Dear Anne-Marie and Tom:

The three of us are writing in our capacity as senators, rather than individual faculty members, to provide the task force with a list of concerns about the ISP that colleagues have shared with us.

1. Preliminary considerations about the list and its authors:

   a. *Why us?* We believe that our colleagues have communicated their thinking to us because we are senators who talk policy with them on a regular basis, and because our extensive involvement in teaching ISP courses prompts frequent and specific discussion of the program with colleagues.

   b. *Whose concerns?* This compilation is not “our list” since, as individuals, we consider some concerns more important than others. It does, however, address issues that we have either heard repeatedly or received in a communication that underscored its importance to the sender.

   c. *Why send the list at this time?* Since as senators we are going to share in the responsibility to review and approve the report that is being assembled by the task force, we will eventually need to make a judgment that the issues we believe to be outstanding have been considered and perhaps addressed. Consequently, it is reasonable to give the task force an opportunity to consolidate concerns that have come our way with concerns that the task force has already identified.

2. Information requests:

   a. *Do we know how departments are staffing large introductory-level ISP courses to meet demand while providing adequate coverage of non-ISP courses in departmental majors or programs?* It is possible that as departments allocate faculty resources to teach introductory ISP courses there may be a corresponding reduction in the capability of some participating disciplines to offer non-ISP courses in their majors or programs. An analogous problem may arise when departments allocate faculty members to teach 300-level ISP courses that do not fulfill requirements or electives in majors or programs.

   b. *For the departments that rely on adjunct faculty to teach ISP courses, how much time is added to the workload of the faculty members who supervise adjuncts?* Some of the components of this supervision include: finding adjunct faculty to teach; mentoring new adjuncts; observing during the semester; and reviewing learning outcomes.
c. **What information exists about patterns and anomalies in the proportions of full-time tenure-track faculty members who are teaching ISP courses?** If they are teaching less than originally projected, what reasons should be proposed to explain unexpectedly low participation?

3. **Academic and curricular oversight and governance:**

   a. **Is the existing governance of ISP seen as efficient, open, inclusive, and responsive?**

   b. **Are all policy changes to the administration and delivery of the ISP Program being approved by the KSC Senate?** Aside from documents that appear in the Senate agenda, are departments and affected faculty notified when changes to ISP policies are under consideration?

   c. **Are affected departments being consulted when courses are proposed and instructors are hired within their subject areas for individual II courses?**

   d. **Are there clearly defined rules specifying who oversees the qualifications of ISP instructors hired for ITW, IQL, and II courses?** If there are such rules, was the Senate included in the drafting or vetting of those rules?

   e. **Are cuts to full-time adjunct faculty jeopardizing the capacity of the ISP to provide the rigorous, developmentally graduated, and cumulative education that was expected when ISP was adopted?**

   f. **Has the ISP published a rationale for the different kinds of program assessment that it conducts that specifically addresses the representativeness of student work used during the assessment?**

   g. **Has the ISP assessment focus on skill development diminished the emphasis on content that must also be appropriate in a program which constitutes one-third of the curriculum for each student?**

   h. **Has the ISP established a process to review the nature and number of requests and requirements that participating faculty members are expected to meet?**