when we started looking at the number of credits to graduation that was something that the SEC charged to the Standards Committee two years ago. That is what we need to do and I think that is where at our last meeting was sort of about. What things do we see in the future that need to be addressed and how will we go about charging committees. Unfortunately both of these two committees already seem to have a long list of things that we could charge them with tonight to address over the course of next year.

Senator Stanish - I think too that the bylaws do mention that all of the work of the Senate technically comes from the SEC and then the SEC gives it to the Program Committee. I think with the Curriculum Committee and the Overview Committee that work was so obvious that we maybe didn't do that process always so deliberately because there was no need. Whereas with the Standards Committee it's not so obvious and that is where the deliberation is. I continue to agree that there is a fine line between waiting to be charged and going out to look for work and then bringing that back through the SEC as a heads up that this is something that we want to look at. That is a question that we continue to ask.

Provost Treadwell - I would just add that frankly this year was a slow year because there were curriculum proposals that had very limited academic standards issues in them and we have had such a feversish pitch with regard to standards and the high credit majors and all of the work in the past few years this was really a year of reflection and a chance for departments. We talked about this and we didn't see any emerging issues other than those in the curriculum proposal. Next year I do think the withdrawal deadline, the declaration of major, obviously some of those issues that had been circulated by email rather than through the Senate or through the Provost's office really should be charged to the Standards Committee to review. Those are very critical issues and things that are
happening around, rather than through, our established processes that we need to attend to. I think that these are the focuses that we are seeing for next year.

Senator Lucey - I just wanted to say looking for work, I didn't want to look at the grading policy again. So I wasn't going to ask about the policy, and I don't think anyone else really wanted to either. We need the guidance; we need to have a frame work for understanding. Well this is what the Administration wants, this is what the faculty wants us to look at, and them come together and sort of make a decision around that. Therefore, if we do get it handed down to us by the SEC without a particular charge, it's hard to know what to do. We might know there's this work to do, but someone has to say it needs to be done. In our department for instance the building access is enormous, it's a huge issue and it's touching everyone, and that's much bigger than the ASC. Something has to have some kind of form for the work to come here; we are just sort of an oversight body with that regard. Maybe not the generator necessarily for the work so to speak. As the Provost was saying it would pass through the Senate and we have got to get that opinion from this body but as an oversight with potentially some changes but not the main player in all this.

Senator Stanish - There are a couple of options we can go with. I am hearing at least a comfort level with the idea of having a one year Academic Policy Committee.

Senator Welsh- I have come up with a better name. How about the Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee for year 2013 - 2014?

Senator Stanish - That would work - so we can give it the title of the Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee for 2013 - 2014.

Senator Welsh - The only other remnant is Senator Blatchly's recommendation of the Chair for the following academic year.

Senator Stanish - We can do that. We will delete that.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Should we just change it or do we care about the Chair at all. Do you want a sentence that says the Chair will be selected in any way, shape or form?

Senator Stanish - We still have a Chair for that committee just not the following sentence. Senator Lucey?

Senator Lucey - The last sentence as well.

Senator Stanish - Yes, we will also leave out the last sentence as well. We shall delete annual because it's only one year anyway for Ad Hoc changes.

Senator Sapeta - I just wanted to ask if the Standards committee for next year will actually have work to do.

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Sapeta - We are not creating a committee that will do work and then have a committee that will not do work?

Senator Stanish - No, we already know that we will be charging the ASC at least with this gateway exit/entry/retention review for sure, and I am sure there are other things on the list that I have written down somewhere, but that is an excellent question. Other discussion?

Senator Welsh - Are we moving now? We would not be voting.

Senator Stanish - We could do it a couple of ways. That was the next thing I was going to say since this By-law change, it is just being presented right now. We could make a revised motion and vote on it. If the vote is unanimous then that By-law change would go into effect. We would need a unanimous vote excluding abstentions. If the vote is not unanimous then it doesn't move forward and we would need to vote on it at the next meeting and the next meeting is in a few minutes tonight. So we would vote again at the next meeting in which case we would need 2/3 majority vote.

Senator Sapeta - Is there release time that would come with that committee? Is there release time that would come with the Standards committee?

Senator Stanish - No and no, there is not release time for either of them.

Senator Martin - I would like to urge that the sitting Senate that contemplates the issue should be the body that decides the issue and that a change in membership should I think require, compel, aid in the way in acting upon legislation because new members I am not sure have the background that 18 years worth of Senatorial experience would provide to the issues that we are speaking to right now.
I strongly urge Senators as you contemplate voting on this motion in this Senate that we try to decide the issue if at all possible tonight.

Senator Stanish - And if we don't, we don't actually have to bring it to the next meeting tonight. We could wait until the fall to bring it forward, so that's another consideration.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - If the votes happens in the next meeting, there is a discussion period after the motion so there could be time to try to catch folks up.

Senator Stanish - I will officially make the motion.

**Motion:** The SEC moves to revise Article 7 The Standing Committees of the Senate as revised in [SD 12/13-41].

I can repeat what the revisions are if anyone would like that. The revisions would be in D. the title would be The Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee for 2013-2014. We would delete the sentence that begins with “The Chair for be following academic year…” and the last sentence “It shall receive annual or ad hoc charges from the Executive Committee.” will be deleted. That's the motion.

Senator Darby - This would be under Standing Committees of the Senate so technically this, we are talking about this Ad Hoc Committee is a standing committee anyway.

Senator Hanrahan - Can we change Article VII to say “Standing and Ad Hoc Committees of the Senate ‘”? 

Senator Stanish - We could, not sure we want to but we could.

Senator Welsh - Can we just not make this a By-law change and just suggest that this is a motion from this Senate and the following Senate will follow this motion and at the end of their year term they will change the structure of the standing committee?

Senator Stanish - Yes, we could do that. So what we have to do is split this so that we would have a motion to change C. as written because we didn't try to attempt to clarify the ASC as one motion and a separate motion as Senator Welsh is suggesting just to create this Ad Hoc Committee which is not necessarily part of the By-laws. I will withdraw the motion I just made.

**Motion withdrawn.**

**Motion:** The SEC moves to revise Article 7 Part C (Academic Standards Committee) only as written in [SD 12/13-41] be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Lucey - Just briefly, have we articulated everything we think is going to come to the ASC in the future? In other words were there things indeed creating an Ad Hoc Committee that might fall back to the ASC.

Senator Stanish - I think the only piece may be the Academic Honesty Policy. That was the piece that was originally thinking would go into the Standards and then moved it to Policy. However, the way C is written in the proposed change it does say that it shall receive annual Ad Hoc charges so we could lump that into the Ad Hoc charge if we didn't have a Policy Committee but it is a good point.

Senator Hanrahan - It does say “also but not be limited to.”

Senator Stanish - That's right.

Senator Lucey - Or “as such matters as.”

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion? Again, this needs to be a unanimous vote and no abstentions in order for it to pass this evening.

**Vote:** Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - The second motion I will make will not be a By-law amendment.

**Motion:** The SEC moves to charge an Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee 2013-2014 with the charge as listed in part D. be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stanish - This is not a By-law change so we would not need a majority vote.
Senator Blatchly - I am thinking about Senator Martin's suggestion that if this is a committee for the next Senate then it should be considered by the next Senate.

Senator Stanish - I think he said the reverse. Senator Martin did you say the next Senate should consider?

Senator Blatchly - The question is if it makes sense to table this until the next group gets to vote. I was thinking a procedural way to ask the next group of people to weigh in on this would be to table till the next meeting. I would like to ask Senator Martin if that matches what he was trying to say.

Senator Martin - I think that if we are going to try to respond to this year’s business by creating a fix for next year, then this year’s Senate has to make that choice. My intention was to identify this body as the competent body and the next body is the charged body.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - The last item on the SEC report is the program review process update. The Provost continues to work on that and we were trying to connect with the Academic Overview Committee and just realized that actually didn't happen so we continue to make sure that that connection happens. We did confirm, thank you to both Senator Blatchly and Provost Treadwell for confirming that the programs that are scheduled to go up for program review next year have already been notified of that and that they should be working on their self-studies. The process of self-study has not changed at all. It would be the process of where that self-study goes and who looks at reports and resources afterwards that will change. That is the process we continue to work out for both accredited and non accredited programs and what that would look like. We will continue to make sure those guidelines are implemented for the fall 2013 and we will make sure we bring them to the Senate as well in the fall. Any questions or discussion on that? That concludes the SEC report.

• Academic Overview Committee
  Senator Blatchly - We have nothing to report.

• Academic Standards Committee
  Senator Lucey - We have nothing to report.

• Curriculum Committee
  Senator Darby - Yes, we have something to report. April 17th was our final meeting of the year and we discussed the revisions to the Curriculum Guidelines. First, I apologize to the body that we haven't elected a Chair for the beginning of next year. I believe the SEC may assist us with that. We have, however, completed work on the 2013/14 Curriculum Guidelines, and we are pleased to report the document as information only and that is [SD 12/13-43]. We do urge the SEC to place the Curriculum Guidelines on the Senate Agenda next academic year for purposes of a rigorous review and debate. As reported earlier, we did not overhaul the curriculum guidelines but we did undertake other revisions that provide clarity and guidance on curriculum development, the approval process for all curriculum proposals, and better communication among academic programs at the college. As the Curriculum Committee Chair, I have already scheduled a meeting with Provost Treadwell and Senator Stanish, and we are going to discuss the guidelines. Based on current guidelines, it is my duty to report that the deadlines for next year's curriculum cycle is June 1, 2013 is the deadline for intent of curriculum changes notifications to be received by school deans. October 2, 2013 is the deadline for proposals to be received by school or II curriculum committees. October 30, 2013 - deadline for proposals to be received by the SCC and February 12, 2014 is the deadline for Senate approval. Very briefly the end of year report, we did have an active and sound curriculum process this year. Our committee had 11 meetings and we reviewed 135 curriculum proposals of which 95 were approved by consensus and passed onto the college Senate as information, 15 course proposals that we approved by committee vote and were subsequently approved by the college Senate. 22 Program proposals were approved by committee vote and also the college Senate, 3 course proposals were not approved by the committee vote but 2 were approved by the college Senate after debate and vote. In addition to reviewing the proposals, we revised the curricular guidelines for the next academic year. There are many people to thank for this robust curriculum process, the different curriculum committees and their Chairs, the Deans and Provost Treadwell, the proposal sponsors and the academic programs. Thank you.

Senator Lucey - Jumping the gun just a little bit here, but I know we have been receiving these emails about the demise of Blackboard so I was thinking of where our curriculum proposal forms will exist in the fall? Do we use public folders? Are we going to switch to Canvas?

Senator Stanish - As far as I know whether or not we are leaving Blackboard and going to Canvas is still yet to be determined. I agree that it is important that at some point in time that we need to think about a potential move from Blackboard, even if it's not next semester or next year. I do think that using Blackboard is wonderful, but it is not meant to be a permanent archive, and we need to think about that. If that change does come quickly we need to think about that quickly.
Senator Lucey - Just to add to that it's not so much the switching. I know a number of faculty who do not use Blackboard, who do not understand it, and so therefore are unable to get the curriculum forms that they need to get. It just happens, so where else are they going to be?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - They are also on the Senate website. All of the Curriculum Committee documents are on the Senate website. You can access them but if you do not use Blackboard where do you submit them to is a different question. Seems to me that they could easily be emailed to someone else who could submit them, but they are on the Senate website.

Senator Stanish - To get the form you get them on the Senate website and then just email them or bring paper copies to the Dean and the School Curriculum Committee as we currently do. I think the piece that would be missing is if people wanted to look at the existing curriculum proposals that they did not. That's when Blackboard is crucial and those proposals don't exist anywhere else. I do think there is some confusion. It's just very counterintuitive to not log into Blackboard as yourself, even if you use Blackboard. To log onto it as SCC is very counterintuitive for lots of people. Senator Schmidl-Gagne probably gets calls for that on a daily basis, and I'm sure Senator Darby does too.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Just to clarify the entire curriculum that gets approved, I do archive it so it is someplace else as well. I think that is where most folks know to look for it.

Provost Treadwell - Just to offer two points of clarification with regard to Blackboard to dispel any rumors or concerns that have you. Any decision to change our learning management system will be phased over time with clear transparent communication to the faculty and would be coupled with aggressive professional development and a phased approach because it would be such a big change for the campus. We would only want to make the change because the tool is remarkable in its ability to offer us things that we can't get through Blackboard such as semester to semester continuation and the portfolio for those departments that wish it. We don't have a proposal to report but I expect it by June with the business case as well as the cost and benefit analysis and feedback from the pilot. There will be a discussion from campus pilot faculty during our Professional Development weeks. So any decision will be phased over time, it will probably be 2-3 years out before we make that move, so it is not imminent. The second thing I would offer, however, is because of the criticality of that dialog space in the learning management system we have now, we would have to recreate it. So even if we moved from Blackboard, we would recreate that same type of structure in a flexible system that the campus is comfortable with. Lastly we talked a lot about the archive and the importance of an accurate archive for curriculum work as well as the Senate work, and our website must be the place where that is clear and that it becomes a repository of approved documents, documents under consideration. We have discussed in the Provost's Office and with Marketing and Communications a way to ensure that our website is a clear and accurate and consistent record and then to pair that whether it's with Blackboard or whatever the other systems emerge in the next few months, there will be clarity, there will be a phase, and we will not lose that ability for continuity. Thank you for your concerns and I am sorry that there are mixed messages that are out there because I have seen some of them as well, and we are not going to move from blackboard until we have had a long and careful phase in.

Senator Lucey - I am just showing that a member of the ASC can be proactive. Where are those forms, they come up to me at a department meeting saying 2009 form where did you get that? How did you find that form? Just being able to say it's there it's on the Senate website there is no question, it's there. They don't even to touch blackboard.

Senator Stanish - So bring all that message back to everyone you see. It's on the site

Senator Lucey - And it's updated.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I just saved the new curriculum guidelines and I usually do end of May update the By-laws. So that timeline works with the curriculum guidelines too. I usually just set aside a day to become friends with the Senate website again. I just checked and they are dated on there. The guidelines actually have 12-13 so I will continue that model.

Senator Stanish - I suspect often people pull up an old curriculum proposal that they themselves created and saved on their own personal computer and just modified it.

Provost Treadwell - This is not a question but I beg permission of the Chair to speak for moment. I just wanted to offer my thanks to Joe for his leadership and for the members of the SCC for the careful stewardship you offered this year. The clarity of the archive that you maintained it made the work of the Provost's Office much easier to communicate with our Registrar and I just want to thank you because I know this is a thankless job and it feels like it many times during the year and I deeply appreciate the effort not only in our Senate committee but our school committees and the college in general to maintain what is the lifeblood of our college, the curriculum. So thank you.

Senator Stanish - I second that thanks. So thank you and well said.

Senator Darby - We had a great committee this year.
VI. New Business
Nothing to report

VII. Adjournment 5:09
Minutes
for the 430th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, May 1st, 2013
Mountain View Room, Student Center

Immediately following 429th adjournment, Mountain View Room, Young Student Center

I. Call to Order 5:18pm
II. Roll Call
III. Election of 2013-2014 Senate Officers
   a. Chair - Karen Stanish
   b. Vice Chair - Sally Jean
   c. Secretary - Kim Schmidl-Gage
   d. Faculty-at-large - Debra White-Stanley

IV. Adjournment 5:25