AGENDA
for the 437th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 9, 2014
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order
II. Roll Call
III. Secretary's Report
  ~ Approval of the Minutes from 432nd Senate Meeting [SD 13/14-34]
  ~ Discussion and vote

IV. Courtesy Period

V. Subcommittee Reports

  • Executive Committee
    ~ Meeting Notes [SD 13/14-35]
    ~ Continue the charge of the Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee in 2014-2015.
    ~ Discussion and vote

  • Academic Policy Committee – Nothing to report

  • Academic Standards Committee
    ~ Meeting Notes [SD 13/14-36]
    ~ MWF time blocks as proposed by the Chairs of the School of Sciences and Social Sciences.
    ~ Discussion and vote

  • Curriculum Committee
    ~ Meeting Notes 4/2/14 [SD 13/14-37]
    ~ The Curriculum Guidelines, AY 2014-15 [SD 13/14-38]

VI. New Business
VII. Adjournment
Minutes
for the 432nd Meeting of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, October 9, 2013
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:07

II. Roll Call
Excused: Senator White-Stanley

III. Secretary's Report
Motion: To accept the minutes from the 431st Senate Meeting
Vote: Motion Carries

IV. Courtesy Period
Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I have lots of fun Symposium pieces. Tonight Kirk Bloodsworth will be in the Mabel Brown Room at 7:00pm. His talk is of Witness Innocence. He is one of the first death row inmates to be cleared by DNA evidence so he is part of our Symposium threaded events. I also have some lovely bookmarks with the Keene is Reading book club dates on it and some postcards that have information about the website so we'll hand those around. The Symposium starts on Sunday night November 3rd with a Key note by a member of the Boston Police Department who was involved one of the major folks involved with the Boston Marathon bombing. So we will be looking at what happens when the common breaks and when your commons is violated. That's the first event.

Senator Stanish - Any other items for the courtesy period? I will announce as many of you folks know since Dean Leversee is here, Melinda did have her baby on Monday night and I just wanted everyone to know and the information I got from Pat Hitchner her name is Margo Eloise Treadwell Morrisette. She was born on Monday night, 8lbs 19 1/2”. It seems everyone is doing fine as far as I know. Any other items for the courtesy period?

Senator Dunn - Just to go along with what Kim was mentioning with the Commons events, the Department of Health Science along with Cheshire County Heals is going to be cosponsoring an event coming up on Tuesday, October 22nd titled The Weight of the Nation. It is a film screening and community event where we will be showing - it's a four part movie series and we will be showing part four of the movie series that's looking at the challenges around the obesity epidemic. The movie was done in part with HBO and Center for Disease Control and Prevention, The National Institutes of Health as well as the Institute of Medicine so we actually received funding from the H&H Foundation to host the event here as well as bring in a panel of seven community members who will do a question and answer forum after the movie screening to talk about what initiatives they have in place in the Monadnock region that is addressing the obesity epidemic from a built environment perspective. So not just usually what people are doing but more so of what is happening out in the community with regard to the obesity issue. That is Tuesday, October 22nd from 6-8pm in the Mabel Brown room. Flyers will be going out to announce the event.

V. Subcommittee Reports
• Executive Committee
Senator Stanish - We will begin with the Executive report which is on page 12 in packet [SD 13/14-5]. As Gordon announced, Dean Leversee will be serving as acting Provost so he will be sitting on the Executive Committee while Melinda is on maternity leave and we welcome him. An update from the Integrative Studies Program Committee: at our last Senate meeting this body approved a revised membership and charge document for the ISPC, and the Provost appointed Co-Directors, Karen Jennings and Teresa Podlesney will be co-directing the new ISPC. That is what we did for this year. As
we approved beginning next year, the Director will be an elected member of the tenured faculty. Senator Schmidl-Gagne as the Senate Secretary is proceeding with the elections of the additional faculty members that we stipulated. We are currently soliciting self-nominations. Senator Schmidl-Gagne - There are some folks who put names forward and it was supposed to have closed on Monday and I have contacted the Deans where we don't have any nominees. We still need a few names.

Senator Stanish - Perhaps I will send out a continued call for self-nominations, so if you know of any faculty from any of your areas that you think would be good encourage them to serve. Senator Lucey - Was there any discussion, we had discussed at the last Senate meeting as to whether or not Karen and Teresa will be sitting on the Senate? Or was that the understanding that it would be the elected...

Senator Stanish - For now, they will not be sitting on the Senate. They will serve as liaisons with the Senate Executive Committee so we would expect that they will be giving regular reports to the Executive Committee. Certainly they are welcome to attend Senate meetings but they will not be members of the Senate. Going forward with the elected member that is where we will continue to consider that piece. Other questions or discussion on that item? The next item is the Provost Search Committee and the President has asked for a Senate Representative, so as Senate Chair I will represent all of you on the Provost Search Committee. I will let you know as we proceed where we are. Also Senator Mallon is chair of that committee, so thank you Senator Mallon for doing that.

A couple of charges to the Academic Standards Committee that we talked about, one was there is a course proposal for a KSC internship that is currently moving its way through the School Curriculum Committees, but there is also a minimum standards piece attached to that. We are going to ask the Standards Committee to look at the standards piece while the Curriculum Committees are looking at the curriculum piece, so we can eventually look at them together as we move along in the Senate year. So that will be coming. Also, a new piece for the Senate the Academic Standards Committee, in looking back in some of the items that past Senates have approved that we would need to catch up on, two years ago the Senate did approve the Accredited Program Time to Graduation Waiver Form that can be found on the Senate website. If any majors required more than 120 credits to graduation or less that 40 upper level credits, they would fill out this waiver form to explain why. That form would then be filed with the Provost Office because either the Provost would accept this or not accept this, so it would be a Provost decision. Since this came from the Senate we are asking the Standards Committee to just do a review of that to get perhaps with help from the Registrar's office, we could arrange for that and direct any programs to that form. Does that make sense?

Senator Martin - I have to say that I don't understand the phrase of less than 40 upper level credits for the case of the major.

Senator Stanish - Right

Senator Martin - Majors are not going to be 40 credits.

Senator Stanish - 40 Upper level credits in totality over all of your program however there may be some majors that require so many credits or the way that the major is designed that it is impossible for students to take 40 upper level credits in totality because they are taking so many major courses. Does that make sense?

Senator Martin - Yes.
Senator Stanish - So that's the piece, you are absolutely right, the 40 upper level credits would include major, ISP, electives everything that you take. Not in your major but 40 upper level credits somewhere. However, there are some majors that are so prescriptive you don't have enough room to take those 40 upper level credits in say electives for example, potentially and so we want to finalize that.

Senator Martin - Thank you.

Senator Stanish - Does that make sense to everyone especially to the students? One example we have here is the Nursing, RN completion option. These are folks that already have an Associate’s degree or certification to be registered nurses but are coming back to complete their Bachelor's degree. This is exactly the example of this type of program where they really cannot take 40 upper level credits because of the way that that program is designed. The Nursing Director did file this waiver form with the Provost's office, and the Provost did approve that, so we are simply reporting this to the Senate as an FYI. The Director is here tonight if anyone has any questions for her.

Mary-Ellen Fleeger - I would like to explain and verify it a little bit for you. Our traditional bachelor student that starts as a freshman goes the four years and follows everything. The RN completion students graduated from a community college. They could transfer 90 credits here as long as they have an unencumbered RN license in the State of NH. The law for the RN's is that they only need 30 credits from Keene, Plymouth, Granite State or any place else; they take 30 nursing credits to graduate. They do here have to take the two upper division ISP. One of the required courses they have to take for nursing is also that one so it gets double counted. What happened was when the Senate passed the 40 credit upper division requirement, these nurses in our program only have to take 32 to get their BSN and we are a prescribed program so I had 16 RN’s in the program last January and this fall we went down to 3 because they don't have to take those extra 8 credits at Granite State College, at Plymouth State University, at SNHU or any other RN completion program. What we did was meet with Karen and Melinda and we got a waiver for them so they take their last 32 here but not 40 so that's the issue. These people are men and women that are probably between 40 and I think 54 are the oldest. They are not traditional students; they are coming back because nursing practice is changing and they want nurses now with a BSN. The clinical agencies are very interested in us supporting them so they can get the BSN and go on. So that is where the issue is.

Senator Stanish - I think another important piece in the Provost's decision there was the accredited program piece. I think the 40 upper level credit requirement in totality is in some way a measure of rigor, not the total measure but some sort of measure, and accreditation is another measure of that. That is another piece in the decision. Any other questions on that?

The last item on the Senate Executive Committee agenda is about the Senate minutes. We continue to struggle with the format of our Senate minutes, and in reviewing what we had done last year even though we had tried new technologies to hope to minimize the amount of work that the Senate Clerk needs to do and the amount of work that we need to do to get these senate minutes to you, we really didn't succeed in reducing the amount of work at all. It is still an excessive amount of time that we are all spending on putting together the Senate minutes and we have exceeded our budget. This is another consideration there but in addition to that in looking at Robert's Rules of Order about Senate minutes it actually discourages a complete transcript the way I read it. They are actually discouraging actual transcription on every word and that minutes should really be what happened at the meeting rather than what was discussed. Putting those pieces together what the Senate Executive Committee is proposing is sort of a happy medium that the Senate Clerk would take some annotated notes during the meeting, trying to capture some of the points of discussion but not word for word what was said, and also to couple that with the audio recording that would be time stamped. It would be time stamped every time a motion is made and discussion begins on that motion so you can search by that time stamp and you can hear the discussion of a certain motion. It would also be time stamped every time a subcommittee report begins so if you wanted to hear a certain subcommittee report you could go to that time stamp and listen.
Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate By-laws Article VI Parliamentary Rules, J. Reports to the Senate, 10. Senate Minutes be added as proposed below, effectively immediately.

10. Senate Minutes: The SEC shall determine the format of the Senate minutes that shall at a minimum be a record of the motions made and votes held during the Senate meeting.

Discussion - Senator Stanish - I will remind us that at the beginning of the discussion that we are proposing a bylaw change so if we choose to vote on this today the vote would need to be unanimous and to be effective immediately as well. Most bylaw changes would not go into effect next year but we would like this to go into effect immediately for exactly the reasons I just described. Today the vote would have to be unanimous for this to pass. If it is not unanimous we would have to vote on this again at the next senate meeting in which case we would need 2/3 vote. Any other discussion?

Senator Martin - May I address the Parliamentarian?

Senator Stanish - Absolutely, thank you.

Senator Martin - Does Robert's Rules say that is was actually improper using the word improper to maintain a transcript? It has a bearing on our discussion and it would be helpful to know if it says improper. While you are looking may I address the Senate?

Senator Stanish - Yes, I will make one note about your improper and then. You are absolutely right what I quoted from the Robert's Rules of Order frequently asked questions says improper however that is not actually Robert's Rules of Order it was referencing the other pieces. I think that is your question, right?

Senator Martin?

Senator Martin - Yes

Senator Stanish - This was someone's interpretation.

Senator Martin - Yes, to boil down Robert's Rules involves some editorializing. I am very concerned that the effort to boil down what we say will introduce editorial decisions that may or may not be accurate. The larger point that I am going to make is that a transcript is entirely accurate.

Senator Stanish - We will have the Parliamentarian look and Senator Martin, please continue.

Senator Martin - I would like to if I may read a statement that I provided for everybody but I would like to read it into the record.

There are at least five considerations that I would like us to keep in mind when we contemplate the value of retaining a transcript of our decisions and deliberations.

1. We represent people who are not present when we deliberate. Consequently, a readily accessible, written record of our discussions enables people are not present to follow our reasoning and to identify the issues that underlie college policy when it is formulated. In the absence of this record, our
colleagues simply become the objects of our policy making, rather than colleagues who can understand our policy making.

2. Our membership changes from year to year. Consequently, a complete record enables new members and future members to reconstruct legislative intent when revising policy.

3. Our subject matter is often complex and our decisional processes are often protracted. Both the complexity and the duration of our work require that there be records that are both detailed and accurate—and there is nothing more detailed and accurate than the actual transcript of a discussion.

4. If cost is a concern, I propose that we remind ourselves that we make policy for a $115 million enterprise that employs more than 1,100 people.

5. If our deliberations were to be boiled down into a set of “notes” then the person who takes those notes would need several unusual qualities:
   - skill in the art of editing other people’s prose;
   - thorough knowledge of both academic and administrative matters;
   - disinterestedness on the issues at hand.

Thank you for your generosity to allow me to read that long.

Parliamentarian Robinson - I can read what it says about the minutes. The official record of the proceedings of a deliberative assembly is usually called the Minutes or in some legislative bodies, the Journal. In the ordinary societies, the minutes should contain mainly a record of what was done at the meeting and, not what is said by the members. The minutes should never reflect the Secretary's opinion favorable or otherwise. Any minutes that are done should be kept in a standard book or binder. That is a summary.

Senator Stanish - Thank you

Senator Lucey - On the archive of the audio, how do we make that available?

Senator Stanish - What we are planning to do is work with Institutional Technology so that it will be available on the Senate website as an audio file. You search by time stamp and I am hoping maybe searchable by word. My dream for how we would do it, and it will take a little while to get here, would be you would have the annotated minutes and a motion would be there and there would be a link. You would click on the link and you would hear the discussion or the Curriculum Committee report would come up and you click on the link and hear the discussion. I think it will take a little while so right now it would be two separate files but it would be an audio file we would have on the Senate website.

Senate Jean - This would be available to all.

Senator Stanish - Yes, yes the entire world if they so choose.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - As our minutes are now. They are posted on our website.

Parliamentarian Robinson - I should make it clear there are several more pages about what should be included in the minutes. What I read was just the summary.

Senator Stanish - So if people have more detailed questions perhaps there will be more detailed answers.

Senator Harfenist - Is that the intent of the SEC to make that change to have the audio and your basic transcripts.

Senator Stanish - Yes, that would be our first format.
Senator Fleeger - I have only been on the Senate a short period of time, but I thought any sort of transcript we might want to reference our legislative intent in both making a change to this policy a year ago and then reversing it only a short time ago. I am wondering if we might be reminded of why when we initially proposed this we went back to going to a full transcript because I am trying to remember in my own mind what the argument was in addition to what issue of what Wes brought forward now why we decided to go back.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - We had moved away from a transcript, and the audio was just one continuous stream, which meant that if you wanted to find a conversation you had to have some sense of where in the Senate that conversation occurred to be able to even get to that place. The audio wasn't very clear either; it was at times significantly garbled. Then what you needed to do was to be able the way the audio file was sent, I mean I am almost 50 so when I was a kid and I really liked a song on a record player and I wanted to get the lyrics you couldn't Google that you had to keep listening to the record over and over again and put the needle back and you always put the needle back to far and you would have to keep listening to the thing that you listen to, and so that's how this audio file worked. It was just a slide that wasn't precise so you couldn't say I am just going to go back to one minute and thirty seconds. You kind of had to look at where the button was and try to estimate moving it and you would wind up listening to the same thing over and over again. Literally I think I was trying to get the transcript for the graduation commencement sashes to clarify what we had decided in a Senate and it took me, it's not a long conversation, but took me about two hours to do that. Other things would arise and it became very problematic when it was a situation where part of a conversation happen in one senate meeting and then another and another and another. Again it is because it was just one big long stream that wasn't searchable. You couldn't do any time stamping on it, so it was taking literally probably more hours for me to extract when we needed for that transcript than what it does for when we did in the past couple of years was have Cheryl work on the transcript and then have Karen and I go back through and edit it. Overall this has saved time from the first way but there's now new technology that would allow us to eliminate the problems that I ran into and keep us moving forward I think.

Senator Stanish - Does that answer your question?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Probably too much.

Senator Stanish - Yes. I will even give another even further back history. When I was first on the Senate 12 years ago, I know some folks have been on the Senate longer than that, we didn't actually have a word for word transcription. We were somewhere in this happy medium without an audio recording exactly how we moved from place to place I don't know. There is history for not having full translation as well. That's all I wanted to say.

Senator Sapeta - Would it be possible to maybe do a test run of that technology at the same time we are doing a real transcript?

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Sapeta - There seems a real time saving and saving money.

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Sapeta - Before we make a decision...

Senator Stanish - We will absolutely save money, that I am certain of. It takes Cheryl probably for every two hour meeting how many hours do you put into transcription? She puts about 10 hours of time per hour of our meeting time. So for every 2 hours she is putting in 20 hours. Then Kim and I review it after
and we don't even keep track of those hours. We will absolutely save money, but does it work is really your question. We have the audio recording right now. we can try to give you simply what I've described, the annotated minutes and the timestamp, if it doesn't work we have the ability to go back and get the complete transcription. We haven't lost that ability; it's just whether or not we do it now. That would be the question.

Senator Lucey - The bylaw you are putting forward allows us the flexibility.

Senator Stanish - Exactly, exactly

Senator Lucey - We could just put in the potential to change. We can make that change where we go back and change that at any time.

Senator Stanish - Exactly, exactly yes. So what I am asking and you can decide if this is a legitimate request is for this body to trust that the Senate Executive Committee will give you a form that you want and you can live with and we will continue to listen to your feedback.

Senator Denehy - As a clarification, I was going through the bylaws when we were talking and currently there is nothing in them that requires us to do anything at all in any format.

Senator Stanish - You're absolutely right.

Senator Denehy - So this motion would set how the bylaws would come about.

Senator Stanish - That's correct

Senator Denehy - If this motion fails, we are not required to continue to go in the current format it would just be a sense of the meeting is my understanding.  
Senator Stanish - Yes, I was wondering the same question. You are absolutely right, we did comb the bylaws and there is nothing currently in the bylaws about any sort of record of the senate minutes whatsoever. In the absence of something in the bylaws, what the bylaws say is we would refer to Robert's Rules of Order and Robert's Rules of Order does say is that there should be something. However last year we actually made a motion in this body that we would have a complete transcript so following our own history we are somewhat required to have a complete transcript. Other discussion?

Senator Hanrahan - So there is no bylaw and it's just a motion? Couldn't we vote just to rescind the motion so you could start immediately if the bylaw doesn't pass unanimously?

Senator Stanish - We absolutely could. We were trying to make this cleaner for future use but you are correct. We could have rescinded and we can if we choose. Further discussion. Seeing none I would like to call the question to see if this is unanimous vote and if not we will revisit it at our next meeting.

**Vote:** Motion does not carry

Senator Stanish - The last thing that I would like to do is just thank President Anne Huot for being here. We have invited the President to come and sit in our meetings as has been the case for the last President so thank you for being here. That concludes the Senate Executive Committee report. We will now move to the Academic Policy Committee which did have a set of meeting notes. I apologize, Kim was out of town and I was out of town and Cheryl, we didn't give her the document. We missed the notes so I apologize for that. There are no motions thank goodness so we didn't violate our 48 hour rule but hopefully folks received them in an email from Senator Schmidl-Gagne the notes from the Academic Policy Committee.
• Academic Policy Committee:
Senator McDonald – The Academic Policy Committee met on October 2nd and I would like to point out that we still have not yet been assigned a student member for the Academic Policy Committee.
Senator Stanish - You are now. Marissa will be your student member as of this morning.
Senator McDonald - At this time, and at the time of the meeting we were not aware of that. To remind the Senate, the charges of the APC are for us to review the travel policy for the campus, look at the challenges and suggest potential solutions, look at the 24 hour or after-hours access policy and identify the challenges and also potential solutions for that, the Student Survey policy for review and also the Academic Advising Policy as it refers to the NEASC self-study. Most of our meeting was used to discuss the college travel policy. It is actually a fairly complex issue. Sue Castriotta was there and she did an excellent job reviewing the issues in that. Most of this is based on the liability issues that the College and the University System face in travel off campus through activities. One of the things that was kind of obvious we are not going to change the policy. What we were hoping to do was be able to change the procedures in that policy and simplify those. The other thing that was brought up in the meeting was the concern over the liabilities for faculty and staff who are participating in off campus travel and for students also. As a result of the discussion, we’ve invited Jim Draper to our next meeting. Jim is the person on campus who is responsible for things like that, liability issues, insurance policies and the connection with the University System, and to address the concerns about faculty and staff liability. Ockle Johnson will also be at that meeting. He will be able to hear the questions and give some answers. The Policy Committee did distribute and is currently reviewing the Student Survey Policy. It seems to be a well written document but it is relatively complex. We felt we could not go over that at our meeting but it is on our agenda for discussion at our next meeting. At that time we hope to conclude that discussion and bring our decision back to the Senate. I would like to invite anyone who within your departments or programs who have concerns at some of these issues and would like to talk to us and get some input I can assure you as far as the travel policy it is kind of universal issue across campus that we have gotten a lot of feedback on that already. As far as the 24 hour access policy, this seems to be more specialized in certain areas but I will certainly welcome the opportunity to speak with anyone who has any concerns they want to bring up. We know there are very specific needs in the Redfern Arts Center, the Media Arts Center, the Science Center, and also in the TDS Center. There may be others that may not be as obvious out there and we would like everyone to have input as we look at the after-hours access policy. Are there any questions?

Senator Lucey - There is always a learning curve with new acronyms and so this should be the Academic Policy Committee because it is concerned with academics and not the policy of the Senate.

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Lucey - APC

Senator Stanish - Yes, it is what we decided on last year, yes. Does that make sense?

Senator McDonald - I was not on the Senate last year.

Senator Stanish - We didn't fill you in and I apologize that was my fault.

Senator McDonald - That concludes the Academic Policy Committee report

Senator Stanish - Any other questions or discussion for the APC?

Senator Depolo - I just have one quick question, it is noted that the next meeting is November 6th where will that be?
Senator McDonald - It is in the TDS Center Conference Room 229 and it is at 3:00pm.
Senator Stanish - Thank you, any other questions or discussion? We will now move to the Academic Standards Committee.

- Academic Standards Committee:
  Senator Lucey - I do have a question about going back to the Senate Executive Committee report. How do you think this should be conducted, should it be us as a committee going through the catalog or should we get this through the Registrar's office the information about 120 credits necessary for a degree?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I believe Melinda made a request before she left.

Senator Stanish - What I was going to say was and I asked the Provost if that was a reasonable request to make of the Registrar to do as much of an audit as possible about the 120 credit.

Senator Denely – That is report that we could produce.

Senator Stanish - Ok if that's easy and it seems to fit your job description, then we will request that the Registrar get as much information as possible and then request that you go from there.

Senator Lucey - We are currently working on the revision to Commencement Policy. We have a course that was mentioned earlier that has a gateway in terms of the admissions and standards.

Senator Stanish - Wonderful, thank you. We will now turn to the Curriculum Committee.

- Curriculum Committee
  Senator Gianno - We met on September 18th and there are just a few things here. The deadline went by of October 2nd, and we got a few proposals after that and we are expecting many more coming down the pike in the next month or so. As you saw we have lots of members on the SCC this year. We have a full group, eight elected members and we are very pleased about that. The Blackboard login seems to be working well, thank you Kim and everyone in the CELT who helped us with that. We actually did not meet on the 2nd of October after all because we didn't have a lot of business, so our next meeting is on the 16th, next Wednesday at 4:00pm. Basically most of the business at our meeting in September had to do with the proposals from Arts & Humanities that had been approved at the end of last spring after our last SCC meeting. We needed to vote on some of them, some of them were informational, some of them had to be sent back, so you have what happened in the case of each proposal here, and we need to vote on a few of these. They are either program changes, are part of the ISP Program, or if they cross school lines then they need to be voted on by the full Senate.

  **Motion**: The SCC moves that revisions to IHAMST 291 be approved by the Senate.
  **Vote**: Motion Carries

  **Motion**: The SCC moves that the addition of IHENG 191 to the college curriculum be approved by the Senate.
  **Vote**: Motion Carries

  **Motion**: The SCC moves that revisions to the English major be approved by the Senate.
  **Vote**: Motion Carries

  **Motion**: The SCC moves that revisions to the Holocaust and Genocide major be approved by the Senate.
  **Vote**: Motion Carries

  **Motion**: The SCC moves that the deletion of IIAMST 375 be approved by the Senate.
  **Vote**: Motion carries
Senator Gianno - Beyond that we simply have a list of courses that are presented as information and those were sent back. Our next meeting is next Wednesday. Thank you very much.

VI. New Business
Senator Lucey - I don't know if this is old business or both. It will be new business, but it is about the minutes. Will the SEC be bringing forth the bylaw change about recording Senate minutes at the next meeting?

Senator Stanish - We will.

Senator Lucey - What are the parameters again, how is that going to go?

Senator Stanish – We will need a 2/3 majority vote to approve a bylaw change if it had already been introduced at a previous meeting.

VIII. Adjournment: 5:00pm
Present: Karen Stanish, Kim Schmidl-Gagne, Deb White-Stanley, Gordon Leversee
Excused: Eric Grady, Sally Jean

- Senate Elections—in process

- ISPC Co-Directors Election—The SEC discussed the election. Gordon will follow up with the AAC and department chairs to discuss options.

- Faculty Meeting on Friday, April 11—Gordon has agreed to focus the April 11th meeting on the ISP. The SEC discussed a model that includes information sharing and the creation of a “letter” to the new provost.

- Senate Structure—The SEC discussed models for Senate Subcommittees for 2014-2015 and beyond. The SEC decided to propose that we continue the current model, APC, ASC, SCC for one additional year. We propose that next year’s SEC engage the campus in further discussion of the Senate structure. Since the APC was charged as an ad hoc committee for 2013-2014, the SEC would like to continue this charge in 2014-2015.

  **The Academic Policy Committee** (APC) shall consist of seven senators, one of whom must be a student. A Provost appointee shall serve as an ex-officio member. The Chair shall be elected by the Committee. The committee shall review issues and make proposals regarding academic policy. These matters shall include, but not be limited to policy regarding the academic calendar, academic freedom, academic honesty and special academic opportunities such as travel and building access.

  **Motion:** The SEC moves to continue the charge of the Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee in 2014-2015.

- From APC—They won’t be able to complete their work on after-hours access policy before last Senate meeting. They will continue their work after the last Senate meeting and Larry will write an end of year report with recommendations for next year’s APC.

- From ASC—They won’t have time to review Academic Honesty Policy this year. The SEC will request that they continue their work after the last Senate meeting and request Steve write an end of year report with recommendations for next year’s ASC and/or APC.

- By-Law revisions?
New Business:

The following MWF time block proposal from the Chairs of the School of Sciences and Social Sciences was unanimously approved by the ASC (7-0-0-0). We bring it to the Senate now for consideration and approval:

To: Academic Standard Committee
From: Science and Social Science Chairs, represented by Karen Stanish, Mathematics Department Chair
Re: MWF Time Blocks
Date: April 2, 2014

The Science and Social Science Chairs would like to propose the following change to the Time Block schedule.

Current MWF Time Blocks:
8:00-9:10
10:00-11:10
12:00-1:10

Proposed MWF Time Blocks:
8:00-9:10
9:20-10:30 (crosses MW time block)
10:00-11:10 (only if not using either of 9:20-10:30 or 10:40-11:50 blocks)
10:40-11:50
12:00-1:10
1:20-2:30 (crosses MW time block)
2:40-3:50

Current Final Exam Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start of Class Time</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M, MW, MF, MWF 8:00</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 8:00-10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W, F, WF 8:00 AM</td>
<td>THURSDAY 8:00-10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, MW, MF, MWF 10:00 AM</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 10:30 AM-12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W, F, WF 10:00 AM</td>
<td>FRIDAY 10:30-12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, MW, MF, MWF 12:00 PM</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 1:00-3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W, F, WF 12:00 PM</td>
<td>FRIDAY 1:00-3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, W, MW, MF, MWF 2:00 PM</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 3:30-5:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Final Exam Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start of Class Time</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M, MW, MF, MWF 8:00</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 8:00-10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W, F, WF 8:00 AM</td>
<td>THURSDAY 8:00-10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, MW, MF, MWF 10:00 AM, <strong>MWF 10:40</strong></td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 10:30 AM-12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W, F, WF 10:00 AM, <strong>MWF 9:20</strong></td>
<td>FRIDAY 10:30-12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, MW, MF, MWF 12:00 PM</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 1:00-3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W, F, WF 12:00 PM, <strong>MWF 1:20</strong></td>
<td>FRIDAY 1:00-3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, W, MF, MWF 2:00 PM, <strong>MWF 2:40</strong></td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 3:30-5:30 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidelines

- Use MWF Time Blocks for majors courses, especially the 9:20-10:30 and 1:20-230 blocks, rather than service or ISP courses
- Designate rooms in which to schedule MWF classes and try to schedule as many classes as possible in those rooms
- Chairs will coordinate to create “tracks” for their majors and to reduce/eliminate conflicts between subject areas

Rationale

Because they have found that their students benefit from meeting three times a week, many of the departments in the Sciences and Social Sciences schedule MWF classes. However, with the current time block schedule, there are only 3 MWF time blocks available for use and chairs were finding it difficult to avoid scheduling conflicts both within departments and across the school. In addition, the current MWF time blocks include a good deal of “dead time” between class meeting times. Therefore, the chairs would like to use this “dead time” to add an additional MWF time block.

In 2013-2014, the School of Sciences and Social Sciences conducted a pilot of the prosed (sic) MWF Time Blocks, as approved by the Dean of Sciences and Social Sciences and the Senate Executive Committee. They found that these time blocks did indeed help reduce the number of scheduling conflicts and had very few complaints from students or faculty.

**The ASC moves that the Senate approve changes to the MWF time blocks as proposed by the Chairs of the School of Sciences and Social Sciences.**

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen Lucey
ASC Chair, 2013-2014
New Business

Proposal presented to the Senate as information:
HLSC 385

As indicated in the Curriculum Guidelines, the SCC needs to announce deadlines for the 2014-2015 curriculum cycle by the end of the spring semester:

- June 1, 2014 - deadline for ‘intent of curriculum changes’ notifications to be received by school deans
- October 1, 2014 - school and II curriculum committees deadline for program proposals and associated course proposals
- October 29, 2014 - deadline for proposals and associated course proposals to be received by the SCC
- February 11, 2015 - deadline for Senate approval
- There are no deadlines (other than timeliness relative to the last senate meeting of the academic year) for course proposals that have no effect on program requirements.

Old Business

Our primary business was to finalize and vote on the Curriculum Guidelines for 2014-2015. Updates to SCC Curriculum Guidelines for the spring 2014 semester were reviewed and discussed. Here is a summary of substantive revisions that will be incorporated into the SCC Guidelines for the 2014/2015 academic year:

1. The SCC reviews over 100 proposals each year with many of these coming forward in the fall semester. To better facilitate an efficient system of processing the curriculum proposals, signature pages for all curriculum proposals are to be signed electronically at each stage of the review process (page 3 of the Curriculum Guidelines).

2. Co-chairs Gianno and Dunn reported upon their meeting with Anne Huot on March 26th as well as their meeting, on the 2nd, with Interim Provost Gordon Levee. Our meeting with President Huot sought input on the President’s signature on Major program revision curriculum proposals. The guidelines and signature pages have been updated to reflect President Huot’s suggested change for those program proposals that require her signature (pages 3, 14 and 23 of the Curriculum Guidelines).

3. Even though the SCC Blackboard site is updated after each Senate meeting to indicate approved proposals, the Registrar’s Office still requires official notification from the
A protocol was included in the Curriculum Guidelines for notifying the Registrar’s Office of the Provost’s approval of curriculum proposals (page 14 of the Curriculum Guidelines).

4. The SCC will streamline the process for course proposals that typically do not influence program revisions. Course offering information, prerequisite and co-requisite information, and course deletions that do not impact program requirements will no longer require curriculum proposal approval. After department approval, these changes must be communicated in writing to the Registrar by the department chair (pages 8, 15 and 22 of the Curriculum Guidelines).

5. Experimental course offerings have changed from 4 credits to variable credit (1 to 4 credits) (page 15 of the Curriculum Guidelines).

6. Courtesy notifications have been removed from the guidelines. And the description of advisory opinions has been broadened (page 9 of the Curriculum Guidelines).

7. The SCC completed its deliberations in regard to two different versions of the curriculum review process for II course proposals in the Curriculum Guidelines.
   a. II course proposals are reviewed and approved through the sponsoring department’s school curriculum committee.
   b. II course proposals continue to be reviewed and approved by the ISPC’s II subcommittee.

Prior to the meeting, the SCC co-chairs had solicited comments from the School Curriculum Committees. We also reached out to the II co-coordinators and the ISP co-directors on March 25th requesting updated verbiage to the current II course review process to make it parallel to the School Curriculum Committees’ section in the Curriculum Guidelines. Reports from the Arts and Humanities School Curriculum Committee and the Sciences School Curriculum Committee as well as updates from the ISP and II leadership have been attached to this report.

At 4:30, Senator Wes Martin was our guest to discuss the curriculum process for II courses from the point of view of a faculty member who had participated in the creation of the ISP program as well as from the point of view of the Political Science Department. A collegial discussion with Senator Martin provided helpful perspective on the process.

The SCC members subsequently deliberated further and then voted 7-1-0-0 for the version requiring II courses to be reviewed and approved by the sponsoring department’s school curriculum committee, with the added stipulations that there be II representation (at least one representative from the ISP II subcommittee) on each School Curriculum Committee, and that proposal sponsors seek advisory opinions as needed. The SCC will assess this change in 2014-2015 by gathering feedback from the School Curriculum Committees and the ISPC.

The following summarizes the SCC’s rationale for this change to the Curriculum Guidelines:

Here is an example of what this change to the II course proposal review process is designed to address: If, for example, the Geography Department proposes a new Geography course, the
proposal goes to the Sciences School Curriculum Committee. That committee has a representative from each department in the school. They all have a seat at the table. When a proposal that does not cross disciplinary boundaries, such as this one, is discussed, each representative has an opportunity to comment or ask questions about that proposal, a proposal that does not claim to cover curriculum beyond its own discipline. Similarly, at the end of the discussion, all can vote on it, even though it does not claim to infringe on any of those other disciplines.

In contrast, if the Geography Department were to propose an II-GEOG course, for example, covering geography, geology, and history let’s say, the proposal goes to the II subcommittee of the ISP. While the Sciences School CC includes ten different disciplinary representatives, the II Subcommittee includes nine members, but only three representatives from that school. There are also three representatives from the School of Arts and Humanities on the II Subcommittee but we don’t know if one of them is a historian.

Therefore, in the first case, the course that is confined to a particular discipline is evaluated and voted upon by nine other disciplines with which it does not claim to overlap. In the second case, a course that includes the perspectives of two other disciplines may in fact not be evaluated or voted upon at all by representatives of those disciplines.

By removing the separate path for II courses, the II courses would go through the School CC of the proposing discipline (with a seat for an II representative added to the committee), just as all other courses do. If the course description includes a discipline that is not in that school, an advisory opinion will be solicited from that discipline.

During the SCC’s deliberations, there was also a strong concern with regard to expertise. As stated in the Integrative Studies Program Proposal from March 29, 2006 (attached), "Faculty teaching courses must have appropriate expertise and credentials.” At present, when someone proposes a course within a discipline, we know that the members of that discipline have been vetted and have degrees and credentials within that discipline. We also know that there are many among us who have degrees and are credentialed as experts in interdisciplinary studies of various kinds. However, it is not clear that everyone teaching an II course has the necessary qualifications to teach those courses. An assessment of expertise is currently lacking in the II course proposal review process.

As a result of this change, a more transparent and integrated process will ensue that will allow for greater interchange of ideas among interdisciplinarians and disciplinarians alike about what we teach and how we teach it.

This was the last SCC meeting of the 2013-2014 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,
Becky Dunn & Rosemary Gianno
2013/2014 SCC Co-chairs

Attached documentation:
Reports from
Date of request:   March 23, 2014
Request prepared by:  Dr. Jamie Landau, jlandau@keene.edu
Chair of the School of Arts & Humanities Curriculum Committee (A&HCC)
Request submitted to:  Dr. Rosemary Gianno and Dr. Becky Dunn
Co-Chairs of the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC)
Dr. William Fleeger and Dr. Debra White-Stanley
Co-Coordinators of the II Subcommittee
Request regarding:  --- SCC unanimous vote on March 5, 2014 to change the path of the II curriculum proposals so that they are reviewed and approved through the sponsor’s school curriculum committee, with the stipulation that there be an “II representative” (at least one member) on each school curriculum committee, and that proposal sponsors seek advisory opinions or provide courtesy notifications as needed.
--- II Subcommittee expressed strong disagreement with this change in the curriculum process.
This request synthesizes questions that were posed during a meeting of the A&HCC on March 12, 2014 where a quorum of members responded to the SCC unanimous vote to change the path of the II curriculum proposals and information provided by the II Subcommittee as to why its members disagree with this change in the curriculum process. A&HCC members who were not present at the meeting due to scheduling conflicts had the opportunity to share their input via e-mail.
The A&HCC hopes that the SCC shares clear answers to the following questions before presenting a recommendation to the Senate to change the path of the II curriculum proposals:
1. What qualifies someone to be an “II representative”? For example, does this person need to have taught an “II” course before, belong to a cohort of “II representatives” from each school curriculum committee, or have participated in interdisciplinary professional development on campus, at another institution, and/or as part of another initiative of higher education? Is this person a tenure-track faculty of a department/program “housed” by the school curriculum committee that s/he will join? Will this person have a vote on the school curriculum committee?

2. What is the rationale for the total number of “II representatives” on each school curriculum committee, especially if that number exceeds one?
Given that these questions are central to the proposed change in the II curriculum process but they appear to not have an answer at this time, the A&HCC could not come to a consensus and does not side with either the SCC or the II Subcommittee.
The A&HCC is happy to engage in further discussion with the SCC, the II Subcommittee, the other school curriculum committees, the ISP Co-Directors, as well as any other faculty and administrators about changes to the II curriculum proposal process. The A&HCC suggests that this discussion might be more productive once the new provost is hired.
From: Stemp, James  
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2014 8:43 AM  
To: Gianno, Rosemary  
Subject: Votes from School Curr. Comm. about II path  

Hi Rosemary,

I’ve not heard back from everyone on the committee, but here are the votes I’ve got concerning the SCC’s suggestion to move the II review path to the schools.

8 – in favor  
0 – not in favor  
0 – abstentions  
2 – didn’t reply with a vote

Questions:

Any idea of how many courses this involves and when they are reviewed (fall vs. yearly)?  
Who decides in cases of multiple disciplines which group(s) should be involved?  Would an II involving chemistry, proposed by professional studies go through the Science & Soc. Science CC or the PGS CC?

James

W. James Stemp, Ph.D.  
Director, Surface Metrology and Archaeological Research Technologies Project  
Associate Professor of Anthropology  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology  
Keene State College  
Keene, NH  
03435-3400  
(603)-358-2092

From: Jennings, Karen  
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2014 1:06 PM  
To: Dunn, Rebecca; Gianno, Rosemary  
Cc: Podlesney, Teresa; Stanish, Karen  
Subject: Response to SCC request  

Becky and Rosemary,

ISPC co-chairs are working on the articulation of the ISP governance process as per the Senate charge. The Senate requested recommendations about this issue among several others by May 2014. Your request was made prior to the deadline for completion of our work, so Teresa and I, in good faith, are responding to your request with a draft process for II courses. These comments constitute a draft set of processes. The distribution of final recommendations to the SEC will occur May 2014.
The goal of the ISPC is to make the II subcommittee as representative as a School curriculum committee, or the Senate Curriculum Committee. II courses differ from other KSC courses in that some departments do not engage in interdisciplinarity while others do. The course review process for these courses must reflect this differential experience. Further, while ISP courses are not intended to replicate courses in the majors, different processes have been established to provide curricular oversight.

Here is the language of the Senate charge. The governance section is highlighted in yellow. Our draft response to your questions follows the charge.

Immediate items to be completed no later than May 2014: (Recommendations regarding the Elected Director must be submitted to the SEC by November 15, 2013. Any other recommendation with requires Senate action must be submitted to the SEC by March 31, 2014)

- Work with Provost’s Office and Senate Secretary to identify and compile the most current documents related to the curriculum, the outcomes, and the requirements of the ISP. Determine the status of each of those documents. Review and update documents, where appropriate. Where necessary, submit documents to SEC for Senate approval. Maintain and share final documents with campus community using the Senate and ISP web pages.
- Work with the SEC to identify, assess, revise (if necessary), and transparently communicate the governance mechanisms of the Integrative Studies Program Subcommittees.
- Develop a draft definition of “integrative study” that leverages best practice models, reflects campus values, and provides consistency.
- Work with Provost’s Office to create direct on-line access to the ISP with a link from the KSC home page.
- Forward to the SEC a recommendation for qualifications and term limit for the Elected Director

How is membership on the Subcommittee established?

What does the Subcommittee strive for in regard to representation from each of the Schools?

The ISPC and II co-chairs are responsible for the recruitment of Interdisciplinary Subcommittee members. The initial call for members is extended to faculty currently teaching II courses, or who have past experience or interest in interdisciplinary pedagogy. The ISPC and II co-chairs then submit a campus-wide call for volunteers by the end of the spring semester. Outgoing II co-chair(s), in collaboration with the Deans from each school and the ISPC, work on ensuring faculty representation from all schools. The II committee elects a chair at the end of the spring semester. It is recommended that each department has an interdisciplinary curriculum specialist who works with the II committee on the curriculum review process.
What is the term of appointment for members of the Subcommittee? The term for II committee members is 2 years with staggered terms to ensure a high level of expertise on the committee.

In addition, would the II Subcommittee be agreeable to the bullet points that are listed under “At the level of the School Curriculum Committee”? Yes, the II Subcommittee would review course proposals in a process akin to any school curriculum committee.

Karen and Teresa

Karen Jennings, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Keene State College
229 Main Street
Keene, NH 03435
603.358.2336
Becky and Rosemary, The II co-chairs also created another document that further articulates process. Karen and Teresa
Karen Jennings, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology
Keene State College
229 Main Street
Keene, NH 03435
603.358.2336

3b. **ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee** - Any course proposal with an II prefix, denoting an ISP Interdisciplinary course, must be reviewed by the ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee, not a school curriculum committee.

The **ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee** is responsible for review and approval of Interdisciplinary (II) proposals. The ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee includes three representatives from each school. School representatives are selected by a process determined by each school. The chair of the ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee is a voting member selected by a vote of the committee. Each member of the committee serves a two-year appointment.

The ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee membership is established at the end of the spring term to serve the following year. The chair of the ISPCC and ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee chair are responsible for the recruitment of committee members.

At the level of the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee:
- The department or program will provide to the committee chair a copy of the proposal at least one week prior to the committee meeting.
- The proposal must first be approved by the proposing department and school dean, adhere to all curriculum guidelines and be free of editorial or typographical errors.
- A proposal must be approved by a majority of the members of the committee before the proposal advances. A tie vote does not constitute approval. A proposal that is not approved will be returned to the sponsoring department with a request for further information or for revision and resubmission.
- A committee member must be in attendance to vote.
- Approval by the Committee is necessary for advancement to the next stage.
• The Committee chair records the vote of the committee, any relevant comments and the date.
• If the committee approves a proposal, the committee chair or coordinator forwards an electronic copy, as well as a paper copy with signature page, to the Chair of the SCC.

** Special note to proposal sponsors -
If a proposal must be reviewed by more than one School Dean and department, (e.g. cross listed courses) the proposal sponsor must coordinate with the committee chair to ensure that both schools and departments have approved the exact same and final iteration before the proposal is submitted to the SCC.

Criteria for approving II course Proposals

The following checklist outlines the criteria that the II Subcommittee will use to evaluate course proposals:

Does the proposal:
Have a course description that clearly explains the interdisciplinary nature of the class? _______

List the disciplines that the course will be drawing on, and the perspectives it will take? _______

Include interdisciplinary and ISP Integrative outcomes? _______

Include a viable attached syllabus that is clear about its inter-, multi- and/or transdisciplinarity? _______

Identify the rubrics that will be used (#1-4) to assess student work at the end of the semester? _______

Include the signature of the Departmental Chair and Dean? _______
FROM THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Dear Colleagues:

In May of 2003, the General Education Program Committee (GEPC) was created and charged with revising our current General Education curriculum in light of the educational needs of future graduates of Keene State College. Based on this review, the transition to a four-credit system, and developments at the national level regarding general education (including Greater Expectations and Integrative Learning), the GEPC is presenting a proposed revision in the General Education curriculum to the Senate that we propose to call the Integrative Studies Program. This program reflects our institutional values (through the integrative outcomes), provides and develops the experiences necessary for success in an academic environment (the skills outcomes) and preserves the breadth of a liberal arts education that should enable our graduates to succeed in a global environment (the perspectives and interdisciplinary outcomes).

We have taken seriously our responsibility to make the proposal reflect the thoughts and opinions of the campus community. We have deliberated among ourselves and also sought out campus experts particularly in the areas of Thinking and Writing and Quantitative Literacy. This proposal reflects our attempt to represent Keene State College’s mission and values, as well as what is happening nationally in a way that will transform our students’ education. We encourage those who are supportive of the program but have a specific concern to vote in support of adopting and implementing this proposal, recognizing that the program includes a permanent committee (the Integrative Studies Program Committee) that will assess the program and revise it in response to assessment results and campus input.

Thank you all for your involvement in the process and for the support you have given us in this effort to revise our General Education curriculum.

The General Education Program Committee

Linda Baker
John Couture
Nona Fienberg
Irene Herold
Karen Honeycutt
Karen Jennings
Anne-Marie Mallon
Liza Mc Cahill
Anne Miller
Ellen Nuffer
Ann Rancourt (Co-Chair)
Ron Spangler

Phyllis Benay
Michael Cullinane
Leonard Fleischer
Judith Hildebrandt
Jerry Jasinski
Ockle Johnson
Wesley Martin
Tom McGuire
Peter Nielsen (Faculty Co-Chair)
Eileen Phillips
Elisabeth Roos
Melinda Treadwell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current 3-Credit General Education Curriculum</th>
<th>4-Credit Integrative Studies Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Formal process of assessing the extent to which students meet program outcomes. Random samples of student work will be assessed each semester to determine the extent to which they meet outcomes of the TW and QL courses, and at the end of each academic year for lower and upper level competencies in meeting program outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising</strong></td>
<td>Take Foundation Courses (TW, QL), 4 courses in A&amp;H (2 courses in the humanities, 1 in the fine and performing arts, and an additional course in either the humanities or the fine and performing arts, each in a different discipline; 4 sciences (2 in the social sciences and 2 in the natural sciences) each in a different discipline; take 1 interdisciplinary course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Review Process</strong></td>
<td>Individual courses are reviewed by the department, school curriculum committees and perhaps the SCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Review Process</strong></td>
<td>Foundations and Interdisciplinary courses will be reviewed by the Integrative Studies Program Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee. Faculty wishing to offer a course within the Perspectives Area would first propose the course within his/her department; the proposal would then advance for review and approval by the designated School Curriculum Committee within the Perspectives Area; then to the Senate Curriculum Committee. A member of the Integrative Studies Committee will sit on the School and Senate Curriculum Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credentials – expertise to teach</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching courses must have appropriate expertise and credentials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credentials – expertise to teach</strong></td>
<td>Faculty teaching courses must have appropriate expertise and credentials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>The College (academic departments) must provide enough sections to assure 1250 students are able to meet the general education curriculum requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>The College (academic departments) must provide enough sections to assure 1250 students are able to meet the integrative studies program requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keene State College Senate
Senate Curriculum Committee
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Section 1. Curriculum Development at Keene State College - an overview

This document contains the guidelines for curriculum development of academic programs and courses at Keene State College, effective academic year 2014-15. The guidelines were updated by the Senate Curriculum Committee (hereafter, SCC) during the spring 2014 semester and presented to the College Senate in April 2014. Additional information on program requirements and curricular definitions may be obtained from the Keene State College Undergraduate & Graduate Catalog (hereafter, Catalog) or by contacting the College Registrar. The Catalog shall remain as current as possible and reflect the actual offerings and practices of each program. Accordingly, the curriculum revision process takes place throughout the calendar year.

Senate Bylaws

Article VII.B (Standing Committees of the Senate / The Curriculum Committee) of the KSC Senate Bylaws states:

The Curriculum Committee shall consist of eight senators, including (when possible) a minimum of two tenured faculty, at least one from each school, and the library, and a student. The Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC) faculty members should serve a minimum of two consecutive years. The Registrar shall serve as an ex-officio member. The Chair for the following academic year should be elected by the SCC before the end of February. The SCC oversees the College’s undergraduate and graduate curriculum. This includes working with the School Curriculum Committees and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools. The SCC reviews proposals that cross school lines, including Integrative Studies Program proposals, and proposals on which the School Curriculum Committee and the Dean disagree, and establishes the guidelines for the curriculum process. Actions by the School Curriculum Committees that do not cross school lines are reported directly to the Senate for information. If any senator wishes to discuss a proposal, a motion and a second are required to bring the proposal to the floor for discussion. A majority vote is required to bring it to the floor for a vote. Any curriculum proposal which crosses school lines or on which the Dean and School Curriculum Committee have disagreed is reviewed by the SCC and then, upon approval by the SCC, the Senate. Faculty members, administrators, and students may attend committee meetings when proposals of interest are discussed. To ensure clarity of operations and consistent treatment of all curriculum proposals, the SCC develops procedures, guidelines, forms and timetables that are then presented to the Senate as information. If a curriculum package includes academic polices, such as (but not exclusive of) entrance/exit stipulations, academic rigor or student orientation, these policies shall be forwarded to the
Academic Standards Committee. If a senator wishes for the Senate to discuss and/or amend a document created by the SCC, a motion and second are required for discussion. It would require a majority vote by the Senate to bring the proposal to the floor for a vote.

**Curriculum revision & approval process**

At Keene State College, all proposals for changing any academic program or course must be reviewed and approved in a prescribed series of steps. The last page of all curriculum proposals must be signed electronically at each level in the review process, in order to verify that the review process has been completed.

To create an electronic signature:
1. Sign your name on a blank sheet of white paper using blue ink.
2. Use a photocopier to scan the signature into a pdf file.
3. Forward the pdf file to Antje Hornbeck (ahornbeck@keene.edu) in Marketing and Communications; she will convert the signature into a usable format and send it back to you.

All changes to KSC curricula must follow the curriculum revision and approval process - no exceptions. Detailed information about the curriculum revision and approval process may be found in Section 3.

1. **Department or program** - All proposals must be approved by the sponsoring department(s) or program(s).
2. **Dean or Assistant Dean** - All proposals must be reviewed by the Dean or Assistant Dean responsible for the sponsoring department(s) or program(s).
3. **School Curriculum Committee** - All proposals must be voted upon by the school curriculum committee responsible for the sponsoring department(s) or program(s).
4. **Senate Curriculum Committee** - All proposals must be reviewed by the SCC; in certain cases, proposals must be approved by the SCC.
5. **College Senate** - All proposals reviewed and approved by the SCC are presented to the College Senate; in certain cases, proposals must be approved by the full College Senate.
6. **Provost** - All program proposals approved by the Provost of the College must be communicated to the Registrar. The Provost is responsible for approving any new program proposals and revisions of existing programs.
7. **President** - All program proposals both for new programs as well as those with substantial changes requiring additional resources must also be approved by the President of the College. The President delegates all other program approvals to the Provost.

**Deadlines**

Article VI.I (Parliamentary Rules / Effective Date) of the KSC Senate Bylaws states: “Senate legislation passed during an academic year takes effect on the first day of classes of the following fall semester. Curriculum changes to academic programs and associated courses will take effect the beginning of the fall semester following the end of the catalog revision cycle (February to February) in which they are approved. **Course changes that do not require program revisions are implemented immediately.**) Immediate implementation of a motion may be achieved and shall require a separate vote passed by a two-thirds majority of those present at the next Senate meeting. [. . .]”.

The deadline to submit program and associated course curriculum proposals, but not standalone course proposals, to the School Curriculum Committees shall be by the first Wednesday in October. Proposals shall be forwarded to the SCC by four weeks after that date. The February meeting of the Senate will be the last one in which program-associated proposals can be approved to go into effect the following fall semester.

Therefore, the deadlines for the 2014-15 curriculum cycle are:

- **June 1, 2014** - deadline for ‘intent of curriculum changes’ notifications to be received by school deans
- **October 1, 2014** - school and II curriculum committees deadline for program proposals and associated course proposals
- **October 29, 2014** - deadline for proposals and associated course proposals to be received by the SCC
- **February 11, 2015** - deadline for Senate approval
- **There are no deadlines (other than timeliness relative to the last senate meeting of the academic year) for course proposals that have no effect on program requirements.**

These deadlines must be met for a curriculum revision to be included in the 2015-16 **Keene State College Undergraduate & Graduate Catalog**.

By the end of the spring semester, the SCC chair, together with the School Curriculum Committee chairs will determine and announce to department chairs and faculty the exact dates for curriculum review for the following
academic year. This schedule will also be published in the minutes of the Senate.

**Curriculum committee membership, 2014-2015**

Committee membership information is updated on the SCC’s Blackboard site at the beginning of the fall semester.

**Section 2. Completing the curriculum proposal forms**

Templates of the AY 2014-15 curriculum proposal forms are provided at the end of this document, in an appendix, and are distributed to the campus in four ways:
1. via email, from the SCC chair to the campus, at the beginning and end of the academic year.
2. on the SCC’s Blackboard site: https://keene.blackboard.com/webapps/login/.
3. on the KSC Senate’s website: http://www.keene.edu/senate/senate-curriculum-committee/.

Proposal sponsors must use SCC’s 2014-15 curriculum forms.

There are two kinds of curriculum proposal forms:
- Program Proposal Form: for changes to a major, minor, or other academic program
- Course Proposal Form: for changes related to an individual course

Proposal sponsors are responsible for the following items:
1. If a course proposal is for a required course in a major or other program, a program proposal is also required if the program’s curriculum is affected by the change.
2. All proposals must be submitted in electronic format including signature pages.
3. All proposals must be in Microsoft Word .doc or .docx or other editable format; any proposal submitted in pdf format will be returned to the proposal sponsor.
4. A proposal will be returned to the sponsor if the form is outdated, incomplete, or requires substantial editing.
5. Proposal sponsors are responsible for monitoring the progress of their proposals throughout the curriculum approval process.

====================
The following information is required on the **Program Proposal Form**:

Proposal sponsors must use SCC’s 2014-15 curriculum forms.

**Date of Submission:** Provide the date of submission to the school curriculum committee.

**Sponsoring Program and Chair:** Identify the sponsoring department(s) and chair(s). Include contact information.

**Proposal Sponsor:** Identify the department and the person who should be contacted regarding the proposal. Include phone number and email address. This person has the option to attend School and SCC meetings to discuss the proposal, or to send a proxy. The proposal sponsor assumes the responsibility for the timely and correct submission of the proposal and all related documentation, including the signature page.

**Proposed Action:** Select the type(s) of action proposed:
- Program addition - to create a new minor, major, or other academic program
- Program deletion - to delete a current minor, major, or other academic program
- Program redesign - to change the curriculum of a current minor, major, or other academic program
- **Change in academic standards** (e.g., admissions and completion requirements) - to add, change, or delete program-specific academic standards for a major, minor, or other academic program, such as admissions and completion requirements
- Articulation agreement affected - to enact a curriculum change based on an articulation agreement with another institution or agency
- Other - please specify

**Note** - a proposal for a change in academic standards must also be reviewed and approved by the KSC Senate Academic Standards Committee; proposal sponsors are responsible for contacting the standards committee chair.

**Current Program:** Provide the program information in its entirety as it exists in the *Catalog*. You may copy the information electronically from [http://www.keene.edu/catalog/](http://www.keene.edu/catalog/).

**Proposed Program Addition or Revision:** Provide the name of the proposed program in its entirety and as it would appear in the *Catalog*. Please boldface changes in the proposed program. If this change affects other programs, please note all the page numbers in the *Catalog* where this change must be made. New prefixes are approved through the course approval process.
**Program Objectives and/or Learning Outcomes:** Provide a list of the program objectives, learning outcomes, or both. Program objectives may be defined as the knowledge and skills the student will have an opportunity to gain as a result of completing this program of study. Learning outcomes may be defined as the knowledge and skills students will be expected to demonstrate by completion of this program of study. See Section 6 for additional information on objectives and outcomes.

**Rationale:** Explain why this program change is being made. Address the connection with institutional mission and program objectives and/or learning outcomes.

**Resources:** Indicate whether additional staffing will be required by the program change. Review the adequacy of facilities and equipment. Also, consider the long-term impact of adding or altering a program. Review current library sources and consider additional resources that will be required. Indicate whether the librarian liaison has been consulted to determine the adequacy of library resources.

**Advisory Opinions:** Provide the names of affected departments or programs and include responses. Advisory opinions are required whenever a proposal affects or overlaps with the curricula of other programs not represented in the proposer’s School Curriculum Committee. An Advisory Opinion must be solicited at least three weeks prior to delivery of the proposal to the School Curriculum Committee. Affected departments have three weeks to respond to the request for an Advisory Opinion. Responses should be attached to the proposal. In the event that affected departments do not respond, evidence of the request for an Advisory Opinion from non-respondents must be provided. If a proposal affects a curriculum in a School other than that of the sponsor, each relevant department and the School Curriculum Committee in that School must review and approve the proposal as well.

**Electronic Signature Page:** Provide the program title at the top of the page. The electronic signature series is to be completed in the prescribed order: the sponsoring program, advisory opinions of affected departments/programs, dean, school curriculum committee, SCC, college senate, provost/VPAA, president (as needed).

The following information is required on the **Course Proposal Form**:

Proposal sponsors must use SCC’s 2014-15 curriculum forms.

**Date of Submission:** Provide the date of submission to the school curriculum committee or ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee, as appropriate.
**Sponsoring Program and Chair:** Identify the sponsoring department(s) and chair(s). Include contact information.

**Proposal Sponsor:** Identify the department and the person who should be contacted regarding the proposal. Include phone number and email address. This person has the option to attend School and SCC meetings to discuss the proposal, or to send a proxy. The proposal sponsor assumes the responsibility for the timely and correct submission of the proposal and all related documentation, including the signature page.

**Proposed Action:** Select the type of action proposed:
- Course addition - create a new course
- Course deletion - delete an existing course from the Catalog
- Number change - change the prefix or number of an existing course
- Title change - change the title of an existing course
- Credit change - change the number of credits of an existing course
- Description change - change the description of an existing course
- Course replacement - replace an existing course with a new course; under course replacement, the existing course will be automatically deleted from the Catalog (i.e., no separate ‘course deletion’ form would need to be submitted)
- Other - please specify

**Note:** Course offering information, prerequisite and co-requisite information, and course deletions that do not impact program requirements do not require curriculum proposal approval. After departmental approval, the changes must be communicated in writing to the Registrar by the department chair.

**Current Course Number, Title, and Description:** Provide the course information (number, prefix, title, description) as it exists in the Catalog. You may copy the information electronically: [http://www.keene.edu/catalog](http://www.keene.edu/catalog).

**Proposed Course Number and Title:** Provide the prefix, number, and title of the proposed course in its entirety and as it would appear in the Catalog. Limit the course title to 30 characters, including spaces. If more characters are absolutely necessary for clarity, the sponsor must submit an abbreviated title of 30 characters or less, for use in the student information system and on transcripts. New prefixes are approved through the course approval process.

**Proposed Course Description:** Provide the proposed course description in its entirety and as it would appear in the Catalog. Limit the Course Description to 50 words, not including prerequisites. Prerequisites should be clear and specific, e.g., as courses (e.g., ITW 101) or number of credits required. Specify
semester(s) the course will be offered. Please note that if the course is a major or minor requirement, one or more of the following course offerings should be indicated: fall, spring, summer, winter, fall even years, fall odd years, spring even years, spring odd years.

**Course Objectives and/or Learning Outcomes:** Provide a list of the course objectives, learning outcomes, or both. Course objectives may be defined as the knowledge and skills the student will have an opportunity to gain as a result of completing this course. Learning outcomes may be defined as the knowledge and skills students will be expected to demonstrate by completion of this course. See Section 6 for additional information about objectives and outcomes.

**Rationale:** Explain why this change is being made. Address the connection with institutional mission and program objectives and/or learning outcomes.

**Resources:** Indicate whether additional staffing will be required by the change. Review the adequacy of facilities and equipment. Also, consider the long-term impact of adding or altering a course. Review current library sources and consider additional resources that will be required. Indicate whether the librarian liaison has been consulted to determine the adequacy of library resources.

**Advisory Opinions:** Provide the names of affected departments or programs and include responses. Advisory opinions are required whenever a proposal affects or overlaps with the curricula of other programs not represented in the proposer’s School Curriculum Committee. Keene State College provides multidisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and interdisciplinary academic experiences for students and faculty through its programs and course offerings. When an academic program proposes to add a new course or topic that crosses disciplinary boundaries into the content of another KSC academic program outside of the proposer’s School, the proposal sponsor (or department chair) must request an advisory opinion from the other program(s) with information about the proposed course. The advisory opinion allows other faculty to know what new courses may become available across campus that have content that overlaps with their curriculum and expertise. An Advisory Opinion must be solicited at least three weeks prior to delivery of the proposal to the School Curriculum Committee. Affected departments have three weeks to respond to the request for an Advisory Opinion. Responses should be attached to the proposal. In the event that affected departments do not respond, evidence of the request for an Advisory Opinion from non-respondents must be provided. If a proposal affects a curriculum in a School other than that of the sponsor, each relevant department and the School Curriculum Committee in that School must review the proposal as well.
**Syllabus for Course Additions:** Proposals for new courses should not duplicate existing or other proposed courses in the department or courses in the Integrative Studies Program. When a new course is being proposed, a syllabus with the following information must be appended to the course proposal:

- Course title, prefix, and number
- Catalog description
- Course objectives and learning outcomes
- Course methodology. Briefly describe your approach to the course (e.g., lecture, discussion, demonstrations, etc.)
- Sample readings, instructional materials, and a list of reserve readings where appropriate
- Course topic outline
- Descriptions of other noteworthy aspects of the course (e.g., service learning, interdisciplinary, honors course)

**Electronic Signature Page:** Provide the course prefix, number, and title at the top of the page. Proposals need to be signed in the following order: the sponsoring program, advisory opinions of affected departments/programs, dean, school curriculum committee, SCC, college senate, provost/VPAA.

**Section 3. Completing the curriculum revision & approval process**

At Keene State College, the **faculty** is primarily responsible for designing and maintaining the curriculum. The Deans, Assistant Deans, School Curriculum Committees, SCC, and Senate are responsible for successive stages of curriculum revision approval.

Any member of the campus community may access documentation related to the curriculum process via the SCC’s Blackboard site, which contains curriculum forms and information for the present year, as well as current proposals under consideration by the SCC and Senate, current proposals presented to and approved by the Senate, and an archive of curriculum approval documentation from prior years.

==============

As outlined in Section 1, a proposal for changing any academic program or course must be reviewed and approved in a prescribed series of steps. A signature page must be appended to each proposal, verifying that the review process has been fulfilled. All changes to KSC curricula must follow the curriculum revision and approval process - no exceptions.
1. **Department or program** - All proposals must be approved by the sponsoring department(s) or program(s).

Drafting curriculum proposals (spring semester):
- Curriculum changes should be discussed by the academic department/program during the spring semester and during the scheduled curriculum/assessment day for faculty.

Approval of curriculum proposals (spring semester & early fall semester):
- If curriculum changes affect the curricula of current academic programs (majors or minors), contact those programs for an advisory opinion.
- A majority of the members of a department or program must vote to approve a proposal before it can proceed to the Dean’s Office.
- The chair or coordinator must record the vote and advance the proposal to the Dean’s Office.

2. **Dean or Assistant Dean** - All proposals must be reviewed by the Dean or Assistant Dean responsible for the sponsoring department(s) or program(s).

The School Dean is responsible for the overall curriculum plan and budget for his or her academic school and maintaining standards consistent with accrediting agency requirements. The dean also acts as the school’s liaison to the office of the Provost. The Assistant Dean often represents the Dean in curriculum matters.

- The Dean’s Office may return a proposal to the sponsoring department or program for additional information or clarification.
- The Dean will record comments on the proposal and forward to the School Curriculum Committee or Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee.
- All comments about the proposal, must be written electronically into the signature page. The Dean’s Office will be represented at the School Curriculum Committee meetings.

3a. **School Curriculum Committee** - All proposals must be voted upon by the school curriculum committee responsible for the sponsoring department(s) or program(s).

The School Curriculum Committee is responsible for review and approval at the school level. At this level faculty evaluate the proposal from the point of view of other departments in the school. Each School Curriculum Committee includes a representative from each academic department (as defined in the collective bargaining agreement), the ISP Interdisciplinary subcommittee and the Dean’s Office. The chair of
the School Curriculum Committee is a voting member. Each member of the committee serves a two-year appointment, with the terms staggered for continuity.

School Curriculum Committees are established at the end of the spring term to serve the following year. The School Dean, (outgoing) School Curriculum Committee chairs and the (outgoing) chair of the SCC are responsible for the recruitment of School Curriculum Committee members. The chair is elected by the School Curriculum Committee membership at that time. The SCC recommends that a department have a curriculum specialist who serves on the respective School Curriculum Committee and stays informed of the curriculum change process. Curriculum specialists are a department’s point person for the curriculum change process.

At the level of the School Curriculum Committee:
• The department or program will provide to the Committee a sufficient number of copies of the proposal for all of its members. These should be received by the chair or coordinator at least one week prior to the Committee meeting.
• To be reviewed by the Committee, a proposal must adhere to all curriculum guidelines, and be free of editorial or typographical errors.
• A proposal must be approved by a majority of the members of the Committee before the proposal advances. A tie vote does not constitute approval. A proposal that is not approved will be returned to the sponsoring department with a request for further information or for revision and resubmission.
• A Committee member must be in attendance to vote. If a member cannot attend a meeting, the member’s department may send another representative to participate in the deliberation and voting.
• Approval by the Committee is necessary for advancement to the next stage.
• The Committee chair or coordinator records the vote of the committee, any relevant comments and the date.
• If the Dean’s Office and the Committee, or both approve a proposal, the Committee chair or coordinator forwards an electronic copy, as well as a paper copy with signature page, to the Chair of the SCC.
• ** Special note to proposal sponsors and School Curriculum Committee chairs -
  If a proposal must be reviewed by more than one School Curriculum Committee (i.e. proposals that transcend schools), the proposal sponsor must coordinate with the committee chairs to ensure that both committees have approved the exact same and final iteration before the proposal is submitted to the SCC.

4. Senate Curriculum Committee - All proposals must be reviewed by the SCC; in certain cases, proposals must be approved by the SCC.
The SCC is a subcommittee of the College Senate. Its membership is determined by the by-laws of the KSC Senate (Article VII. B). It oversees the entire curriculum process and has the authority to return any proposal that does not comply with the curriculum guidelines.

The SCC votes on proposals that fit any of the following categories:
• new degree, major or minor
• program revision (e.g. program proposal)
• split vote from the Dean’s Office and the School Curriculum Committee
• course proposal that crosses school lines

Additional considerations of note:
• Questions regarding proposals where jurisdiction may not be clear should be directed to the SCC chair.
• When a proposal requires review by the SCC, the SCC chair must receive it one week in advance of the SCC meeting where it will be reviewed.
• All proposals must be reviewed, voted upon, and approved for the proposal to be presented to the Senate. If a proposal is not approved, it is returned to the sponsoring department.
• A Committee member must be in attendance to vote.
• The Chair of the SCC will record the committee’s vote and comments in meeting minutes. Proposals that have been approved by the SCC also need to be voted upon by the Senate. The SCC chair will provide substantive information about program proposals where Senate approval is required, and a brief summary of those proposals not voted upon by the SCC as information to the Senate. This information is submitted to the clerk of the Senate (by the Friday before the next Senate meeting) for distribution with the Senate agenda.

5. **College Senate** - All proposals reviewed and approved by the SCC are presented to the College Senate; in certain cases, proposals must be approved by the full College Senate.

The **College Senate** must vote on all course and program proposals that cross school lines and on major changes in college curriculum (e.g. program proposals). The College Senate receives as “information only” all other curriculum changes from the SCC.

Article VI.F (Parliamentary Rules / Presentation of Motions) of the KSC Senate Bylaws states: “In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals. If a senator wishes for the Senate to discuss and/or amend a document created by the SCC, a motion and second are required for discussion. It would require a majority vote by the Senate to bring the proposal to the floor for a vote.”
Proposals voted upon and reviewed by the SCC must also be reviewed and approved by a Senate vote. If a senator would like the Senate to discuss an approved proposal presented to the Senate as information, a motion and a second are required for discussion. It would require a majority vote by the Senate to bring the proposal to the floor for a vote. The SCC chair records the Senate vote and forwards approved proposals to the Provost. The SCC chair will move approved proposal from “Proposals before the Senate” to “Senate approved proposals” on the SCC Blackboard site for the editor of the Catalog to access.

6. **Provost** - All program proposals approved by the Provost of the College must be communicated to the Registrar. The Provost is responsible for approving any new program proposals and revisions of existing programs.

7. **President of the College** - All program proposals both for new programs as well as those with substantial changes requiring additional resources must also be approved by the President of the College. The President delegates all other program approvals to the Provost.

**Additional Notes**

**Editorial Changes**

Editorial changes are defined as changes to catalog content that do not otherwise require submission of a formal curriculum proposal. If a department or program has identified a potential editorial change, or if there is some question as to the nature of the change, the SCC chair should be consulted. Editorial changes such as discrepancies with Senate-approved documentation, typographical concerns, etc. should be communicated directly to the Editor of the Catalog in the Registrar’s Office.

Course offering information, prerequisite and co-requisite information, and course deletions that do not impact program requirements do not require curriculum proposal approval. After departmental approval, these changes must be communicated in writing to the Registrar by the department chair.

**Three-Year Rule**

Each fall, the SCC will send the department chairs and coordinators a list of the courses that have not been offered in the past three years. At that time, chairs and coordinators must present a compelling rationale for continuing to list the course in the Catalog. Courses not offered within a three-year span receive a course status code of “inactive” in the Student Information System and will not be listed in the Catalog. A course can be re-activated once the department chair and/or dean have notified the SCC chair. The department chair will have access to the list of de-activated courses.

**Cross-listing of Courses**
Requests for cross-listing will be considered provided that most of the course content is not readily identified as exclusively belonging to one department or the other but rather crosses the boundary between the two departments. Cross-listed courses must have identical numbers, titles, course descriptions, and prerequisites.

**Experimental Course Offerings**
Experimental courses are identified as 199 (basic), 399 (advanced), and 599 (graduate). They may be offered as variable credit (1-4 credits) with permission of the program’s faculty and the appropriate school dean. Normally, experimental courses are not repeated. If a topic is to be regularly offered, then it needs to become a course listed in the catalog.

**Topics Courses**
Courses that include “may be repeated as topics change” within their description provide a place for course topics that are not, for whatever reason, course offerings included in the catalog. 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.
Section 4. Guidelines for approving new programs, new options and concentrations, changes in program degree designations, and mergers, consolidations, and splits in existing programs

New Majors: Guidelines for Curriculum Development
When proposing new programs or redesigning existing ones, the following questions must be addressed and the following kinds of information provided prior to the review and potential approval of a proposal.

Description of the Program
- Describe the curriculum; include descriptions of new or altered courses being proposed and courses being deleted.
- How does it relate to the mission of Keene State College?
- Why is this (new) program being proposed or changed?
- Who is the intended audience?
- What are the program objectives and learning outcomes?
- Does the program have any innovative or unusual features?
- How does this program relate to others at the College; within the University System of New Hampshire?
- Who has been involved in developing the proposal to date?

Course or Program Objective and Learning Outcomes
For each course proposal, faculty must explicitly identify the knowledge students must demonstrate to complete the course successfully. The expectation for student learning will emanate from specific course objectives.

Need for the Program
Faculty developing new program proposals must explicitly identify the need for the new program.

Projected Enrollment and Graduation
Estimate the potential enrollment in, and numbers of graduates from, the program (both majors and non-majors) and state the basis upon which these figures were calculated.

Resources
Estimate the resources required to implement this proposal:
- Faculty: Who will teach in the program? Are additional personnel needed? How many? When?
- What particular kinds of expertise are required for this program? Identify faculty having such expertise. If lacking, what additional expertise is required?
• How will the program be administered? Is additional administrative assistance required?
• What support staff is in place and what, if any, additional support is needed?
• Are library resources adequate, or are additional resources required? In consultation with your librarian liaison, determine whether library resources are adequate to support this course addition or program change.
• Are additional equipment and/or supplies needed? Specify and estimate the approximate cost.
• Are space and physical facilities adequate? If not, what extra space or facilities are needed? Approximate cost?

Section 5. Minors: Guidelines for curriculum development or revision

A minor is a coherent set of courses (normally 20-24 credits) in a discipline or related disciplines smaller in scope than the major. A maximum of 9 credits of courses required for the major may also be used to complete requirements for the minor.

A proposal to establish a minor for a particular discipline should define the philosophy and purpose of the minor and explain how the design of the minor achieves that purpose. It should also indicate the degree of student interest anticipated, and its prospective impact upon course enrollments, faculty load and staffing, budget, and its impact upon other courses and programs. Faculty members are encouraged to study existing minors in the Catalog as models.

For practical and academic reasons, a discipline offering a minor program should be staffed by at least two full-time faculty members.

Minors should include both lower and upper division courses, and should utilize existing courses whenever possible.

Minors in the liberal arts or sciences typically reflect breadth rather than depth. For some minors, it may be a priority for the program to address basic competencies.

Courses used to satisfy requirements for the minor may also be used to satisfy ISP requirements when such courses meet the established criteria for ISP. Credits earned in courses used to satisfy multiple requirements will count once toward the total number of credits required for graduation.
Section 6. Guidelines for developing objectives and learning outcomes

Program objectives and learning outcomes must be identified when a proposal for a new course or program is submitted. The sponsor must identify how a proposal affects objectives and learning outcomes for an existing program or course.

Objectives identify what the program, course, and/or professor will do. Learning Outcomes identify the knowledge and skills that a student will be able to demonstrate, including what learning will be assessed, and how it will be assessed (in addition to course grade) upon completion of the course or program.

There is no single “correct” method of stating intended learning outcomes. The guiding criteria are that the statements are both clear and well understood by faculty and students.

Course or Program Objectives
Identify the knowledge students will have an opportunity to gain, and the professional and intellectual skills they will have an opportunity to develop as a result of completing this course or program of study.

Learning Outcomes
Identify the knowledge, professional skills, and intellectual skills that students will be expected to demonstrate at the completion of this course or program of study.

Sponsors of ISP proposals should carefully align their outcomes statements with ISP Program Outcomes guidelines (http://www.keene.edu/isp/ProgramOutcomes.cfm) and Intellectual Skills Outcomes guidelines (http://www.keene.edu/isp/docs/IntellectualSkillOutcomes.pdf).

Assessment
How will the department/faculty know that learning outcomes have been achieved?
Appendix A. The Program Proposal Form

KEENE STATE COLLEGE
SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2014-15 PROGRAM PROPOSAL FORM

** Please refer to the SCC’s Curriculum Guidelines, 2013-14, for instructions on completing this form (see Section 2, pp. 5-7).

Date of Submission:

Sponsoring Program and Chair:

Proposal Sponsor:

**Proposed Action**: Select the type(s) of action proposed:

- Program addition
- Program deletion
- Program redesign
- Change in academic standards **
- Articulation agreement affected
- Other - please specify

** Note - a proposal for a change in academic standards (e.g., admissions and completion requirements) must also be reviewed and approved by the KSC Senate Academic Standards Committee; proposal sponsors are responsible for contacting the standards committee chair.

Current Program:

Proposed Program:

Program Objectives and/or Learning Outcomes:

Rationale:

Resources:
Advisory Opinions:
SIGNATURE FORM, 2014-2015

Program Title: ____________________________________________

1. **Sponsoring Program**: __________________________ Chair Signature: __________________

   For ___ Against ___ Abstain ___ Absent ___ Date _____________

   **Advisory Opinions:**
   List the names of the affected departments and attach department responses.

2. **Dean:**
   Comment:

   Approved___ Not Approved___

   Signature: ____________________________ Date _____________

3. **School Curriculum Committee:**
   Comment:

   For ___ Against ___ Abstain ___ Absent ___ Chair: __________________________Date ______

4. **Senate Curriculum Committee:**
   Comment:

   For ___ Against ___ Abstain ___ Absent ___ Chair: __________________________Date ______

5. **Keene State College Senate:**

   Passed ___ Failed ___ Information___ Signature: __________________________ Date ______

6. **Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:**

   Approved___ Not Approved___ Information___ Signature: ________________________ Date ______
7. **President:**

Approved ___ Not Approved ___ Information ___ Signature: __________________ Date _______
Appendix B. The Course Proposal Form

KEENE STATE COLLEGE
SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2014-2015 COURSE PROPOSAL FORM

** Please refer to the SCC’s Curriculum Guidelines, 2013-14, for instructions on completing this form (see Section 2, pp. 7-9).

Date of Submission:

Sponsoring Program and Chair:

Proposal Sponsor:

Proposed Action: Select the type(s) of action proposed.
___ Course addition
___ Number change
___ Title change
___ Credit change
___ Description change
___ Course replacement
___ Other - please specify
*Note: Course offering information, prerequisite and co-requisite information, and course deletions that do not impact program requirements do not require curriculum proposal approval. After departmental approval, these changes must be communicated in writing to the Registrar by the department chair.

**Current Course Prefix, Number, Title, and Description:**

**Proposed Course Prefix, Number, Title, and Description:**

**Course Objectives and/or Learning Outcomes:**

**Rationale:**

**Resources:**

**Advisory Opinions:**

**SIGNATURE FORM, 2014-2015**

Course Prefix, Number, & Title: ________________________________

1. **Sponsoring Program:** ____________________ Chair Signature: ____________________

   For ___ Against ___ Abstain ___ Absent ___ Date ___________

   **Advisory Opinions:**
   List the names of the affected departments and attach department responses.

2. **Dean:**
   Comment:
   Approved___ Not Approved___
   Signature: __________________________ Date ______

3. **School Curriculum Committee:**
Comment:

For ___ Against ___ Abstain ___ Absent ___ Chair: ________________________Date ________

4. **Senate Curriculum Committee:**
Comment:

For ___ Against___ Abstain ___ Absent ___ Chair: ________________________Date ________

5. **Keene State College Senate:**
Passed ___ Failed ___ Information___ Signature: __________________________ Date ________

6. **Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:**
Approved___ Not Approved____ Information___ Signature: _____________________ Date ________