AGENDA
for the 438th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 16, 2014
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order
II. Roll Call
III. Secretary's Report
   ~Approval of working copy of the Minutes from 437th Senate Meeting [SD 13/14-39]
   ~Discussion and Vote

IV. Courtesy Period
V. Subcommittee Reports
   • Executive Committee
     ~Meeting Notes [SD 13/14-40]
     ~Item 6 from the 437th SCC report [SD 13-14-37]
     ~Discussion and vote
     ~Item 7 from the 437th SCC report [SD 13-14-37]
     ~Discussion and vote
   • Academic Policy Committee
   • Academic Standards Committee
   • Curriculum Committee

VI. New Business
VII. Adjournment
Working copy

Minutes
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 4:09 pm
II. Roll Call
Excused: Senator Sapeta, Senator White-Stanley, Senator Davis-Kelly and Senator Rust
Absent: Senator Donnelly
III. Secretary's Report
Motion: To approve the Minutes from 432nd Senate Meeting of Keene State College.
Vote: Motion Carries

IV. Courtesy Period
Senator Grady - Candidates for the Vice President of Student Affairs will be here starting tomorrow and all of next week.

V. Subcommittee Reports

• Executive Committee
  ~ Meeting Notes
  Motion: The SEC moves to continue the charge of the Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee in 2014-2015 be approved by the Senate.
  Vote: Motion carries

• Academic Policy Committee
Senator McDonald - Advised they had been working on the after hours access for facilities on campus and it turned out to be a much bigger charge than what was expected because of many specialized needs. They will put together a report and give to the Senate Executive Committee in the fall.

• Academic Standards Committee
  ~ Meeting Notes
  Motion: The ASC moves that the MWF time blocks as proposed by the Chairs of the School of Sciences and Social Sciences be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Martin - A student that takes one of the proposed times on MW at 9:20am or 1:20pm they would not be able to sign up for two other courses because it straddles.

Senator Lucey - It's already in the curriculum for studio art.

Senator Martin: There are consequences outside of programs that run in that fashion.

Senator Stanish - That is correct that it straddles other time blocks but would really try to use these for major courses and creating tracks not using these for service courses. This has been discussed in the Chair meetings for about two years and everyone is well aware and did not express concerns.
Senator Grady: From the student perspective, students do not like Friday classes.

Senator Stanish - Many departments already have MWF classes and their struggle is they schedule two courses they need to take at the same time. They were asking us for more time blocks within the majors. On a personal note I think Friday classes are good.

Vote: Motion carries

- Curriculum Committee
- Meeting Notes
- The Curriculum Guidelines, AY 2014-15

Transcription requested by Senator Stanish

Senator Stanish - I would like to give clarification on the report. ____As is the case in the Senate Bylaws, the Senate Curriculum Committee is only obligated to present their guidelines for information which is exactly what they have done here. However, it is in the Senate Bylaws that any Senator can make a motion to have the guidelines discussed and further make a motion to have the guidelines voted on. Since there are several significant changes here most notably the II process but others as well, I feel a responsibility to make sure the Senate does discuss this and ultimately vote on it. So what I am going to do, my intention is is to make a motion today for us to discuss these guidelines. Then also make a motion at our meeting next week since I know others will be able to attend. others from the campus community will be able to attend to discuss again and then make a motion to vote on these at the next senate meeting. That is my intention______.

Motion: The SEC moves that we discuss the guidelines presented by the SCC be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Mallon - I would like to turn to item number 7, the SCC's deliberation and vote regarding the change in process for II course approval. I would like to express my dismay having read fully the report. Never the less the end and the deliberation and rationale I would never the less like to express my dismay that the SCC has decided to move forward with this quote un quote substantive and indeed revision to a curriculum policy despite objections from multiple voices and multiple groups of voices. Despite unanswered questions from groups as large as the Arts & Humanities Curriculum Committee and the Science Curriculum Committee despite their ____ of approval. Despite the opportunity to benefit and I articulated this at our last meeting, despite the opportunity to benefit from the new leadership of and guidance from a Provost as well as and we have heard Provost Leversee as well as potentially the new leadership structure for ISP. I guess most importantly, despite not having a, at least not from what I can see in the materials that I am looking at, despite not having fully engaged in this discussion with the varied colleagues in the field of interdisciplinary studies who's expertise should be, I think respected in this regard. I think that there is a lot more work to be done I think it can be very positive and open discussion. When the discourse on Interdisciplinary that has happened over the last several year's is access and is at least tapped into by larger groups and by representative groups rather than having this move forward through the more narrow channels, I think of the SEC.

Senator Martin - I had a statement that I prepared in advance and it includes a typo that I have corrected by hand. What is the best way for me to distribute that, just pass it to my right or left?

Senator Stanish - Or both.
Senator Martin - I will read because I like to be as careful as I can about what I say. With regard to the process that we should use to review II courses I would like my colleagues to consider three issues. First, the college faculty should be suspicious of any program or proposal that's used to reduce the range of expertise that can be brought to bear in curricular review. By restricting the review of II courses to a subcommittee of mind we do not include the more than 200 experts who work in 22 disciplines and programs we have used to work on this college. Second, the college and not just a subset of the college as a collective state in the process of vetting course proposals. When we hire within a discipline we examine the credentials of our candidates and we hire ones who have demonstrated a specific expertise in two or three fields. The departments exercise self restraint in course offerings precisely because they know the limits of their expertise. However, when we leave the confines of a single discipline to whom should we turn to ascertain the degree to which we are qualified to teach inside to our disciplines or in another faculty members discipline. I would expect the college to insist that we hold ourselves to the highest standards available and the standards reside in the _faculty and not in a well meaning subset of the faculty. Thirdly, I think the proposed curriculum review that bypasses school committees have a positive obligation to explain why their curricular review is more expert than that of a larger bodies that already engages curricular review. Thank you.

Senator Lucey - I would just like to say that the SCC is a somewhat random subset of faculty that you are describing here in terms of the subcommittee for II. I don't know the numbers of the SCC that are trained in looking at curriculum and curriculum development. All of those kinds of things I would take it on faith as colleagues. I can't say much more than that I am too angry but that's all I have to say.

Professor Hottinger - Women & Gender Studies - I am concerned about this. I think it really undermines the work that the II subcommittee has been doing for the past 8 years. To cultivate an expertise in interdisciplinary we have held two faculty workshops each semester. We have held reading groups where we have read national and international scholarship on interdisciplinary. We have brought in expert consultants, consultants from the association for interdisciplinary study. Both of those consultants held day long if not day and a half long workshops on interdisciplinary pedagogy and interdisciplinary research. Those workshops were attended by anywhere from 25-30 faculty. We have spent a lot of time really thinking hard about what interdisciplinary is at this institution, what it means for our curriculum and for our classes and for the ISP. To have that 8 years of work undermined by a revision to the Senate Curriculum Committee guidelines without broader discussion feels..I'm a little disheartened.

Senator Hanrahan - I want to be clear that the Senate Curriculum Committee totally supports the II subcommittee and the II effort. Totally supports the workshops that the II committee puts forward. Totally supports the recruiting and the promotion of II courses. The question is not the II process or the 8 years worth of work, that is totally supported. The question is is it in the college, what advantage does having the current process have over putting the approval process through the school committees where there can be a greater say and participation of the school process. I think there is a little bit of maybe a miscommunication but the SCC totally supports the II process and everything that the II stands for. The only thing they are talking about here is the approval process once the courses start going to get approved through the curriculum process.

Senator Dunn - If I can just continue with that piece. It is not as if we are asking the II courses to go away, it's not as if we are asking interdisciplinary programs to go away, it's not as if the SCC vote reflects that the II subcommittee or the ISPC should go away. It's as Senator Hanrahan has stated is that the review process is what we are asking for a revision in. With regard to a couple of points that were raised with Senator Mallon's comments regarding addressing the school of Arts & Humanities as well as the school of Science's and Social Science's, one of the pieces that was brought up in the school of Art's & Humanities comments was with regard to II representation. I think when this comment was provided
from that particular school curriculum committee, it almost sounded as if what is going to happen to the II subcommittee and in terms of that representation the II subcommittee will still be in place, it will still be an active committee of the ISPC and what will designate representation are members from that subcommittee. Hopefully that clarifies that particular issue that was raised by the school of Arts & Humanities. The other point that was raised with regard to representation, I believe back in the March 7th meeting when we initially put out this proposal we had suggested that perhaps two II representatives serve on the school curriculum committees and then we revisited that and felt that one was appropriate given that one discipline has to sit at the table of the school curriculum committee. With regard to the questions that were raised by Sciences and Social Sciences in terms of how many course proposals are reviewed yearly? We reviewed 3 course proposals this year from II. In terms of the case of multiple disciplines I believe that we did address that with regard to advisory opinions and then also in the rationale. There were pieces that we did address that were raised by the school curriculum committee. This is not as if we are asking II to completely go away. It's just a change in the process as to how course proposals are vetted.

Senator Jean - You said that there were only three II proposals that came to the SCC this year?

Senator Dunn - There were actually four and two of them were the same proposal but from different...I think one was from IIWGS and one was from IISOC but they were the same proposal. Four if you want to count those as separate proposals.

Senator Jean - Those four were they all approved by the SCC?

Senator Dunn - I believe they were, yes.

Senator Mallon - I guess I find it more that a little discongenuous to assert over and over again the presence of the II subcommittee, the II leadership voice at the same time. What essentially is happening, I believe is a disempowerment of that II subcommittee and those II co-chairs and potentially even the ISP chair or new leadership. I am paying attention to the language in both Senator Martin's comments as well as in the comments of the rationale of the SCC that really address what I think is at the heart of some of this response to, this need to make this change right now without again considering the larger interdisciplinary conversation or the larger conversation with those involved in interdisciplinary discourse on this campus. I do see that this request to move forward at this time without being fully vetted has to do with suspicion, has to do with suspicion of colleagues who dare to I am quoting now from the document "infringe on any other disciplines" infringe on, violate, transgress, break into other disciplines. Those comments are pretty key to me in understanding or at least in trying to understand why there has to be such a move right now when we are in the middle of the kind of revision we're in the middle of such a move right now to take the power of course approval process, to take the power of vetting those courses away from a committee that has been involved in doing that work for years and has invited the committee as Professor Hottinger has invited the campus community rather as Professor Hottinger has said into constant conversations about this discourse. Very challenging and one of the things that it challenges is our notion that anyone who teaches interdisciplinary is infringing upon or in some way crossing over into space that they are not allowed to because they don't have expertise in it to cross into it.

Senator Harfenist - I think my concerns are that this is premature. I am new to the ISP committee and this discussion has been floating around a lot and at the same time I teach an II course and I am not really worried about it going away but I feel that this year the ISP committee has a charge to try to streamline maybe make the process easier or make it more understandable and I believe the co-chairs are quite close to producing a document that they'll provide to the administration about this. I think fellow members of the ISP committee might find it funny that I agree with most everything that the SCC
was talking about. I do have concerns, is this person qualified to teach in both realms, who is a buy in. I think that definitely the other discipline you might not have expertise in and should have a say. I just think at this point it's premature and almost chops the legs out underneath what the current ISP committee is trying to do. At this point it would be my great objection to it. Overall from what I have read I think it's quite legitimate. It was well thought out but I have some concerns especially with the timing of it and it seems premature. I don't know if there is a way you can table this or anything or delay it but that is what I would hope to do, at least for now until the co chairs can get their report to the Provost and to the President.

Senator Stanish - We have reached the end of our 15 minute discussion but I see lots of other hands so I will make a motion to extend the discussion.

Motion: Senator Stanish moves to extend the discussion be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Fleeger - I am also a co chair of the II subcommittee and also have been a member of the subcommittee for the past two years. I am a late comer to the academy, prior to getting my Phd. I worked for 15 years in natural resource management where interdisciplinary was just an accepted norm to the profession. I worry that I see interdisciplinary courses and years of ___work being important for our graduates to enter the world that exist beyond Keene State College. I feel that most of us spend our time here and disciplines make sense to us but they really don't translate very effectively to the world that our students encounter when they leave. My interest has been being here in an interdisciplinary department and I feel that my interest is in supporting and promoting interdisciplinary work on campus. If I felt that this proposal would achieve that I would whole heartedly embrace it. I feel that the current process has several advantages that this proposal does not and the first advantages I feel that the II committee is representative of interdisciplinary work that occurs across schools and doesn't seem to make sense to me to have one school vote on curriculum that potentially bridges across schools so from a representational stand point I think that there is interest in having a committee that includes the multiple schools. I think that the question expertise that this committee has been much more effective or has the potential to much more effectively support interdisciplinary people that want to engage in interdisciplinary work that people that have experience are drawn to this committee and structured workshops and other types of activities to try and fill that expertise and address the expertise question in that fashion. I think that is an advantage of the current process has. I also had another advantage At any rate I do think that the current process has merit and I don't believe that this current proposal is being proposed to support interdisciplinary work. In fact I feel that it is actually in response to some concern that interdisciplinary on Keene State campus has gotten out of control and it needs to be reigned in and I don't feel that. I don't agree with that assessment and believe that the current process can be effective and I acknowledge that there are legitimate concerns with how the committee can operate but I am going to appreciate the opportunity to address those concerns rather than having that responsibility removed.

Senator Gianno - I am not sure how this change in the process would undermine ISP and II courses and program. If the people who are teaching it are well qualified to teach it then why not know that more clearly? One thing I think is that we have built into this first of all an assessment process this coming year. There seems to be this assumption that this is going to be bad for II courses and the ISP program. All of the other ISP program courses already go through the different school curriculum committees. We'll see how it goes, we'll pay close attention, we'll see if there is some kind of prejudice. There seems to be some kind of suspicion on the part of the ISP in regard to how people who are not in the ISP and people who are representatives of the disciplines and the interdisciplinary respond. The school
curriculum committees are going to react or behave in regard to their courses but we actually don't have any knowledge. We don't have any data, we don't have any information that indicates that there is going to be a problem. We can't just assume there is going to be a problem. The other thing is that the curriculum guidelines are only changed once a year. If we don't do this now we'll have to wait another year. We'll have to go through this all again. It's a very very ___ process obviously and I think that those of us who have been on the Senate Curriculum Committee for a while have seen this really as a question of trying to go from a segregated process to an integrated process. Integrate interdisciplinary courses into the main stream of the curriculum process. That's simply all we want to do.

Senator Martin - I would like to address the issue of suspicion and say that it is not just a suspicion but it's confirmed to that. There are concerns that are merited about the expertise of people who are teaching. I distributed a document that is two sides it consists of screen shots from the college webadvisor. There is one of them that is labeled in my handwriting at the top screen 2012 original and on the other side is spring 2014 revised and current description. I am picking on this course and this individual faculty member because I picked on him in school committee and I picked on him on the floor of the Senate and I voted against this course so there is no surprise in my position on this issue and I don't think I am doing anything unethical here. I want to draw your attention to spring 2012. This individual proposed to teach a course that had the core concept of Political Science in it's title and one of the approximately 50% of Political Sciences content in it's title. Core concept is power and it's voting and so it's voting, power, and the portion. First I want to call your attention to in the ___ that we do that. Secondly, in the course description is has two but lets focus on the first arrow I've got a second arrow, you see the topics include the analysis of fairness in voting systems and the portion from the historical point of view and so on. I wrote a document dissertation in electro behavior. In conversation with this I asked him about his interest in this material and his qualification to do this and he said well Political Science hasn't really looked at voting. I was dumbfounded by that and I was dismayed and I ____ with him. I still think we ____ look at each other and we greet each other you'll see that he changed at least course description and even the course title. The commas are significant because by turning it into voting and power he turned it into something that's a term of art in the discipline. There are about eight and half thousand articles on voting power alone in a journal of policy studies that is dedicated to that kind of thing. He is clearly working in our discipline, ____ approach ____ any member of this campus about his course. I am trying to draw attention to the fact that at least review is appropriate and occasional demonstration are appropriate and I would like to be able to provide that input. As for Senator Fleeger's concern that only one school would be looked at, I hardly agree, I actually think that the SCC proposal is adequate and given the fact that only four, counting optimistically, interdisciplinary courses went through the SCC I don't see any harm in having all three schools review double like courses. Thank you for your time.

Provost Leversee - I just wanted to say to me the important things are our students need to learn about are not discipline specific. The real challenges facing our society has multiple perspectives and that's the important part of the education that we need to offer. When we designed these courses that we provide multiple perspectives in a course. I just think that we don't expect students to have in depth expertise in every area that is touched on by a course but the other level is to have an understanding that there are different perspectives. I have seen, especially 300 level ISP courses you will have students in the room who come from different majors. The students contribute that expertise to the courses in an important way. To me the question here is what's the effect of this whatever the intent was, is the bar being raised in a way that makes it more difficult for us to promote interdisciplinary courses? That to me is unfortunate. What is the effect of this be, practically, the other is what is the effect in terms of sort of symbolic value. I see some of the courses within disciplinary that if you drilled down and look at some of the syllabi it is not uncommon to see that there were a variety of perspective ____disciplinary course but we in fact won't circulate those discipline based courses to all other disciplines across the campus the same way that we propose this. My concern is I think it is important as Senator Fleeger said to
recognize that the issues of the world are interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and we want to promote that opportunity so our students to learn that way and I am concerned about the practical effectiveness involved of this proposal.

Senator Stanish - Other discussion? Seeing none I will remind you that I will bring this up for discussion and a vote at next weeks meeting. Given that all of the discussion that we heard today centered around item 7 on the Curriculum committee report and it is to address Senator Gianno's point point of, she is exactly right, if these curriculum guidelines are not approved they will revert back to the existing curriculum guidelines. What I will intend to do is frame the motion in such a way that items 1 - 6 can still, we can separate those out. Items one - six can still move forward, we vote on those separately and then item 7 I think we will be able to do that. I will ask our Parliamentarian if he agrees that we should be able to do that. I am assuming giving your lack of discussion on the other points that everyone is ok with them. However, if you are not feel free to mention that either now or next week. Any further discussion?

Senator Lucey - I want to say thank you they have obviously put a lot of hard work in this.

Senator Stanish - That's right, that's right. Absolutely right

Senator Dunn - Is it appropriate to make a motion to separate those motions at this point and approve items 1-6 and then bring item 7 back to the table?

Senator Stanish - Sure, I think we can do that today. Absolutely, would you like me to make the motion? Whichever way, I don't care.

Senator Martin - I will make a motion.

Motion: Senator Martin moves that the Senate separate items 1 - 6 in the Senate Curriculum Committees guidelines from item 7 and vote on them today be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Fleeger - I would like the opportunity to reflect on the advisory opinions question more extensively. We really appreciate the opportunity to consider that part of the guidelines as well. In part, my concern is based upon a couple of different factors. I agree and support wholeheartedly the expectation of consultation with affected departments and disciplines. Where the question comes to me more problematic is in the sort of the nature of interdisciplinary departments where that expertise is in some cases presumed to exist within the department as well as the idea of the course level. For example, teaching courses in Environmental Studies at the 100 or entry level, beginning level, I typically deal with a little bit of Chemistry, a little bit of Biology, a little bit of Political Science, isn't the expectation that we would be burdened with the requirement of sending these advisory opinions of all these departments for all of our courses, that we would promote in the future? That seems to me to be problematic so I just have some questions about the implications of the design of the advisory opinions as they are currently written and uncomfortable with that___

Senator Dunn - Could I make a friendly amendment?

Senator Stanish - Absolutely

Senator Dunn - Could it be 1 - 5?

Senator Stanish - If the proposer who wrote the motion is happy with that, absolutely.
Senator Dunn - Item 1-5 separated from 6 and 7.

Senator Stanish - Other discussion on 1-5?

Senator Dunn - We hate to lose

Senator Stanish - That's right, other discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish - ___So I think we can start with ____the motions ????. I believe that concludes unless I will turn it over to Senator Dunn. Unless you have anything for Senator Dunn and the Senate Curriculum Committee report I think we are done.

Senator Dunn - Point of clarification, is there anything that the SCC needs to prepare for for next week or are we revisiting this current document?

Senator Stanish - I believe we are revisiting the current document. I will ask Senators, would it be helpful to ask the Senate Clerk to include this document again in your senate packet for next week or will you bring the one you have with you? Either way is ok whatever is more convenient. We can attach both to the email as well so if you misplaced the email from this week, you will have them both. How's that? That works. Alright I believe that concludes the Senate Curriculum Committee report.

VI. New Business
VII. Adjournment 5:24pm
• Senate Elections: In order to allow as many Senate elections to be completed as possible, the SEC proposes holding the organizational meeting of 2014-2015 Senate (439th meeting) on Wednesday, April 30, at 4pm in Madison Street Lounge, rather than immediately following the last meeting of the 2013-2014 Senate on Wednesday, April 16 (438th meeting).

• Curriculum Guidelines: The SEC would like to discuss and vote on the remaining items pertaining to the AY 2014-2015 Curriculum Guidelines [SD 13-14/38] in 437th Senate Meeting SCC report [SD 13-14-37].

  Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate discuss and vote on item 6 from the 437th SCC report [SD 13-14-37].

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

  Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate discuss and vote on item 7 from the 437th SCC report [SD 13-14-37].

  7. 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.

  (See the 437th SCC report for the full deliberation and rationale for this item.)