

Minutes
for the 427th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, March 6, 2013
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:10pm

II. Roll Call

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

III. Secretary's Report

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

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

Vote: Motion passes as amended

IV. Courtesy Period

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

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

V. Subcommittee Reports

• **Executive Committee**

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

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

Vote: Motion carries

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

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

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish – That was the first item on the Senate Executive Committee report, we do have a few items so feel free ask questions as they come up. There are a few motions, so feel free to jump in with comments as we go. You do not need to hold your comments until the end since there are many items here.

Our first item was just a reminder around Senate decorum. We do have in our By-Laws Article VI about floor procedure. The first one; Order of Debate says that all discussion and debate shall take place through the Chair after proper recognition, not through direct exchange between individual senators or senate guests. The By-Law doesn't specifically address guests but we'll talk about that, but an exchange between individual senators is not in order. I will try my best to keep us on track. I know it is difficult; and it is more human to talk to each other. I think we understand that and we will try to keep comments to at least the Senate at large. The Chair may relinquish the gavel temporarily to the Chair of a committee or a special speaker.

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

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

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

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

Senator Stanish - Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

I have three observations about this address:

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

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

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

I also have three expressions of sentiment:

First, I apologize to Senator Bedell. I should have spoken in a timely manner to uphold the dignity and competence of her position and contributions; but I was dumfounded into silence. I believe that I had company in that regard. I have been informed that she cannot be present today; but I believe that it is important to place a timely response into the records that are kept by this body. Although I wish that I could speak for the membership, I think that I am expected to be circumspect and convey my individual regrets.

Second, I would like to thank the Senate Executive Committee for starting to respond to this matter, in its reminder to members that the terms of Article VI : C: 1-3 should govern all exchanges in this body. However, that reminder—and most of the Bylaws of the Senate—is directed to the behavior of Senate members, and does not adequately remind guests of their responsibilities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There were two things that I think were reassuring in this amendment. One is that we were assured there would be College review and approval of changes made to the ISP program. That they would see the light of day and the general College would talk about them before we implemented them. Two, that there was

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Again, with regard to individual thematic offerings as we discussed I believe we have confirmed that an approved topics course are not separately approved but are offered by departmental faculty with

expectations that the thematic offerings will meet learning outcomes and other expectations defined during the original course topic shell approval. That's the practice that we have been using for departmental courses as well as the II category courses that we discussed and the Registrar reconfirmed these processes. There are some questions with regard to the administrative registration processes and clarity of these courses within the curriculum, those are things I think I will be working closely with Registrar on and report back to the Senate. With regard to the courses themselves, the themes versus the shell, this is the process that is used in approval cycles. I was grateful to be able to work with the Registrar and present that to the Senate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Professor Mallon - I wanted to turn your attention to page 3 of the document created by the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee. Here we listed some of the resources that we all on the subcommittee make use of and that are publically available to anyone who is interested. Just some context here, when we began to talk about interdisciplinarity at Keene State 6 or 7 years ago the first thing we did was turn to

the national conversations on interdisciplinary research and pedagogy that had been happening since about 1970 and we turned to the literature to have those conversations. We read through key literature regarding definitions and outcomes for our interdisciplinary courses at Keene and you can see those resources on the interdisciplinary page of the ISP website. The address is included on that document about our workshops.

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Darby - I do not recollect receiving those.

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

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

Senator Darby - I don't recall receiving those.

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

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

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

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

Senator Stanish - It is.

Professor Antonucci - All Coordinators became Chairs after 2009?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Stanish - Was this the ISPC?

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

Senator Stanish - Thank you, this is very helpful.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Darby - It is still helpful.

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Stanish - We will hold off on discussion to that as it is related to the course proposal that we will make a motion on in a minute. We will have all that discussion at that time. We did have some motions at

our last meeting to bring these course proposals forward and the SEC will do that on behalf of the Senator's.

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

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

Senator Stanish - We would be voting on approving IIFILM 362 course proposal.

Senator Lucey - The Senate is voting to override the SCC?

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

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

Senator Stanish - Yes

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

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

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

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

Senator Hanrahan - Historically when II first was approved there were certain topics that were considered the II disciplines, Women and Gender Studies was one, American Studies was the other. I know this first hand because when we were initially going to ISP, Computer Science thought that we would be one of these II disciplines like everybody. But when we applied, I had a nice conversation with Professor Mallon who very politely told me "no," in our opinion you are a science and on the science path and we were not allowed at that point to advance an II course. That since has changed, I think, but I don't think it has officially been approved by the Senate. There were certain subjects; I think Holocaust and Genocide at the time was another one. So, those are the official II courses. I just wanted to make that point.

Professor Mallon - I just want to communicate a point that we need to keep separate and distinct what is a discipline and what is a department. Nobody who proposes an interdisciplinary course is stepping into another department and asking to teach a course in that department. As Professor Hottinger said in our last Senate meeting all of these interdisciplinary courses have a departmental home. There is no orphaned interdisciplinary course out there arbitrarily grabbing a department from another school and saying I will locate myself here. That distinction is really important and we can't keep interchanging a discipline and a department. The department is how the course moves through our system but the interdisciplinary field is not an interdepartmental field it is an interdisciplinary field. Professor Velasco can speak to that for interdisciplinary degrees better than I but it is a very very important distinction that needs to be made here.

Senator Lucey - Just a couple of comments that were brought up by Senator Welsh. In terms of the official language, again that Senate approved document from 2006 it talks about Interdisciplinary Studies, there is absolutely no mandate about team teaching. It says the college supports having a percentage of these courses team developed and team taught the first time the course is offered. After the initial offering, faculty will individually teach the course. There is no expectation that every course that goes through II will have faculty teaching from separate disciplines.

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

Senator Welsh - I think that my objection, if I may display my interdisciplinary credentials also I have a Masters degree in Environmental Studies which is an interdisciplinary major. I understand interdisciplinarity and I am very much in favor as it has enriched my education. Coming to this point; but I think my objections, that are the basis of where I might vote, are much more mundane. I do not see the language of the existing ISP proposal or a permissiveness about courses where faculty have not collaborated across disciplines. That is not team teaching, that's just collaborating across it seems to be

the main phrase that keeps coming back again and again. I think that as long as we have that as our definition at Keene State that is how we judge whether it is an interdisciplinary course or not. I would be fully in favor of reexamining that definition, putting in new guidelines, opening the door to an array of new courses and clearly defining what they are. That's a fine thing but I think our current language is fairly explicit and I think also that the advisory opinions for better or worse, they are asked for. At least the process of asking is something that is required and pertinent to the guidelines. I think they have potential benefit. I can see where they could constrain the courses, but again it's a process question. Ignoring process is bothersome to me and that is why I am conflicted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Stanish - We have reached the end of 15 minutes of discussion on this proposal and I see that Senator Blatchly still has a comment.

Motion: Senator Stanish moves to extend discussion for another 15 minutes be accepted by the Senate
Vote: Motion does not carry

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

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

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

Vote: Motion carries 16-5

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

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

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

This seems very standard and very uncontroversial. It doesn't seem to fit these proposals. However, there were six other courses and I just want to name them ART 455, English 208 and English 308; I've got titles for them if you need them, Geography 340, Health Science 216 and Holocaust & Genocide Studies/Sociology 427. Those are topics courses and they seem to be from what I could tell, it's a little hard from the course description, the focus of the course is really kind of on a methodology and they can change the topic without really altering that fundamental focus. The topic is there to support that. It obviously needs to be appropriately chosen so the topic fits with the methodology that is used. It's a rich topic that can support the courses and so forth but the topic is not so fundamentally entrenched that it can't

be changed with lots of effort on the part of the instructors but without really changing the fundamental methodology.

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

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

Senator Blatchly - I don't see it.

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

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

Professor Mallon - Again communication issues are important here. What exactly does regular mean? I call your attention to the topics course in bullet one in response to the SCC. Take a look at those examples of what curricular offerings are for topics courses; occasionally, fall, spring, summer, annually, fall, spring, fall, spring, occasionally, offered occasionally, offered occasionally. If we want to standardize our

language around our topics courses at the college level, I think that is a fair discussion to have. Now we have a very irregular set of definitions for regular.

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

Vote: Motion carries 17-4

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

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

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

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

Senator Stanish - It's there.

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

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Blatchly - With the AOC sun setting out there is a requirement I think to do something with the people who are on the committee and one would hope be a little more ambitious than that.

Senator Stanish - Yes, in fact that is on our agenda and I forgot to put it on the list so thank you for reminding me to add it. There may be some work with the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Group in terms of governance. Their recommendations are coming forward in governance and those recommendations may effect that discussion and hopefully those pieces will come together for us but yes, the SEC has been

discussing this and thank you for continuing to remind me. Anything else on this? If you do think of anything please email the Senate Secretary by March 29th so we have time to review in the Senate Executive Committee meeting. We need to bring it forward to all of you to have discussion at the April 10th meeting and then vote on it at the April 17th meeting in terms of our bylaws.

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

- **Academic Overview Committee**

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

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

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

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

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Keene State College currently consists of nine tenured or tenure-track faculty, all of whom hold a Ph.D. In addition, there are four part-time and adjunct faculty currently teaching in the department. Outside reviewers noted the strength of the Sociology and Anthropology which includes its faculty. They engage in collaborative research with students; take students to academic conferences. They are productive scholars and active on campus. It is a professional community. It is also focused on international perspectives and Community engagement. Another strength the external reviewers noted was the support for other campus programs including the contributions to the Anthropology and Sociology department with ISP. They also thought that the curriculum was described as "robust and rich." They also felt that the new addition to the Criminal Justice Studies and Anthropology-Sociology majors were a strength as well and also the collegial relationships. The challenges that were noted was the lab space and the increasing programmatic demands provided by expectations for assessment as well as helping students in making career choices. They also expressed a concern that the addition of the new criminology major may bring some different types of students into the department with different expectations and that may be a challenge. The reviewers also felt diversity and engaging communities of color was also noted as a challenge in the department as well as related to strengthened sequencing in the learning outcomes for the major. The recommendations that were followed were developed by the reviewers and forwarded to the AOC were to encourage the department at looking at their sequencing and explicitness of their learning outcomes and objectives. A specific

suggestion was to examine and make the Capstone course consistent across different instructors as well as being explicit in the types of theory that were expected to be used in capstone courses. Career advising the formation of services provided to students and that assessment learning outcomes specifically for the Anthropology major and minor programs to bring them into step with the Sociology learning outcomes. And what AOC report would not be complete without a recommendation for consideration for facilities and faculty lines.

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

Vote: Motion carries

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

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

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Lucey - we have nothing to report

- **Senate Curriculum Committee**

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

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

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

Vote: Motion carries

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

HGS 356 The Holocaust and the Christian World

IHHGS 356 The Holocaust and the Christian World

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

Vote: Motion carries

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

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

Vote: Motion carries

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

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

Vote: Motion carries

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

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

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

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

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

Motion: Senator White-Stanley moves that the IIGEOL 340 course proposal be brought to the next Senate meeting for discussion and vote at the April 10th meeting.

Senator Stanish - this is just to bring it forward to vote at the next meeting. We will discuss it at that time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Jean - We made two motions.

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

Senator White-Stanley - I withdraw the second one.

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

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

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

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

Senator Hanrahan - Call the question.

Vote: Motion carries

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

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

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment 6:05pm