

Minutes
for the 412th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011
Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 5:40**
- II. Roll Call**
- III. Election of 2011-2012 Senate Officers**
 - a. Chair – Larry McDonald
 - b. Vice Chair - Peter Stevenson
 - c. Secretary – Kim Schmidl-Gagne
 - d. Faculty-at-large - Pat Dolenc

- IV. Adjournment 5:53**

Minutes
for the 413th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, September 14, 2011
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:07pm

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Sapeta, Senator Martin, Senator Ditkoff, Senator Denehy

Absent: Senator Shalit

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 411th and 412th meetings of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes

IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing to report for the courtesy period

V. Subcommittee Reports

• **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – The only committee report tonight is the Executive Committee. Many items included in the Senate packet are for information purposes only. The interim report from the ISP Task Force is also included their next report is due October 14th.

The Co-Chairs of the ISP Task Force will be joining us to give a brief update.

We included the Academic Review Policy in the packet because of some confusion this year in regard to open enrollment. This policy changed to reflect that as long as there were open seats in a class, students could electronically enroll. The only time we were to sign the add/drop slip was if we went over the caps listed for that class. This is implemented now and the only unfortunate part this time was that while some people were signing the add/drop slips students were electronically adding the class.

Senator Stanish – When this policy was discussed was there any discussion about students who would add a course late in the week and potentially miss a full week of course and never even have conversation with the instructor. My concern is that are we setting the student up for failure. They do not know what they are getting themselves in for and they are already that much behind. I just didn't know if that was considered.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It was not discussed in the Senate, I do not know about Academic Standards.

Senator McDonald – I do recall a conversation when this was proposed several years ago, I think it was worded that when our technology caught up to that process it would be implemented chronologically.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – As part of the last revision to the calendar guidelines it was considered and written in a vague enough way to accommodate this.

Senator Welsh – As Chair of the Standards Committee, my understanding is that our first task is to reconcile the difference between the Calendar policy and the Academic policy; to make a call about which one or when the time starts and stops. I want to understand the mission of the Standards Committee on these conflicting policies. Is this correct or is this an administrative fix?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It was part of what we talked about in SEC that the Academic Calendar has it listed as seven calendar days and the Academic Standards policy that was approved has five working days or class days or some sort of language so we wanted to get both documents to have the same language.

Senator Welsh – We can fix that.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The Calendar Guidelines only have that listed in one place but the Academic Standards document has it in several different places.

Senator McDonald – The last document is a copy of the time to graduation that was passed by the Senate in the spring. I brought this up at the Executive Committee the other day; this is probably something that will take additional review this fall so that we have everything covered. If you were in the Senate this past spring this was something that was brought up with some pressure to move forward on and we did that to meet deadlines. As I understand it, our outline of this plan was accepted by the Board of Trustees and we will be moving forward with this. This is something you should review and bring up with your constituencies because in some ways it has the potential to affect every program on campus. Whether it does or not, it is something that should be reviewed and has been included in the packet. This is something that will be ongoing with discussion.

The Co-Chairs from the ISP Task Force are with us today and I have asked them to give us a brief update.

Co-Chair Dr. Anne-Marie Mallon - This has been a tremendous amount of work just organizing the report we submitted in May. This is literally just an update so we can get back to our committee meeting. We are in the process of working in subcommittees and there are five subcommittees that are reviewing the charge and pilot survey that went out to senior students. We went back to the charge and the issues that the charge had raised. We are also looking at all the constituencies that have been identified and need to be heard from.

We have identified and are working in five subcommittees. The Faculty Subcommittee is creating a survey and will be in the process of refining that survey. A Student Subcommittee is working with a draft of the survey we sent out last May but this also needs additional work on the questions and the material that we received. The questions need to be complete and sharpened. What we are calling an Academic Affairs Subcommittee is looking at all staff and PAT who are involved with students that are taking ISP. One example they are looking at is how students know about ISP. There is also a Student Affairs Subcommittee which includes Admissions; people who work with students and get advising on ISP. Finally, we have an Administrators Subcommittee and they are looking at who their administrator is as well as what their intersections are with ISP and the administrative detail. So we have five subcommittees that are working on different ways to reach everybody involved in ISP.

We are also looking at options that would include an open forum for folks who want to come out and talk about it other than from the administrative or survey point. We haven't developed that yet but are looking at other options that involve faculty, students and staff in ways that they can share responses. That is the major work that we are really trying to hammer out right now. We will be sending out information to our constituencies on campus and the timeline for that is tight.

Co-Chair Thomas Bassarear – We are finalizing some of the surveys now and several of our subcommittees have actually started meeting with groups. The Academic Affairs subcommittee has had a meeting with people in Academic Advising and talking with them face to face. Some of that stuff feels like the information is better received face to face. By the end of September or early October we expect to get that information to start looking at that. At that point we are going to look at going back to the charge and mapping all of that information and then look at the Assessment and NEASC documents. We will then start different subcommittees to look at each one of the charges. At that point we start to look at what is emerging in terms of what we have and do not have consensus on with respect to the charge. We want to look at the successes and challenges of ISP and then recommendations. As we work through that we will be looking at how the four major charges work with each other. Once we have all that a report will be produced in a timely fashion. The college made the decision to not hire an outside consulting company to do this so it is with limited resources and time and that is the tension we are working with which is a tension we all work with in all of our subcommittees. What can we do within the time and resources that we have? When we get to that writing phase we might ask for some administrative support. We have had some conversations in CELT and with Institutional Research about how they can help with analyzing data and stuff like that. That is an update on what we have done. One of the struggles we are having and the whole college is having is fewer people doing more jobs. It is showing the strain and you feel that across campus. There are some people on the committee saying I just can't come to every meeting and not being able to work in between meetings because there is just that stress.

Senator Welsh – Is there anything we are voting on in regard to this today?

Senator McDonald – No there is not, we just asked for an interim report today.

Senator Welsh – I sense there is a immense amount of work toward a preset deadline of October that may be met but personally I would rather see the deadline pushed back and the quality and sanity of everyone to be retained than to rush it for that deadline.

Co-Chair Tom Bassarear - October 15th is just a progress report the final report is due January 31st.

Provost Netzhammer - There are a number of interim reports so they are constantly in touch with the Senate.

Senator Welsh – What I am hearing about the inability to come to a meeting and members not able to address the issue with the energy that they might like, that is also reflected out there among the general constituencies of the college. Faculty know that this committee is working and would like to jump in and say things and help in the direction of the findings but find themselves occupied

by classes and all sorts of other things. They are worried that the report will be produced without their input. I really don't mind pushing the timeframe back. My second point is that I heard there is a survey for faculty under production.

Provost Netzhammer – That is correct

Senator Welsh – That is a very important point to me. If I remember the reason for creating and charging the committee and one thing I have consistently heard was Chuck Weed saying that Tenure Track Faculty were voting by not participating in the program as we originally perceived. I think that that fact, especially one that has been brought up so much early in the process needs to be thoroughly investigated. As far as surveys go it might be useful to include the survey in a faculty meeting as opposed to the survey monkey which people have a tendency to delete. You want good and honest responses. You want good responses where people can speak frankly and feel like they are being heard. I don't think it would be a bad idea to have it at faculty meeting.

Co-Chair Anne-Marie Mallon – It wouldn't be a bad idea because this is really important and we want you to pay attention to the survey. You all need to take the time to do it. We are certainly hoping that we have the support of various official and non official groups and individuals across campus that will take the survey as well. We are asking the students the same thing. We have a student that is involved in student governance and a student that is connected to student activities. We are relying upon them to get the word out to students to do the student survey. It really does become a task for all of us that have a commitment to this issue. All folks on the committee are feeling overworked and commitment is not the issue otherwise we would not be sitting on this committee. We all have a commitment to the issue and we have to push in whatever ways we can to make sure that those kinds of things get full responses. It would be great to have a Senate and it would be great to have Chairs remind faculty about that survey.

Co-Chair Tom Bassarear – The survey has closed ended quantifiable questions but it also has open ended questions. In your opinion what parts of ISP are working? What are your challenges? What are your recommendations? If it's done by hand then we would definitely need clerical support to enter that. With the student survey that we did there were 240 responses that was dumped onto an excel spreadsheet. With an excel spreadsheet we can tell what the quantification stuff is within an hour. We can get the quantification of that easily. Then we printed all the open ended questions which were ten pages and this is rich stuff. If the surveys are done by hand then we need help to have somebody type that in and then the quantifiable stuff pulled out. Going back to your other point, the other piece is the open forum. For some people, they want to say it in person because it is not something they can type in three lines. We do want to use as many different vehicles as possible and feasible so people feel like they have been heard and the input registered. If that doesn't show up on the recommendation it is because they didn't listen to us. We know what that is like. Our job is not what this is and what everybody has said, but these are some of the things we saw merge as patterns.

Senator McDonald – Other questions?

Co-Chair Tom Bassarear – If you do have other questions you can send emails the committee and subcommittees meet every week.

Senator McDonald – This was set up so the committee could keep very close ties with the Senate throughout the process. We appreciate the fact that we have steps along the way to look at this.

Motion: The SEC made the motion to nominate Ann Atkinson to serve as Parliamentarian

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Senator McDonald - The Parliamentarian can be someone who serves on the Senate or outside of the Senate. I really appreciate the time that Ann takes to serve as Parliamentarian

I will take responsibility that there is one item not on the agenda that we actually went over in the SEC meeting last week. I would like to open a discussion on the structure of the Senate. In the NEASC report there was a brief mention that it is possible that the college might want to at least review the structure of the Senate at Keene State College. I believe that there was no criticism of the structure. In some of the surveys sent out, there seemed to be a plurality of people whose responses indicated that they had a preference of looking at revising the structure of the Senate. At the SEC meeting the other day, we thought we would give the opportunity to put this out there and open up a fifteen minute discussion period for people who may have ideas. This would be something opened up to further discussion and debate at a later time but for tonight's meeting it is just a chance to take the temperature and get the opinions of the Senate.

Senator Stevenson – I think it is a good idea to look at the governance and perhaps think about ways to reformulate the Senate. Senator Welsh and I have been working on papers for a shared governance conference and our research on faculty government seems to reflect that faculty should take a more active role in the Senate as opposed to including staff and students in those discussions. We believe it is worth exploring.

Senator Harfenist – Is there anything in particular in the NEASC report that people brought up or through the information drive of surveys? Was there anything in particular or more general, like we should just restructure?

Senator Darby – I was on the NEASC subcommittee for Standard 5 which is on faculty. I was on a subcommittee that represented the different constituencies on campus and we formulated the survey that Senator McDonald mentioned. One particular area of concern for the faculty was that they have a greater say around curricular issues.

Provost Netzhammer – That was an important piece that came out of NEASC Self Study. If you look at the whole projection from the self study, it sort of identifies this tension between greater faculty control and greater faculty interest in having a more of a leadership role in that and diminishing faculty interest in serving on the Senate. How do you build a Senate? How do you build faculty leadership when we have positions that are always contested and sometimes remain unfilled as we do in this Senate? I think it is a combination of as we think of how the Senate is. What is the right size? What are the issues that need to be involved? Who should be around the table?

Vice President Robinson – Can you tell the make-up of the Senate now?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – There are 4 students, 3 staff members, 18 tenure track faculty, 1 librarian and 1 adjunct and 2 PA's for a total of 29 voting members.

Senator Darby – Does anyone recall when the current constitution of the Senate was established?

Senator McDonald – The last change was about five years ago when we added an adjunct representative.

Senator Stanish – I think that both Senator Darby and Provost Netzhammer have spoken correctly and accurately about the NEASC self study. The actual projection around this is written in Standard 3 which is around organization and governance. My feeling for the report as my memory recalls is that yes you identified in your self-study that this is something that you want to do. NEASC is not saying that we are doing something wrong. That was my sense of the tone there.

Provost Netzhammer – That is absolutely correct.

Senator Stanish – I do think it is a good idea for the Senate to reevaluate the structure of the Senate. Even periodically, I think that it is a good assessment and a practice for any group to do. In a way it can confirm that yes this is still the right structure or no we have evolved and need to change.

Senator Doreski – The make-up of the Senate in 1983 is comparable to what it is now. The complaint I heard at that time from several faculty was that students have the Student Assembly and Administrators meet all the time but there was no forum in which faculty could meet on their own. After hearing that complaint, if you want to call it a complaint for almost thirty years, maybe it is about time we discussed this.

Provost Netzhammer – I think the reason the SEC wanted to bring this discussion to the floor today even if we didn't want to discuss it, it is one of our NEASC projections so we sort of obligated ourselves last year to discuss it this year. I think where we are sort of stumbling is what is the best way for discussion? Do we put together a committee of Senators? Do we charge the SEC? Part of the reason we wanted to have a discussion even though we have nothing to vote on was to get a sense from this body on what is the best process to go through to evaluate the composition of the Senate, knowing that it is kind of a political thing. We have four students who sit on the Senate and one of the questions we are raising is should students sit on the Senate. It is not an easy thing to say we are going to just put faculty on this committee to decide what the Senate should look like. How are we going to approach this? Our hope is that we could get some feedback back from all of you about how to proceed down this path of discussions. Have the committee put something together and bring a proposal back to the Senate for putting this process in place that the Senate could then approve.

Senator Darby – I appreciate the SEC bringing this forward but I am a little bothered because there are important voices that are not here today.

Senator McDonald – I appreciate the fact that everyone needs to be involved in this. This is just an open discussion that should involve all people.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – When the SEC meets to discuss it, both Colin and I are members of the SEC so we will be sure our opinions are heard.

Senator McDonald – You are also welcome to send emails to any member of the SEC with suggestions. We are looking for input on how we can look at some structure, whether it is an ad-hoc committee and what that committee would look like. This is not something the SEC is pushing onto the Senate and in the end we may find that the structure is fine the way it is.

Senator Welsh – It seems like a committee might be the right thing to do. The SEC could compose what they believe the composition of an ad-hoc committee should be and then the Senate could vote on that composition. It would not be a terrible thing if the start date of the committee was put off a month or so. We have another committee doing important college work. I do believe a committee needs to be created and discussion needs to happen.

Senator McDonald – We have two faculty slots on the Senate that have not been filled and we still have open positions on the AOC.

VI. New Business

Senator Darby – I have some questions about the SEC meeting notes on September 7th. I would like to direct your attention to bullet number five on the SEC meeting notes. It states that *40 Credit Upper-Level Requirements (effective Fall 2012): Students entering in fall 2012 will be required to complete 40 credits at the upper level. Programs will need to review and potentially revise their curriculum to ensure this is possible. The Provost will request that the Deans share information with Chairs to begin the review process.* Is the charge for ISP to move the number of ISP credit requirements from forty four to a lower number? Is that correct?

Provost Netzhammer – Forty is the minimum from NEASC so it could not be lower than that.

Senator Darby – How will that operate with programs that need to review and potentially revise their curriculum? This is something that departments will need to do this semester. How are programs going to potentially revise their curriculum when they don't have a firm idea of what ISP is going to look like twelve months from now, particularly, around upper level requirements? What if it comes from ISP that we move the number of upper level requirements downward or even upward? How do programs know what number to target if they need to revise their programs? This is a rhetorical question because without full information with where ISP is going with respect to credit requirements, it may make it a bit challenging for some programs to move forward.

Senator Darby - On bullet number eight - *Process for reviewing program elimination: Currently there is no system in place to consider program elimination. The SEC will develop a procedure with input from the Senate. We will discuss this process, what needs to be considered and the roles of the Senate/Senate Committees during the upcoming Senate meeting.* In our curriculum documents currently there is a place that indicates program deletion. I think what we are really talking about here is retrenchment is that correct? What do we mean by program elimination if we are not talking about retrenchment?

Provost Netzhammer – The program elimination does not necessarily mean elimination of faculty. As we talk about this in the Senate and with the work we were doing with NEASC, the discussion was that we have a huge amount of consultation when we add programs but we don't have a lot of consultation when we eliminate. Not that we give the Senate authority to decide one way or the other, but the Senate is the recommending body and to make recommendations, for example, processes for students who are currently in the major and complete the major before it is eliminated or what some of the considerations are in eliminating that major. Part of this is the external requirement we had from the Board of Trustees this past year which was related to a three year enroll average of five or fewer graduates in ten or fewer majors. That is going to target a program. What we are looking to do and want in a few years time, is to develop our own process on how we look at those programs that are triggered by that metric. What does that mean for us? I could see a BA program in the Sciences that might not meet those numbers but every single one of those courses is a subset of the BS program in the Sciences. Eliminating that program, we are actually hurting the Sciences and not helping the institution in any way. We want to create an opportunity for that kind of discussion to take place to the Senate level prior to the Provost and President making a decision about whether that program will be eliminated.

Senator Darby – Elsewhere in the document it speaks under bullet number nine: *Process for reviewing externally mandated or proposed programs: The NEASC Self-Study recognized that forces outside of Keene State can require the development of programs to serve the needs of NH but our SCC guidelines were not designed to accommodate these requests: “Create a Clear Process for Developing New Programs: While there is a process in place for creating new programs in which the proposal is reviewed from the department-level to the USNH-level, this process needs to be re-examined. Whether the College is contemplating the addition of a program, such as nursing, in response to state needs in a particular area, or considering the expansion of successful and financially viable options, such as Graduate Education programs, the conversation and decisions need to take place in a way that is consistent and respectful to all constituencies, taking into account staffing challenges and the needs of the e larger community. The Provost, in concert with deans and department chairs, will begin to consider this matter in 2010 and develop a revised plan for the creation of new programs to be submitted to the Senate by 2013.”* Turning that language around a little bit is the process for reviewing program

elimination under consideration because potentially a force outside of KSC can require the elimination of programs? Are we setting ourselves up to allow someone from outside of Keene State to say, we need to eliminate a program?

Provost Netzhammer – I think that item really is a product of nursing. These two things didn't happen on the same committees nor did they come out of the same discussions. That was a moment in time where the Board of Trustees and the State were saying, we want nursing on all USNH campuses. As we were doing that, we were also realizing that we didn't really have a process in place. They are disconnected in that way. I would guess that the Board of Trustees has the authority to tell us what we can and cannot offer. I think the way the Board of Trustees has traditionally operated, and it's clear from what has happened in the last year, they are providing much more scrutiny in these areas than they have in the past. They want to see the numbers. They want to see that we have healthy majors for both fiscal and pedagogical reasons. That you are attentive to that and if you are not eliminating those programs, then you are being held accountable for that and are reporting back to them on those issues. We will see more and more of that and in fact at the next Senate meeting I will include in the SEC report the work plan for the Programs and Services Committee for the next year. That gets very specific into the things they are going to be looking at on the campuses. I think it will feel in a lot of ways similar to what happened last year, we were given a charge with less than a semester to respond to something the Board of Trustees wanted to see. I think that this is the way this Board of Trustees is operating, this year they have put out a work plan of the things they are going to be paying attention to over the course of the year. I think it will be a different kind of relationship with the Board of Trustees than we have had in the past. In some ways it will be uneasy, in some ways it will be hugely positive because they are actually interested in not just our finances but also the curriculum we are offering and they want to learn more about that in a sincere way. I think it will be a very different year for us.

Senator Darby – Colleagues across campus should not view this as an ominous sign. This is to set up a process to potentially eliminate or retract programs.

Provost Netzhammer – Personally, I do not think so. I think the process of eliminating a program is actually a positive thing for our campus; that we are going to discuss them rather than have that happen out of Hale building without a lot of consultation. I think it's absolutely the right course of action for our campus to take the process with regard to external pressure. We need to figure out how we are going to respond to those kinds of things.

I have had and continue to have several meetings about the Trans location of programs. This is the next big issue and I will present something to the Senate next time. The Trans location of programs is a big deal for the University System. Many states are in the process of giving bachelor graduating authority to their community colleges and if it is not the majority of community colleges that have it, then in a very short amount of time it will be that.

In the State of NH we have taken the approach where the two Systems are working together trying to say we do not want that to happen in our state. One of the alternate directions to move is to have our bachelor granting campuses offer some of our high demand programs on the community college campuses. There is a huge push now from Nashua which is our largest community college campus to offer a robust range and not just one or two programs but each campus come in and offer two or three programs that can be taken by students there. That is an outside pressure that we are going to need to respond to and we need to figure out a process for our Senate to give it's consultation on that issue. There will be a number of others that will come to us in that way. We hear rumblings around engineering like we did with nursing being offered on all the four year campuses. I have not heard much about that recently but it is a possibility that the Board of Trustees may decide is essential for the economic development of our State. Those are the kinds of things that the University System and the Board of Trustees are discussing that will have an impact on us and how we discuss them is very important. Because our tradition on this campus has been if it deals with curriculum it comes up from the faculty, even the Senate Curriculum Committee procedures allow that to be different. Even though it says that faculty can bring it forward, a Dean and the Administration can – it's not our tradition and hasn't been our culture so given that this is a more likely scenario, we need to figure out a way to get these into the pipeline for discussion. Whether it starts with departments or starts at the Senate level we need to develop a process for that.

Senator Stevenson – I do not want Senator Darby's question to get lost in this whole discussion given the Board of Trustees new found penchant for micro management and to let those out on the campuses and not share things with the SEC. I think one of the words and correct me if I am wrong but programmatic relevance and things like that. I am concerned, are there processes in place to stymie, prevent or delay if the Board of Trustees for example decides a program is no longer relevant that we feel is important to the sense of a Liberal Arts Education that they want to get rid of. Do we have a say?

Provost Netzhammer – Absolutely, they understand that it is their job to learn from us and it is also their job to hold us accountable. Senator Stevenson is correct; efficiency and relevance are probably the two words that appear most often in the work plan for the Program and Services committee. They are going to hold us accountable but we get to guide that discussion and they ask us questions. We have choices in what we would afford to them and they are going to, in broad strokes, look at job placements and student learning outcomes - whether we are doing that and we have evidence that our students are learning the curriculum. Those are the types of

things they are going to hold us accountable for over the next year. Boards have done this but it would be a very new thing and out of character even for a Board that micro manages to say you can no longer offer Sociology. I do not see it happening under any of the scenarios that are playing out for us at the moment.

Senator Blatchly – I just wonder, if we brought in a reasonable proposal for procedures for these reviews and in a sense build in some protections for appropriate arbitrary actions and we pass it through, does that then get that kind of Board approval? In other words, are they also agreeing to our procedures if we pass them?

Provost Netzhammer – No, it needs the approval of the President.

Senator Blatchly – It is a little like a pre-nup. You kind of hope you don't need it, but, it may offer us a little protection in saying these are our values and we don't want our own people to come in and say, I don't like the political tone of your major and out it goes. That is an arbitrary action and we would fight against it.

Provost Netzhammer - Those are the kinds of things we have been talking about and in the process I hope we would include. You don't want that from the Board of Trustees and you do not want it from the Provost either. I do believe that these processes we are looking at are greater than any one individual and however much faith you have in me to not do that. We should have clear processes that articulate our values and say these are the things we are going to consider when a program is brought to us for elimination.

Senator McDonald – Senator Darby, I think when we went with forty credits at upper level that was probably something that was passed prior to time to graduation and it certainly did have an effect on it. It is a good point to look at that. This is a question; we are not required to build those forty credits directly into the major and the ISP. We are only required to allow them the room that they come from upper level electives. Is that correct?

Provost Netzhammer – Absolutely, the degree requirement is forty credits of upper level. For those of you not on the Senate two years ago when we passed it, it was the idea that the community colleges only offer lower level courses. There should be some expectation of upper level course work for a bachelor degree. One third is where the Academic Standards committee landed.

Senator Harfenist – The Academic Standards committee - we went through that and that was generally the sense that a certain amount of upper levels need to be in place for us to feel good about the bachelor degree. I believe we did do a bunch of surveys on how many each major requires.

Provost Netzhammer – At the time, I think there were only two programs that raised concerns for the SEC because they required a high number of credits in the major, almost all were lower level. That raised a concern for the Academic Standards committee. That is already under review and we wanted to just remind people that this needs to happen. To your point, I think if we are calling it so close that the elimination of one course of ISP or the addition of one course could throw this whole thing off, concerns me. Overwhelmingly, the eight credits in ISP and the major requirements equal forty credits or more.

VII. Adjournment 5:10pm

Minutes
for the 414th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, October 12, 2011
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 4:04 pm
- II. Roll Call Kim
Excused: Senator Stevenson, and Senator Dolenc
- III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 413th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Senator Denehy – I was disturbed and disappointed in these minutes with the discussion that was held on the structure of the senate and I was disappointed for two reasons. First, the minutes indicate that this item was not on the agenda, therefore, did not meet the forty eight hour rule or bylaws which is designed to “allow Senators adequate time for thoughtful preparation” so Senators who were here did not have adequate notice to formulate discussion and Senators like myself who were not here could not request a delay in the discussion to a more appropriate time. The second reason I was disappointed was that the discussion took place at a meeting where student senators could not attend and therefore they had no opportunity to share their voice. Having discussion without them is wrong. Of the Senators who were not at the previous meeting their first knowledge of this discussion came from reading these minutes that were published forty eight hours ago. I do not believe this an appropriate way for the Senate to proceed therefore I am voicing my strongest objection.

Senator McDonald – What was the item that was not included?

Senator Denehy – The discussion about the structure of the Senate.

Senator McDonald – The forty eight hour rule was not required to bring a discussion to the Senate. It is only for final reports and motions that require a vote.

Senator Denehy – Right, it is the philosophy behind the forty eight hour rule is why I was disappointed.

Senator McDonald – We didn’t discuss anything at the senate that was voted on at anytime without that forty eight hour rule. I would also point out that it was in the minutes from SEC report where any motions coming to the Senate for vote are included there. In the SEC report, item seven, it was distributed with it and it says Constitution of the Senate: Included in the NEASC Self-Study Projections is a projection to review the constitution of the Senate: Review the Structure of the Senate: The Senate is the academic decision making body on campus. Faculty has stated that they want more representation on this body, yet current positions go unfilled. By spring 2012, the Provost will lead the faculty and the campus community in a discussion of the structure and the effectiveness of this body. We will begin discussion of this process at the upcoming Senate meeting and we made a stipulation that there would be a one – fifteen minute time period. This was not a motion. It was just information that yes, in the spring we would have discussion on this. Nobody will be excluded on that item in the future. It was just a heads up of what is coming.

Senator Denehy – It was not how I read it. Thank you.

Senator McDonald – I do not know what my introduction to that was because I didn’t review that. It was something that was intended to be brought up and chipped away. It will be an open discussion for the rest of this year, I would expect. The entire campus, I would expect, would be included. Our discussion was to make sure that all constituents that were here were aware so they could take that information back to those parties.

Senator Denehy – My understanding is that student representatives were not here at that meeting. Am I correct?

Senator Darby – My recollection was that one student, Senator Daly was here.

Senator Welsh – On page 4, paragraph on the bottom, I believe what I was trying to say was Chuck Weed saying that Tenure Track Faculty *were* voting *by* not participating.

Senator Darby – I want to thank the secretary for the report and would like to offer a friendly correction. At the bottom of page 7, where Senator Darby is speaking of bullet point number eight, I ask that the word retraction be replaced with the word retrenchment. That word appears twice in the minutes. Again, I believe the word that I used was retrenchment.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as revised

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The Senate website has been updated. It is the same link. It is now a website that we can choose to upload information into and I can update it at any point. If you have a chance to take a look at it I would appreciate that. Susan, in particular, if there are forms that you would like added I have the ability to add word documents to the site. Anyone else who has forms, someone was actually looking for the SCC forms. If it would be helpful to also have them on the website and not just Blackboard, I didn't want to do it without talking with you but let me know and I would happy to shift them there and any other forms that might be out there. Take a look, if there is additional information that you would like there, I have stored some archived documents there I am happy to continue to build it in whatever ways useful to the Senate and the campus. Please let me know.

IV. Courtesy Period
Nothing to report

V. Subcommittee Reports
● **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – The SEC met on October 5th and we had charges for several committees. The first charge is to the AOC. It has to do with revising the calendar for review of programs so that it will include Nursing and Women & Gender Studies. I want to point out that since nursing will be an accredited program, we ask that you tie that cycle so that it works along with accreditation.

We also have a request for the ASC to review the language surrounding the length of schedule adjustment period and also looking at the on-line adjustment that started this fall. We charge that committee to look at that and revisit that item and also I think we have some confusing language in that as far as the length of time where one says one calendar week or five days. They are also going to clean that part of it. With a reminder that what has been enacted for this year will remain in force for this year. If there are any changes they will not take place until fall 2012.

We also looked at the Time to Graduation document that was created last spring by the Senate. There are some things that need to be changed in there. The SEC will create a process for programs to apply for a waiver of 120 credits limit as outlined in the "Time to Graduation" document approved by the Board of Trustees. The process will include requests for information on accreditation standards, examples of the curriculum from other accredited programs including COPLAC institutions. If you are applying for a waiver through standards, there is going to be to some degree proof that is going to be asked.

The other change is in the language that was developed last spring. It simply mentioned accredited programs but did not leave any room in that structure for programs who intend to be accredited. At least the accreditation program and the process I am aware of usually takes several years of critical history before they can actually apply for accreditation so we will come back to the Senate with language to make that adjustment that is also appropriate.

Other items that came up were charges and I have to make a correction to the Enrollment Management committee. That is not a Senate Committee, so we cannot actually charge them. We have asked them to look at Gateways/Admissions/Exit Requirements, grade requirements for Gateway courses and registration requirements to declare a major by 60 credits.

We did charge the ASC to look at dual degree and major requirements and commencement participation requirements.

The ISP Task Force – some questions were brought up about the role of Professional and Graduate studies courses in ISP, dual application of classes for ISP and Major requirements.

There was a discussion about the drafting of the process for program elimination. That will come at a later date.

The ISP Task Force: Several Senators have raised questions regarding the charge of the ISP Task Force. At the time, Patrick Dolenc was to meet with the Senators and with the Chairs of the ISP Task Force to discuss those concerns but I do not believe that ever took place.

Provost Netzhammer – That is correct.

Senator Welsh – I was involved but I do not know what the final resolution will be. Senator Dolenc looked into starting the meeting and decided that perhaps it was not the idea that it seemed at the time. We'll figure something out.

Senator McDonald – Just to let you know this was not something that was dropped but at the time we thought they had a plan in place and work with that and I apologize if that didn't take place and we will re-look at that. Would you like to express what some of those concerns were?

Senator Welsh – I wish I had brought my list. It was an array of concerns around ISP as it is currently housed, its governance and some of the implications and qualifications of the people instructing. I will give you the background coming from the attention of various Senators now serving and it seemed like it would be a good thing to inform the Task Force about especially considering eventually that it will be the Senate's job to approve or not approve the final report. We would want to make sure that we have spoken and seen that our constituents are being heard and taken into consideration. It would take minutes of this Senate meeting to read out loud and I will if it is desired, otherwise I won't. What I will do is see how this moves forward and certainly report back to the Chair of the Senate.

Senator McDonald-The other item, constitution of the Senate Review Process – that was also continuing discussion in the SEC meeting. Senator Stevenson will hear back from faculty on the direction they would like to proceed. He is also going to report back to the SEC on gathering information from all the constituency groups that are represented on the Senate. We want everybody to have a say in this as it goes through and it is not to say that in the end there is a change that takes place at all. This is just an information gathering.

Senator Harfenist – The third charge, to create a process for programs to apply for the waiver of 120 credits, is that going to include or involve the limit of the number of credits in the major? I remember that was an issue last year. This is for personal reasons because one of our majors has high credits and I am wondering if that is going to be part of the process too. A waiver for high credit major in the major courses required. We still fit the 120 credits for the whole degree so is that going to be an issue that could be waived?

Provost Netzhammer – I do not think that is the waiver, the current policy the Senate has passed was that your major needs to be 52 credits or the degree can be completed with 120 credits. If the entire degree can be completed with 120 credits then you are in compliance.

Senator McDonald – I believe the process for an accredited program if a major was not accredited and could not be completed in 120 credits was they would have to make changes to it.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is 52 credits. The total number of credits needed toward graduation to equal 120 credits in a BA and BS or majors may be comprised of no more than 52 credits. The Time to Graduation document is on the Senate website now under the SEC.

Senator Harfenist – Under the 4th charge, second bullet, ASC: Dual degree/dual major, we have a Math Physics and Chem. Physics dual majors and I am not sure if they fall under that per say. We call it a dual major.

Senator Stanish – I have two questions about the Academic Standards Committee charge about the dual degree/dual major requirements and commencement participation requirements – is the idea that in relation to the time to graduation documents the inconsistency in the departments as they stand but how they affect time to graduation.

Provost Netzhammer – Yes

Senator Stanish – My second question is about the beginning of the constitution of the Senate Review process. At this point we are saying that we are gathering feedback about what the process should be, not necessarily our personal opinion of what the structure should be? Is that accurate? That is the feedback we should be giving at this moment?

Senator McDonald – The answer from my point of view is we have not developed that process yet.

Senator Stanish – So if I have thoughts on process I should communicate those to the SEC.

Senator McDonald – Correct

Provost Netzhammer – For people who are new on the Senate this year, in the document about majors with a large number of credits that we approved and forwarded to was approved by the Board of Trustees last June, we had a number of unanswered questions that tagged along as part of our report to the Trustee's we said would be addressed by the Senate in this academic year, that we were not saying what we were going to do. What you see in item 4 in the SEC report is those items now being referred to different committees

that are appropriate for that. That is our attempt to do what we committed to the Board of Trustees that we would do this year against issues that were unresolved last year

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly – You can read most of the information from the meeting minutes but I will give a brief overview of the important things we plan to be bringing forward. Included in this is a number of program reviews so we are set for Library information literacy program, Math program, Music, Physics and Geology are being reviewed separately and we have committees and self-studies. Most of the outside reviewers for those processes are going pretty much on schedule. That's good news. The Music program falls into the category that they are an accredited program and they are allowed by current regulations to use their review and self study for the program review process. That always ends up being a little problematic so we committed this year to try and revise our guidelines so that when there is an accreditation, the program review process can really be more fully fleshed out. As we look at accreditation documents we find they really don't address the college community issues. Things like the ISP for example, it is rarely if ever addressed in an accreditation self study. We would like to give the program the opportunity for this self reflection. That is one example of the things that is missing from the accreditation self study. We are of course very aware of the amount of time accreditation self studies takes so we are going to try and work with programs to assure that this is not a huge extra burden but we are also aware of how long it takes to do the program review from our stand point. We would like to make it possible for us to at least do a comparable review of all programs.

There is some competing interest to some extent but I think everyone is pretty much on the same page.

We are hoping to get a number of veterans of the review processes last year and we are hoping to come out with some of those guidelines sometime in the next couple of weeks and bring those forward to the Senate for an official blessing. We will have to review Music under the current guidelines. We cannot change the rules after they have submitted their materials so we will do our best to get this through but we are hoping before this comes up again that we will have a chance to get out in front of the accreditation visits and make a full review. We are also going to propose a change in guidelines at the same time to change where the self studies are deposited. We have come to a digital age so all the materials are submitted to us digitally. We have not yet quite come to a full official Keene State owned curated digital depository. Right now self studies are held on Blackboard; this seems maybe not the best place. No one who doesn't have access to the Blackboard site can see them, so they are not really public documents in the normal sense. While we are looking at the guidelines we hope to change the guidelines so as to make something more appropriate. There is a really good alternative, which is the Kdig site that is used for NEASC. We have had conversations with the librarian and they are very happy to give us a real alternative. We are looking forward to thinking out the process. We have got to work through some issues of who agrees to the reports before they get deposited here because once it gets in Kdig it is really hard to get it out. We want to be careful about the deposit process from this day forward.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I just wanted to remind you that with the bylaw changes last year that the AOC guidelines and calendar come to the Senate as informational. A Senator can put forward a motion to have those voted on by the Senate but the way the SCC has altered their guidelines in the past and revised them as now the AOC can do that as well.

Senator Blatchly – So what you are saying is that the bylaws can provide new bylaws as information?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – As information, if a Senator wishes for the Senate to discuss or amend a document such as a review calendar or guidelines created by the AOC, a motion and a second are required for discussion and will require a majority vote by the Senate to bring the proposal to the floor for a full vote. You have more flexibility than you did.

Senator Darby – I want to thank Senator Blatchly for looking out for the accredited programs. It is a tremendous amount of work to do a self study for a national accreditation so the suggested changes that you spoke about I would just ask and hope that the accredited programs are consulted while these changes are being considered and developed. I think one will find that the national self studies have a great deal of information. For instance, the most recent self study there is actually a great deal in there about the history of general education here at Keene State; development of ISP and some data related to student participation in ISP. I appreciate that you are sensitive to their not just work load that are required for these self studies breadth of these programs rather than institute something that wouldn't work.

Senator Blatchly – Of course, it is the civilized thing to do and we are also hoping to go through the accreditation process ourselves. As chemistry tries to go through accreditation we have some experience with reviews from last year. As we sit down to go over things we will talk to the folks that we worked with last year and get their feedback to what we do to kind of highlight the process. It was really sort of experimental and of course as we are doing reviews this year we have another opportunity to say I think it is only civilized.

Senator Darby – I appreciate it and have served on the AOC on a couple of occasions and I would appreciate that the AOC has their own timelines that they have to follow as I read the notes that the Senate suggest to change it including requiring programs to write an appropriate self study concurrently with the accreditation for our open parameters so that much of the writing and support for the materials can be produced for both including the AOC subcommittee and site visit. I am not terribly sure the writings supporting the materials can be used for both. It is the same that we talk about the college reports to the National Association of Schools in Music, we could not use an AOC self study that we wanted to in any way for the college's probation in self study. They have very strict guidelines on how that document gets to the written and to the organized and I am sure I am not alone in that. I appreciate the sensitivities that you show to the accredited programs.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Welsh-Our original charge was to reconcile the schedule adjustment period lengths of time between the Academic Guidelines and the Calendar Guidelines and came up with a proposal to do so and we are ready to forward that to the committee for a vote. In addition, we came to a consensus among the group that we would like to reopen the discussion of the schedule adjustment period in the semester so we were going forward with the question to the Executive Committee and that has been approved. What we realized was that the adjustment that we had revised involved quite extensive overhaul of the calendar guidelines and that we could have done that but it would have involved extensive discussion and things like that and probably would have had to be changed again if we made any changes to the schedule adjustment period so what we decided was to go back to the schedule adjustment period and when we are finished with that we will also reconcile the calendar guidelines and academic policies. Those will come as package from us.

VI. New Business

Nothing to report

VII. Adjournment 4:39

Minutes
for the 415th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, November 9, 2011
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:12

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Dolenc, Senator Doreski, Senator Schmidl-Gagne and Senator Rust

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 414th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion:

Senator Blatchly – I was able to read the minutes this afternoon and there were a couple of things that will really help with the clarity whether it is my error or the error of transcription. I am just hoping we can get a clear sense of what I was trying to say. On page six, the way my version came out there is a mention of having to review math under current guidelines. This is in the context of having to review programs that are subject to accreditation. Math is not an accredited program but Music is, so the meaning of that sentence should be Music. That was on line four but if you go to line ten the word cur rated should be curated. This should be one word as opposed to two. The rest are just some grammatical changes that I could suggest but I will pass those along but really the big change is where I meant to referred to Music as the accredited program.

Senator Welsh-Meeting wise on page seven in the essence of meaning is the only word I would strike is the word really in the sentence *What we really realized was that ...* one other thing I noticed was on page four below a quote by me there is another paragraph that begins with *The other item...* and I believe that is Senator McDonald speaking and not me.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as revised

IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing to report for the courtesy period

V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald –The SEC met on Wednesday, November 2nd and Senator Stevenson presented the issue concerning the makeup of the Senate at a recent meeting of the faculty. I would like to turn it over to Senator Stevenson to see if he has any comments on that part of it.

Senator Stevenson – The Monday before the last Senate meeting not all faculty members of the Senate made the meeting but the majority of them did to discuss the idea of reforming the Senate. We talked about some of the different models at different institutions and as you can see there is a summary in the SEC minutes but basically the thoughts of the faculty and members who were in attendance weren't necessarily in favor of adopting a faculty only Senate but didn't want to take it off the agenda so they would like more data to explore what are our other options are. Because of that, Provost Netzhammer graciously agreed to email other Provost's at other COPLAC Institutions to see what the structures of their Senate is. We are waiting to hear back from him but basically the gist of the conversation was that we would like to gather more data and not just go in one direction or the other but receive the data then decide how to proceed.

Senator McDonald I also encourage any constituent of the Senate that if you are interested to do some research on this or bring any material you have on this to bring it forward. This is an ongoing process. This is basically a study at this point so I encourage you to be involved with this also because everybody has a say in this.

The second part of the discussion is the SEC had been tasked to look at program elimination guidelines. This was part of what had started last spring when we were making some adjustments from everything to the number of credit hours in programs and the ISP program. Senator Dolenc has drafted a plan for discussion today. This is not a motion; this is simply that we want input from Senators on this particular draft plan.

Senator Dolenc – As Senator McDonald said, this is coming from some external constraints and I think the Provost can speak to this but the Chancellor has been asking for some time for us to provide framework and a process to address programs that may be too small to continue to offer as majors. I agreed to draft some language to start a conversation and I think today we can have feedback so something more formal can be crafted from the sense of this group. Essentially the idea that is before here is that in those instances where some sort of trigger in terms of low enrollments and declared majors or in terms of actual graduates that some trigger would take place and as you can read here there will be information for the Provost and a process for these programs that they would be given some notice that this is now on the radar. This would go over a period of several years and if it continues to trip the trigger then another set of events would happen. The real goal behind this as it seems to me is first of all, we want transparency; we are only an advisory body so ultimately this decision is not something that would rest with the Senate. I personally do not want to have to vote on program elimination one way or the other since it is not my decision, not my authority. I do not want my name attached to something that I don't necessarily agree with but I do want transparency. I do think it is important that there is an opportunity for this body and for other affected parts of the campus to weigh in on something that hopefully doesn't happen very often and if it does with a great deal of consideration. One of the pieces at the very top under where it says guidelines and above Initial Steps is language that is very rough. It came out of the conversation I had with the SEC which is the idea that program elimination doesn't necessarily only happen because of these triggers or criteria the Chancellor is looking for. Other criteria is a possibility and it might be in conversations I have had with some of you since last week that it might be more appropriate as a footnote or at the bottom as an indication that obviously this process is bigger than somebody just looking Majors and the number of graduates.

Senator Stanish –A question to make sure we are clear about how we are defining academic program and the major. This is coming from a personal point of view within mathematics. We have a mathematics major that has many graduates however there is an option within that mathematics major for middle school and junior high certification which is designed for students to be able to teach grades sixth through eighth which is very small. However it is an option in the major and only uses courses that are also used by many other students so it is not a resource strain at all in particular the configuration of courses that already exist. So my question is whether that would fall into that definition or have we thought through things like that?

Senator Dolenc – It is not in here but the language in the document would indicate that this is not what this is about. Options would be singled out.

Provost Netzhammer – Or that it would fall into the example we have used separate from this is Chemistry. You have a BS and BA and the BA is a subset of BS and so eliminating the BA actually hurts things and not propel things as you used in your example. I think that if under this policy that gets triggered but it gets easily dealt with as it is not in the best interest for the college, for our students or the University System to eliminate that program.

Senator Welsh – Point of clarity then. Our review of this language is not on the way to a Senate vote.

Senator Dolenc – It is not a motion. We are looking for feedback.

Senator Welsh – Will it eventually?

Senator Dolenc – That is the plan

Senator McDonald – Yes.

Senator Welsh – So offering up editorial revision is constructive then?

Senator McDonald – Yes

Senator Welsh – I have offerings. The first is I endorse the movement of that clause. The first clause which seems like the hammer clause is not necessarily what the guidelines are about to the bottom or to a footnote status. The second thing is the part of the clause that I like moving it down to the bottom for is the language that makes me feel uncomfortable and that is the phrase program relevance. It strikes me as difficult to measure, available to an arbitrary kind of judgment and available to judgment that is not necessarily knowledgeable about the internal workings of the college, so I am going to offer a substitute phrase besides program relevance perhaps consistency with institutional mission. In line with that I would insert it at another point and that is two bullets below program elimination process. I would insert right before etc. *Importance to institutional mission*. One other edit I would propose is the last bullet "*The Provost will create a transition plan for students currently in the major* I would insert in consultation with the department to determine which courses will continue to be provided. It's the idea that departments know which courses are important and worth saving

Senator Darby – I agree with Senator Stanish. I was a little bit confused on the word program so I consulted the Keene State College graduate and undergraduate catalog and I have a hard copy of it and also a pdf of it which is available on line. On page five under

definitions there is a very clear definition for major, a clear definition of option and a clear definition of specialization. If you move forward and with the draft with word program I think by certain consensus know what that means it involves all majors, minors etc. because on page two and three in the catalog all of the outline features are listed under the heading programs of study. I would ask some consideration to define terms if we move forward with the word program and what we are talking about. Are we talking about majors? Are we talking about majors with minors? Are we talking about options? Are we talking about specializations? Doesn't the program meet all of that as I suspect it will? I was looking for clarity on the term academic program. The other issue is the numbers that are given under initial steps under the first bullet and where those numbers come from. Is this a Chancellor's directive?

Provost Netzhammer – The Senate endorsed them last year as part of that whole packet.

Senator Darby – Did or does NEASC make suggestions or recommendations, standards or guidelines on the number of students in a program and if they fall below a certain number is the suggestion. Does NEASC weigh in on this?

Provost Netzhammer – They do not.

Senator Darby – Thank you, under Program Elimination Process, third bullet, *Provost will inform the College Senate of potential programs to be eliminated and the SCC will etc.* The last sentence states *this report will be presented, discussed, and voted upon at a regularly scheduled Senate meeting.* Under this language what in essence would this body be voting on? Would we be voting on the acceptance of that report?

Senator Dolenc – My intent was that there is a transparent process with a thoughtful sequence of gathering information where we would have the opportunity to respond to that. Indicate things were missing to put our reasons on the record in regard to the program and decision but all we are is an advisory ultimately. I don't feel like I want to be told you have to vote yes or no to eliminate something so I specifically didn't go in that direction. Thinking our opportunity was feedback and to vote to accept the report. That may not be the will of this body.

Senator Martin – I have written text that I would like to read from. Is it ok to send this forward and read from this?

Senator McDonald – Certainly

Senator Martin – I have two key concerns: First, this draft policy needs a statement of purpose. Right now it begins with language that is essentially a footnote, qualifying the applicability of the whole policy.

Second, this draft policy focuses exclusively on the “demand” side of a complex relationship that clearly entails both supply and demand. As currently drafted, the policy would deal with deficiencies in demand by eliminating supply. If we refocus our attention on the purposes that would be served by program review, then we could place demand for courses in its proper context: the simultaneous balancing of supply and demand. The statement of purpose should declare the *principle that is being served* by establishing a program review policy. The terms of reference in that principle should be used to frame the indicators that would be tracked and that would ultimately trigger a full-scale program review. I can illustrate my points. We might say something like the following: **Sample statement of Purpose for Program Review.** The College intends to ensure that faculty assignments and course offerings provide students with a *liberal arts education*. That objective necessarily balances at least two considerations: the *representativeness of academic offers* and the *evident interest of students in particular offerings*. To ensure that we are able to offer this kind of education, we define: the representativeness of academic offerings as the programs that must be available in the liberal arts institution (in effect, the courses and programs that offer a sample of our civilizational inheritance); and the evident interest of students as the willingness of students to take courses, and declare majors, and graduate with majors in particular programs. I hope to have us focus on why we engage a program and until we define what our purpose actually is in relation to our objectives I think we run the risk of applying criteria that may be incomplete if they are incomplete at this point.

Provost Netzhammer – I wouldn't disagree that they are incomplete but in fact if we want to know why we are doing this the first bullet we are putting into a footnote is in part why we are doing this. That the system office through the Chancellor last year said right now our college is considered for elimination of programs in a ten year cycle as part of the program review and that is not a sufficient enough way for us to do this. We need to have metrics that trigger some kind of analysis that we come back to look at. That is how the rolling average of ten majors or five graduates over a three year period came into this discussion. I think as a Senate we need to discuss that and we move in that direction but what we realized when we went through that process was that at the time the entire process was me. There was no articulated process that the Provost had the sole authority to decide whether a program major minor, and I agree with what the major minor option should say because that is what we are talking about. Those things we need to report to the system when we change that we had no process for doing that. It was at the sole discretion of the Provost. What I think we decided as a Senate last year was that we needed to rethink that and we needed to put that in place or at least consultation around that issue that was laid out. Our purpose is really being driven by this idea that some key points are supply and demand, if you want to call it that - will drive some decisions and trigger a process. How we handle that process is. If all we wanted to do was say if a program has fewer than ten majors on a rolling average it gets eliminated it is easily done. It is a process I mean if it meets this criteria then it gets

eliminated. We didn't want to go in that direction. We wanted to say that that is going to trigger a larger discussion around some of the issues that are raised in this. I think a rich policy will have us discuss those kinds of things but in fact what triggers it is a number, a metric.

Senator Martin – Should choice of metrics be determined by our objectives and not simply chosen because they are readily available? The two metrics that appear in the draft are certainly readily available. There is a third one that I added to my statement which is the number of students enrolled in courses which I think would be very valuable to add to the list of metrics but I would hate to have that list to simply be determined by our cleverness at a particular session in group editing. So I would hope that we define these metrics in relation to principle and be as transparent as possible and against which we would apply metrics and say you know we have a set a metrics and these may be necessary but they are not sufficient.

Provost Netzhammer – I do not disagree with that at all but I think there is also a piece that is if course enrollments are high that's a reason to keep a major and that is not necessarily a given either. Course enrollments could be very high but if they are only two majors in the department then we have built a whole infrastructure around supporting those courses that are connected to a major for which there are no students. While that may be a factor I think it is a different question that is raises in whether we should keep a major, a minor or an option as a result of that. We can have this discussion now but I think this discussion is going to be larger than when we go down this path.

Senator Blatchly – I want to discuss a couple of complements. Sometimes we get into these discussions and we forget what we like about these. I think what is nice about this process is it does seem to carry the expectation that the first response is supportive. The idea is that the administration is obligated to work with the program to give the best shot and enough time perhaps to support the program so that it can grow to escape the elimination. I think that's right and it may be that we don't implement this part of elimination but should it come up I think we need to refine the guidelines a bit. One thing that caught my eye is the third item in the elimination process and looking at the third line which refers to a report similar to the AOC final report. I will take that as a place holder because I know the intent of this is to get something for us to discuss. What I ask is that perhaps we think very seriously about eliminating reference to the AOC but taking the relevant opportunity. The reason I have a big concern is we are trying to build a review process which is supportive of the programs and encourages them to give them an honest self evaluation and I worry that if they think that somehow this is going to get wrapped into program elimination that it is going have a somewhat potential chilling effect. We want to try and avoid that and to keep the AOC out of this that makes it a little bit easier. The other piece that the AOC final report has as a comparison of internal review program with external review of the program and that doesn't seem to be part of this process. That is another reason you may want to eliminate that. I don't think I would suggest we bring in outside reviewers. That does not seem appropriate in this case. There are lots of things in an AOC report like the demographic, curriculum and staffing analysis and the marginal cost of putting the program together – all of those things would be relevant to the question of whether a program is eliminated or not. Thank you.

Senator Stevenson – I have some questions about the third bullet as well about the program elimination process. This has to do with the AOC like advisory opinion lack of a better word that the SEC would advise a vote to accept or not to accept that report. Generally, the way I see this is that this is a serious matter. Being a criminologist I see this as serious as the death penalty. This would be the most serious things this body could do. I am concerned that we would not be able to vote up or down on program elimination. I am not sure why we would want to disenfranchise Senators by not allowing them to voice and consent for decent for program elimination. If the sole concern is that our vote is advisory in nature anyway then I would suggest we never vote on anything again.

Senator Sapeta – Was there a program eliminated on this campus ever or was there a program that dissolved itself ever?

Senator Dolenc – Senator Welsh's program hit the death penalty.

Senator Welsh – That's right.

Provost Netzhammer – The most recent in history would be Political Science.

Senator McDonald - Your department was electronics, Technology Education.

Provost Netzhammer – We have eliminated all of our Associates degrees even more recently than that. So yes, we have eliminated a number of programs.

Senator Sapeta – If a department has a program that is no longer valid is there a process now that we follow?

Provost Netzhammer – Yes

Senator Sapeta - How does that work, is it just the department's decision that the program is being eliminated?

Provost Netzhammer – My understanding at this point has been with the Associate degrees we are talking about a degree we would offer generally. We went through a very long consultative process around that. I am not sure about earlier programs but there is no policy that requires consultation in place at this moment. There is no process.

Senator Sapeta – In the SCC we have the process of adding options to the program and we also have the process of eliminating those from the program right now.

Provost Netzhammer – I didn't get the question.

Senator Sapeta – In the SCC we have a process of adding options to the programs and we also have a process for eliminating those from the program. Is that right?

Provost Netzhammer – Correct Yes, and I think that departments can make program changes, no department has ever come forward and say eliminate our major except for the context of putting a different one in place to replace it.

Senator Sapeta – What I am getting at is that there might be external pressure about programs to be eliminated but there might be some internal desire from the department to eliminate a program. Is it the same process trying to guide that situation? We are looking at this from an external component for the program to be on the chopping block but what once the program is eliminated should it be one and same process or should it be a different process. Does that make sense?

Provost Netzhammer – Yes

Senator Denehy – Question on clarification, the initial steps sounds sound like a three year process and the first bullet of the elimination process it states in the fall, I am assuming that is the fall of the fourth year.

Senator Dolenc – Yes

Senator Denehy – Just a grammatical edit further in the sentence Chairs singular and Programs plural.

Senator Fleegeer – I thought it was impolite to ask but is there an idea how many programs this policy would affect? Who are currently going to be impacted by this policy?

Provost Netzhammer – Last year when we were going through this policy we looked at programs like the BA in Chemistry. That would trigger one or the other of those and also our subsets of larger programs in their entirety. I don't know how far we would get down that process. The two programs if you look at the rolling averages that are most likely to be affected by this are Geology and French. These are the two majors that would be affected by the policy. We would look at options in terms of options with majors and minors.

Senator McDonald – I would suggest on both of the items in the SEC report that if you have any additional comments, information or want to know where we are at in the discussion please let me know and I will hold it for future discussion

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator McDonald – I want to apologize for the several different packets you received for this meeting. The first was the SCC attachment that was sent contained several items from last year. There are no motions on the floor. The second item from the ASC was received by me late and nothing was sent to the Secretary. It does break the 48hr rule but again there are no motions to vote on. This is for information only so we inserted the information and will go over that today.

Senator Welsh – The report is in the minutes and I will allow you to read it and I will just hit the highlights. We met on the 19th of October and a couple of times. On the 19th we did decide that given the kinds of policies that we will be reporting on to this Senate over the next few months that we thought it would be useful to solicit input from members of the campus on these things. We have begun a process of emailing out a notice that we are going to meet and discuss certain issues on a particular date. The issue of commencement participation policy and we have begun drafting a policy on that and we will do it for the other two policies that you see on your 1, 2, 3 list. Items two and three on the list of our report are items we will be looking to report to the full Senate by February. The first item one is schedule adjustment period issue and I wanted to bring that up at this meeting because one of things that we noticed and will not be passing on policy with that until next year. One of things that we have noticed is that we still have two policies in place about schedule adjustment. One is the on-line student adjustment schedule and the other is the policy in which schedule adjustment can be made by using forms and signature is in fact permission. Those two policies do have a potential of

working together without overfilling classes and that did result in confusion over class time. I want to get it on the record that we still got the policies in place and perhaps it would be a good idea to notify members of the faculty before the beginning of next semester that their signature on a schedule adjustment form has possible implications. We are looking at policies for programs with two majors and their requirements in the coming month and then at the beginning of the year. We should have something for the Senate...

Senator McDonald – One thing I want to point out is that Senator Welsh reported back to the Chairs Committee this week some of you may have been there. Especially the course adjustment period in the fact that nothing has changed for the upcoming semester.

Senator Welsh – That is the first item of our agenda and if we were to report to the Senate that policy would not be in place until next year.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees ~We are presenting as information the following course proposals and course deletions.

VI. New Business

Senator Welsh –This is where I decided this belongs and at the last meeting I promised to report to the Senate on any progress made and presented of the ISP task force. They had a list of concerns that they voiced to a few of us Senate members. What we have done since then is to have a list of concerns presented and handed in to the Chairs of the ISP task force that I replied an acknowledgement back and that is the report. I can convey a written copy or a digital copy of those concerns being from Senators who have heard from their constituents and we will be mindful of their process at this time.

Senator McDonald – Could you please send that to the SEC.

Senator Welsh – Absolutely

Senator McDonald – The task force has been meeting regularly and has been reviewing the surveys that were submitted.

VII. Adjournment 4:55

Minutes
for the 416th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, December 14th, 2011
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 4:05
- II. Roll Call Kim
Absent: Senator Stemp,
Excused: Senator Stevenson, Senator Fleeger, Senator Dolenc, and Senator Ditkoff.
- III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 415th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion: Senator Stanish - On the minutes from the last meeting on page three where I speak. Senator Stanish about ¾'s of the page down in the second to last sentence of that paragraph, *so it is not a research strain*...should read as *so it is not a resource strain*.

Senator McDonald – I have a correction on page six the second line from the bottom should read Technology Education.

Senator McDonald – I am to remind everyone to speak loudly as the recorders are picking up mumbles at meetings and make it difficult for the transcriber.

Senator Martin - I have a correction on page six and an apology. The correction is on the first line ...*principal* should read *principle* as in idea or concept. Then I dribbled off into incoherence and I simply want to acknowledge the fact that the rest of my statement requires deciphering.

Senator McDonald – Could you repeat that Senator Martin.

Senator Martin – There is a spelling error on the top of page six and I apparently dribbled off into incoherence and I simply want to acknowledge the fact that the record is in there and I am probably responsible for it. I wish I could fix it.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Maybe the tape recorder picked up mumbling.

Senator McDonald – Are there other corrections:

Senator Welsh – I won't correct the fact that the tape recorder doesn't pick up the periods at the end of my sentences. It makes me seem more breathless than I feel but there is one word that I think changes the meaning and that is on page four. Senator Welsh...three lines down right next to the end of the line is the word *four* and I think *for* is more correct.

Senator McDonald – Any other comments or questions?

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as revised

- IV. Courtesy Period
Nothing to report

V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – Senator Dolenc is not here today but he did take notes when we commented last meeting about the program elimination standards. He is working on those for our next meeting which is the first meeting of the year. He will bring those back with the suggested changes and corrections so that will move up to the next meeting.

We cancelled last week's meeting and moved everything to this meeting to give some of the subcommittees a chance to catch up on some of the work that needed to be done.

We had a report from the Secretary from the COPLAC institutions with research on the different types of Senates that existed at those institutions and I have asked Kim to update us on that.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – We looked at ten to twelve institutions and I reviewed all of their constitutions and tried to come up with some categories of things. So was it a College Senate or a Faculty Senate or was there a College Senate with a Faculty Senate and a Staff Senate. Then we tried to look at what size and whether it was an elected body or open to all fulltime faculty and staff on campus. Then we tried to look at committee structures to see what was under different Senates. Basically, there doesn't seem to be a model out there. It sounds like campuses develop what works best for them. We found everything. We found College Senate's just like ours. We found college Senates that have faculty Senates and then Staff Senates. We found just Faculty Senates. There didn't appear that there was a component where staff was involved. In terms of committees, it depended a little bit on the structure that they had in place whether it was a college Senate of a faculty Senate or some variation on that. There were some similar committees and almost always curriculum committees and policy committees. Academic Overview was a little bit harder to find. I think one institution had an Academic Overview Committee. A number of the Senates moved a lot of the faculty promotion and tenure into the purview of the Senate. There were committees that dealt with sabbatical, promotion and tenure. In terms of who sat on the Senate, there were a number of where everyone is a part of the Senate. I think the majority was elected or some sort of elected body or it was that there was an elective body that votes but everyone participates in Senate meetings. It is sort of an open meeting that everyone would attend, give comment on and then an elected body would make some decisions. It was good and there may be things within all of that that we decide that we like but it didn't say this is the direction to go.

Senator Welsh - Is this information compiled in a report or in a document?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I just have it in a spreadsheet.

Senator Welsh – Is it possible to get a look at this. I am very interested in it.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Sure, maybe attach it to something that goes out to everyone. If you want to read everyone's constitution and bylaws I printed them to try to go through them.

Senator McDonald – The ISP taskforce is working toward their deadline of giving their report to the Senate. It will come to the SCC before it comes to the SEC meeting in January. It should be up for discussion for the next meeting of the Senate. The ISP is aware and has been reviewing some information that was brought to them with concerns of some of the charges given to them. They are taking that under advisement. We are also aware that there are other suggestions going around as far as ISP models. What we discussed at the SEC meeting was that for now we would just like to allow the ISP task force to complete their report and at that point, if it comes open for discussion and for interpretation of the findings of that ISP taskforce. Are there any questions or comments about that?

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Welsh - ~ Academic Standards met three times between this meeting and our last Senate meeting. Two of those meetings were occupied with the task of finding information about dual major degrees and in keeping with that we met with Representatives from the Education Department and the Dean and the Assistant Dean from Professional and Graduate Studies. Our product of this research will probably be a memorandum from the committee to the Senate that we will move forward for review and approval in the February meeting and we will be drafting that up in the coming month. We also discussed and further advised a proposed policy for the Commencement Standards; 120 credits for crossing the stage or not. We have come up with some language that we are putting forward for review by people that are likely to be involved in the implementation of that policy across campus. When we get comments from those people we will finalize our draft and again bring that to the full Senate for review and perhaps a vote in February. Other types of policy that we reviewed were the program change for the Communication major. It had a couple of requirements for admitted students, an average of two classes with a C or higher, this is in the report that I submitted and is in your packet. Also, a requirement of C earned in courses that count towards the Communication major. That is my synopsis of the review, the actual language that is in the program proposal if you would like to see it. That met with our committee's approval and it generates a motion that I need to bring before the floor. The motion is down there in bold that the Senate approves the following.

Motion: ~The ASC moves that the Entry and graduation standards included in the program revision proposed by the Communications Program for the Communications Major be accepted by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Welsh - We will be bringing two similar kinds of proposals, motions before Senate in February, one for Health Science and one for Athletic Training. We are going to be working on those between now and the next meeting. Likewise, I think we are going to be doing one last review of the other program revisions before the Senate this year to make sure there are no standards issues that need our consideration and motion.

Senator McDonald – We do not have a report from the Overview Committee tonight.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees – We met three times since the last Senate meeting. Two of those times we did not have the information to vote on. Those were separate issues but we were not able to do that. We have discussed the communication proposal but we have not had a full committee too really, there is an issue that we have with the proposal that we are waiting till the spring semester before we address it again from the full committee. We do have several proposals to get approval from the Senate.

Motion: The SCC moves that the Revision of the Math/Physics major be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Welsh – Question, this is one that our Standards Committee has not seen. We are not certain that there are no standards, changes or issues remaining in this proposal. If we are to vote on it, would we be voting on the Curriculum Committees piece of this proposal and then if there are standards issues reviewing those then voting on those from the Standards Committee next time? Did that make sense?

Senator McDonald – I understand what you are saying. Basically, are we putting the cart before the horse in this particular case?

Senator Welsh – I think we just did that the cart before the horse with regards to the Communication review because we approved the change in their standards before we approved any of their curriculum proposals. Is it more sensible to approve these as a package, standards and curricular changes?

Senator McDonald – I think generally we have heard them separately but we try to at least hear them at the same Senate meeting rather than lagging behind. In this case are there issues in the math proposal?

Senator Menees – There were none that I remember in terms of changing entrance requirements. There are some requirements of a C in the course but nothing to do with the entrance.

Senator McDonald – So that would be something that would come to the Standards Committee.

Senator Menees – Inside the course of a C or better...

Senator Welsh – I think so, yes.

Senator Stanish – For someone who is familiar with it, I did not write the proposal but did review it from the Math Department so I can wear that hat and also as someone that is on the Academic Standards Committee, I can wear that hat. The main change in the major was the introductory physics sequence with previously two courses and now is going to be three courses and then an upper level elective will be eliminated to keep the number of credits the same. That is the main change to this major so this does not involve any

grade requirements. Any grade requirements already existed so they are not called in the change. There are no entrance or graduate requirements anyway in the major. I do not believe there are any standard issues.

Senator Welsh – It sounds like there are no standard issues.

Senator Menees – Well the changes that they made to adding the C to some courses, we did that at the school curriculum level.

Senator Stanish – Maybe I hadn't seen that.

Senator Menees – They did that at the request of some members of the School Curriculum to add a C to the prerequisite on some courses.

Senator McDonald – My suggestion on this would be to table this until the Standards Committee also has a chance to review this and bring it back to the next Senate meeting. That way we would at least have an idea if there were going to be any issues with the standards.

Senator Welsh – This sounds reasonable to me and to approve them as a package.

Senator McDonald – We don't usually do this as a package but we at least would be aware if there were any issues that might be coming up that we may have to bring together at that meeting.

Senator Menees – Just one point of question, these are not changes to the majors but are changes to courses presented as information only. I am wondering how that works with standards, I know I am fine with tabling it but I do not know how that works when things are presented as information. The majors themselves did not have those changes in them, only the courses which do not require votes.

Provost Netzhammer – We have not traditionally sent those to Academic Standards and I am also curious if there had been an Academic Standards issue, wouldn't it had been forwarded when it reached the Senate to the Academic Standards Committee.

Senator Menees – Frankly this has been a point of confusion to me as to where it goes from the School Curriculum Committees to the Senate. I know this worked backwards last year and I do not know if I forward them to Academic Standards or forward to both, maybe from the Senate or maybe to the School Committee.

Senator Welsh – With regard to Communication, Health Science and Athletic Training, these are all Standards issues that we were notified of by the Curriculum Committee. I am not sure it that is typical route of notification with the committee. I am also not sure that that catches every standards issue that should be reviewed where they are not necessarily looking for changes. Looking down the list of the various major proposals and program revisions that we have coming today I know that there are issues that our committee has not reviewed them for standards issues. For example, with the Nursing program there is what looks like a revision of the standards in format if not substance and we have not seen that.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The revision of the Bylaws talks about this a little bit. It doesn't specify that it should come as a package. It just says that there is a responsibility of each committee to inform the other committee when they see that there are standards, curriculum and curriculum and standards and it still has it so they can go forward separately. So Curriculum can go forward and get approved and standards can do the same. It makes sense and maybe we should revise that a little bit but right now what we changed before was that there was a responsibility to inform but not that there is timing or a package issue.

Senator McDonald – I would like to ask the Parliamentarian, Ann Atkinson. Ann, do you see any problem with looking at these separately?

Parliamentarian Atkinson – No, I was just reviewing the language and there is nothing in here. I believe the rule is if the bylaws do not provide you with information then you would defer to Roberts Rules and so there is nothing to prevent that in there.

Senator McDonald – My understanding is that we can do this separately and we do not have to do it together. I will withdraw my request to have this tabled and is a motion that was put forward and seconded. It will with the understanding that there will be a review by Standards Committee. If there are any standard issues then that will come forward at the next meeting on any of these issues that we are talking about.

Senator Welsh – Sounds good.

Senator McDonald – Any objections to move forward? We are now back to the discussion on the math proposal.

Senator Denehy – This is a general question. After reviewing the different proposals, the question is with the ISP program in that the Architecture proposal here lists ISP as forty credits and the other ones list it as forty four credits. I do not know where we are and whether that needs to be addressed.

Senator Menees – That is actually a question that I have because I know on the ISP Board we approved a proposal to change the program to forty credits but it remains the question as to whether where that goes from there. I thought it would go somewhere. Does it go to the Curriculum Committee? Does it go to the Senate? People are assuming it is going to authority and you see that in these proposals but I have not seen that come forward.

Senator McDonald – I believe it was last year at a Senate meeting that we voted that it would move to forty credits and they were instructed at that time to design a curriculum around that number of credits.

Senator Menees – The question is that it is a curricular change; does that curricular change get reviewed by the Senate?

Senator McDonald – Yes

Senator Menees – So where does it go? Does it go to the Senate Curriculum Committee or to the full Senate as a curricular change?

Provost Netzhammer – We have a document that was approved five years ago now that would speak to that directly. I do not think that we have to fish for it but we should just go back to the document. It created a process to create changes to the ISP. I would say that it is not directly germane to this motion and we could continue with the other business and address this separately if everyone is ok with that. .

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Chem/Physics major be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Physics minor be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the INPHYS 241 course proposal be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the PSYC major be accepted by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Blatchly - Presumably the INPHYS Majors who took Math 141 were replacing IQL with that course. Will they be taking an IQL?

Senator Menees – Yes

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the PSYC minor be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees – There are two courses for the Nursing Program coming through ISP. I guess they were part of the package last year but they weren't really there so these are the real courses.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IINURS 309 course proposal be accepted by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh –II courses are interdisciplinary and clearly one of the disciplines involved in this II course is nursing. What is the other discipline that is the interdisciplinary half of this thing and how were they brought in to design this course?

Senator McDonald – We have representatives from the Nursing program to answer that.

Thomas Connelly, Director of Nursing – Holistic Health, there will be people from the community brought in from other sciences, Yoga, Acupuncture and we will also be assessing people within Keene State who have those areas of expertise will be coming to look at the science and of alternate therapies promoting health and wellness. This is not just a nursing focus. It is a health focus as well.

Senator Stanish – My question is about this first being an integrative studies course. I am not sure if this is necessary or not and some of the other integrative studies course proposals that are on this list today. In addition to the course outcomes also was listed is the integrative outcome that has been chosen or other outcomes that are appropriate to that area. In this proposal there was no outcome or

where they are addressing the integrative studies program and this was a part of that. My question is that is necessary and I would like to know how that works. I can rephrase my question. What makes this an ISP course as opposed to a nursing course? That was the part that I didn't see in the course proposal.

Mary-Ellen Fleeger, Associate Vice Chancellor Academic & Student Affairs Nursing –Any student in any major can take a nursing course.

Dean Treadwell – Last year when we proposed the two courses for the ISP contribution on nursing faculty it was the hope that we would engage a number of the majors through the expertise of nursing and particularly the interdisciplinary courses. It is common within a single discipline for a course to be taught but would touch upon the myriad of disciplines through that course. This would be the expectation of this course. That we would have a view of holistic healthcare practice through multiple lenses both scientific and Eastern and Western practices although in the Nursing program. Critical to our campus was the contribution of Nursing to the ISP program, touching all majors who may be interested. With respect to naming a specific integrative outcome, if that was missing and is required, certainly we can submit that as well. Although we have gone through the process we will need guidance to make that adjustment. It is certainly very easy to do.

Senator Blatchly – I am a little fuzzy on the procedure with the II courses but I think they have to go through the ISP Review Committee. Is that correct?

Senator Menees – Yes

Senator Blatchly – Do you have a vote from that committee?

Senator Menees – I do not have one in front of me.

Senator Blatchly – Do you know if it was brought before that committee?

Senator Menees-On my sheet it states that it was forwarded to an ISP Committee from your school. Do you know Dean Treadwell if it did?

Dean Treadwell – I do not have notification of that. When I signed it off, we certainly had a review and contacted the Chairs of the II Committee. I can try to review and evaluate where that is now.

Senator Welsh – I think if that evaluation resulted in a temporary tabling that would increase my comfort level in this course. Another source of discomfort is that the other discipline out there is a discipline that perhaps we don't have a Keene State but I wonder if yoga were to be taught for example, at Keene State which discipline would claim the authority to hire an appropriate yoga instructor or well credentialed yoga instructor. I would want that disciplines authorization of that kind of expertise as opposed to people who may or may not be educated or taught in this. For now I am in the process of doing some thinking about my comfort level about II courses that don't have another discipline on campus that they are closely related to.

Senator Menees – If I may add to that – there was a P.E. Yoga course offered that came from the Senate and that might be the appropriate department. I am happy to table this course to verify the responses from the Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee.

Senator McDonald – I am going to ask the Parliamentarian if we are following correct procedures to table this.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – The Chair of that committee requested the review and they can call on the rest of the group to table the above motion.

Senator McDonald – The motion on the floor would be to table this and bring it back to the next Senate meeting.

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that the IINURS 309 course proposal be tabled

Senator McDonald – Any discussion on the motion to table?

Provost Netzhammer – There is no discussion on a motion to table.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the INNURS 310 course proposal be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Blatchly – I have a point of order. This one I know did not go through the Science Curriculum Committee or at least I was told by the Chair of the Science Curriculum Committee that it did not go through that committee. Is it in order to consider a proposal which has not gone through the appropriate or at least the School Curriculum Committee?

Senator McDonald – Would you explain that a little further.

Senator Blatchly – The bylaws say that a course proposal which has an IN prefix is supposed to be reviewed by the Sciences of School Curriculum Committee. I am told that this was not reviewed by Science School Curriculum Committee. Therefore the question is, is it in order to bring this forward as a motion or not? Certainly there is another chance to discuss this but I am just kind of curious that if we know that something has not gone through the correct review process and if that is a point that we raise.

Senator McDonald – Is that within the student walls or within the ISP?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Could you repeat the question?

Senator Blatchly – Senate bylaws say that the advisory opinions, that's a good question: I do not know.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I just found the supporting documents.

Senator Blatchly – This is why I raised the point of order. Are we in order to discuss this?

Provost Netzhammer – Interdisciplinary courses are reviewed and approved by the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee of the Integrative Studies Program. After review by the subcommittee, the area coordinator forwards decisions to the faculty co-chair of the Integrative Studies Program Committee who forwards proposals for approval to the Senate Curriculum Committee.

Senator Blatchly – So if it's a disciplinary course load, we are talking about an IN course. Does it say anything about the interdisciplinary course?

Provost Netzhammer - Faculty wishing to offer a course within the Perspectives Area would first propose the course within his/her department; the proposal would then advance for review and approval by the designated School Curriculum Committee within the Perspectives area; then to the Senate Curriculum Committee.

Senator Blatchly – So the question is, are we in order to consider this?

Senator Menees – I guess it is where our confusion would be. If Nursing is clearly Professional Studies and IN is Sciences, how does that work?

Provost Netzhammer – It goes through the Sciences and Social Sciences Curriculum Committee. We will have another example of that coming up today but that is exactly the case. I think there is enough concern about both of these that taking the next month to look at that and make sure that everything is in order and these are our first proposals from our colleagues in the Nursing program and that we can set things right and bring them to the next meeting.

Senator Menees – I agree to withdraw the motion.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Since it was a point of order to ask the Chair and there has been discussion and the Chair of this committee has requested that the motion be withdrawn there is no need for a vote.

Senator McDonald – Ok, it has been withdrawn and it will be back assuming it goes through the correct process at the next Senate meeting.

Motion: The SCC moves that the INHLSC 175 course proposal be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Menees – This course was put through the Sciences.

Senator Welsh – Do we have clarity on the issue of school? Health Sciences is in the School of Professional and Graduate Studies and making it an IN proposal. Perspective proposal from the Natural Sciences, do we have clarity on that?

Senator McDonald – I do believe that Senator Menees said that it went through the Sciences.

Senator Menees – The proposal went through the Sciences and Social Sciences. There were comments from both of them as well as the School Curriculum Committee Chair. It was initially reviewed with some wonder but the committee felt that it had merit and met the ISP learning outcomes and objectives and there was no opposition to it.

Provost Netzhammer – Is your question on whether the guidelines make that ok or one school to propose?

Senator Blatchly – I suppose that is my question.

Provost Netzhammer – Absolutely, the original guidelines of the proposal actually encourage. They move away from what school it is offered in to what the learning outcomes are for that particular perspectives course. It absolutely allows someone from the Arts & Humanities to propose a course with a Social Science outcome that would then go through the process of the Sciences and Social Sciences Curriculum Committee or someone from Professional & Graduate Studies can propose a Humanities course would have to go through that process as well and in fact encourages that in the original document.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the Revision of the ARCH major be accepted by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees – There has been a question from Senator Blatchly whether nursing requested advisory opinions from Chemistry for the removal of INCHEM 103

Dean Treadwell – There were extensive conversations within the Sciences. This began with our proposal originally last year where we met with the Chair of the Chemistry Department, Dr. Blatchly with Dr. Leverage regarding the fact that by Board standards and by accreditation standards that Chemistry courses are not required in the Nursing curriculum. We proposed the Chemistry course with all good intention to have a Chem. 103, as our new director who has joined the program and proposed the curriculum as well as the number of seats in Chem. 103 available. With a potential of eighty nursing candidates this year it made this very expensive and would impact college resources just to require a 103 course. So the removal of Chem103 with respect to the curriculum requirements of the Board which would not require a Chem. prefix course. Also, with the fact of resources perspective on our campus, this course was quite a burden to the Sciences. We are trying to work hard on this course that is not required on the curriculum it would be wonderful to have. If we are successful we will have a Chemistry competency requirement to meet the prerequisite in math and physiology. We are working with Biology on that issue as well.

Senator Blatchly – Do I take that as a no? I think I did not hear you say that you requested an advisory opinion. Is that correct?

Dean Treadwell – That is correct

Senator Blatchly – So the bylaws say we have to have an advisory opinion.

Senator McDonald – That is correct

Senator Blatchly – Can we move to table this proposal?

Senator Menees – I would like to table that one also to wait for advisory opinions.

Dean Treadwell – May I request clarification. Is an advisory opinion from Chemistry alone or from your Dean as well? There was extensive conversation with the Dean regarding staffing and course support availability. Is it simply to submit? Some clarity would be helpful.

Senator Menees – Advisory opinions are simply requested from affected departments.

Dean Treadwell – In this case it seems an advisory opinion about the impact on a program by removing a requirement from the nursing curriculum is needed. Is that correct?

Senator Menees – Yes

Senator Blatchly – If I may add just looking at the bylaws – affected departments should be listed in the submission. Advisory opinions are required when the proposal affects the curricular of other programs other than that of a sponsor. The department and the School Curriculum Committee in that school must review and approve the proposal. So it would need to come to Chemistry it would need to go to the Science School Curriculum Committee. They need to see a copy of the actual proposal as it is completely written and not a verbal description.

Senator McDonald – Senator Blatchly if the document is forwarded to your school do you see any problem with having that go through that process and getting it to the Curriculum Committee prior to the next Senate meeting?

Senator Blatchly – I cannot speak for the School Curriculum Committee but certainly we would like an opportunity to discuss this in its actual form.

Senator Denehy – The conversation we have been having I assume this is all regarding the motion on the nursing major?

Senator McDonald – Correct

Senator Denehy-That has not been stated and I would like that in the minutes it states what the conversation is about.

Senator McDonald – In actuality there was not a motion put forward it was simply a motion brought forward prior to that motion being made. In this case it did bring a question about bylaws and processes. That did not take place.

Senator Denehy – We were talking about that and it and a proper noun would be helpful.

Senator Menees – I would also like to request that an advisory opinion from Health Science for the removal HLSC 305.

Senator Fleegeer – I have a question about the requirement and clarification on the language. As I was reading the idea that it had to go through the school if it affected the curriculum of the department. I wonder what the case is when a course is being deleted if it actually affects the curriculum of the department. Certainly seems like an advisory opinion would be appropriate for the Chemistry department in this case but what I am wondering is does it have to go through the School Curriculum Committee if it is a deleted course, it doesn't seem to affect the curriculum of that department.

Senator Menees – I would like to add to that. If a course is deleted from a program that initially required it, it may affect resources as well as a change in scheduling which could affect that perspective school.

Senator McDonald – So the nursing is tabled till the next meeting assuming it makes it through the process.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The next meeting is February 8th.

Dean Treadwell – Just one respectful request from the floor. We will address the issues of the advisory opinions on the issues tabled to date but there is a question on the RN BS completer curriculum package that is provided in today's packet that was reviewed. There was a series of things with the nursing curriculum that the RN BS completer track some changes to remove the clinical courses not required of those individuals who come here with licensure are critical and are very timely. With respect to the COHORT beginning in this coming next month in January there are already completer candidates who already possess licensure and would at this moment be required to take lab courses and it is an error in submission from last year that we required all of those courses to be completed by those starting year candidates. So there was a component of this proposal that is extremely timely in its cleaning up those lab requirements that those candidates would already present. Is it possible to consider that piece of this package that has already been through the Curriculum Committee so that we can move forward with that completer change and we will address the issues of the two licensure candidates which will these other chemistry health sciences those other changes to discuss.

Senator Stanish – A point of order about this. I understand the request and I want to make sure we do it properly because I believe I understand it that motions made that include curriculum do not come into effect until the following fall unless we made a separate motion to implement the change and I do not know if that will hold for you in short of doing course substitutions on an individual basis.

Dean Treadwell – We will be doing that this year but we want clarity for communication for these candidates. We need it now so we can communicate it.

Senator McDonald – Is that part of the proposal that we put on hold?

Senator Menees – Yes, as far as I know and I know it has happened before. This is a major and we do not generally approve separate parts of a major without approving the major. This is like approving the option within the major and it is unusual to do that without approving the entire major.

Senator Shalit – Would the February meeting be too soon?

Senator McDonald – For the February meeting we have to have it in order to make it for the catalog.

Provost Netzhammer – We can push some things but February is what we had established as a Senate.

Senator McDonald – At this point we cannot separate that document to have a motion into separate parts. We are going to have to leave that particular section until that next meeting.

Senator Menees – That is being put forth as a major program and not a separate option.

Senator McDonald – I would ask that the people involved with the various committees in here if we can try to expedite this to make sure it does get through the system within that time. I don't think there is anything we can do to fix this issue tonight.

Senator Menees – There are several programs that we will be reviewing in the spring for academic standards as well as the communication major there are some issues we want to work out with the full committee. It is very difficult only having six members on the committee to conduct our business or to have adequate discussions about curriculum, we would like to replace the student member that was on our committee.

Senator McDonald – Would the SCC please stay after tonight's meeting to discuss that replacement and have them in place for the next meeting if possible.

VI. New Business

Provost Netzhammer – To Senator Denehy's question, it is not entirely clear on this issue but I will read it because it's brief and we can read it into the minutes. Integrative Studies Program Committee (ISPC), any faculty member(s), or academic department(s) may propose a change to the structure, principles, or policies of the Integrative Studies Program by submitting the proposed change in writing to the ISPC. The ISPC will consult with the proposal originator(s), and within three weeks of receiving the proposal, the ISPC will submit the proposal with an advisory opinion to the School Curriculum Committees. That is all it says, my assumption would be that it would then move from the School Curriculum Committees to our regular process to the SCC.

Senator Menees – Does anyone know if it has gone to the School Curriculum Committees?

Provost Netzhammer - The last I heard about the forty credits was that the ISPC had developed a proposal to reduce the credits consistent with what the Senate had asked last year which was to reduce the credits to forty credits. I have seen nothing since then.

Senator Menees – I was on that committee last year and that was approved in October or November and I was wondering where it went since then. .

Provost Netzhammer – I will work with Ann this week to make sure it goes through the right process for spring.

Senator Doreski – That proposal did come to the English department for an advisory opinion so I assume it has gone to other departments as well.

Senator Denehy – We just approved three majors with the forty four credits ISP. Once this has been officially cleared as forty credits would it be appropriate to do a technical correction motion for these three majors to bring it to forty?

Senator McDonald – My assumption on this is that whenever that passes it would automatically apply to all programs on campus including those we just changed but also the existing.

Senator Darby – This also becomes an issue with the catalog as to placement for all programs.

VII. Adjournment 5:11pm

Minutes
for the 417th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, February 8th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I.** Call to Order 4:06pm
- II.** Roll Call
Absent: Senator Ghatak and Senator Sapeta
Excused: Provost Netzhammer
- III.** Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 416th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – Two changes and they are on page 11 of the minutes. The first one after a quote from me, the 5th quote down where I say “Do we have clarity on the issue of school” there is a sentence that begins with the word perspective proposals from Natural Sciences. I think I probably meant to say or I did say is *A perspectives proposal*. It is a reference of the subcategory of the ISP offerings. Lower down Provost Netzhammer asked a question on whether the guidelines make that ok or one school to propose? I think it is *for* one school to propose and the line below that has Senator Blatchly saying .I suppose that is my question. I believe that was me saying I suppose that is my question.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as revised

- IV.** Courtesy Period

Vice President Andrew Robinson – I just read on line that the NH Senate has voted to send the gun bill to a study committee. I am not totally sure what that means but I know that it didn't pass in this go around. Thanks to all who testified or commented and to the students who wrote letters to all the Senators saying please don't pass that gun bill.

Senator Stanish – The faculty staff campaign for fundraising will begin March 1st, I believe. Looking forward to messages from those who want to help and stop in.

- V.** Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

We have a new student Senator who was selected by his student peers, Jared Peters. Jared was assigned to the Curriculum Committee and I believe he has already met with them. The second item on the Executive Senate Committee is the SEC received a request to consider an appeal to a curriculum change that dropped a Journalism Course that should have remained available to Communication Majors: Upon review it appears that an appropriate process was followed. In addition, the drop of the course will not impact students since it was one course within a list of electives and students who have taken it will be able to count it and other students may use a course waiver if necessary. The SEC voted to not reconsider that at this time.

Professor Timney – A point of information, I think the SEC misunderstood my question. Neither the department nor I had any problem in the change of curriculum. What we were confused about and would like clarity the Provost and the Dean to clarify is what does it mean that this class is waived? For example, as we understood it, waived could possibly mean that past catalogs would no longer have that course listed as possible for a student to take. We would have no problem with this change if adopted tonight for next year of courses excluded. It's fine that it went through the proper channels however, in our recollection, it has never happened nor has it been a policy to go back and change a past catalog to say this course no longer counts for that student for that year and if that is not the case we are also told that students would not be taking that course. What does - waived mean? Are they forbidden from taking it? The class still exists. That has never happened before and that was the question actually proposed to the SEC. I apologize if that was not clear to you.

Senator McDonald – Let me answer and if anyone else from the Executive Committee has a different view of this please speak up. My understanding and what we took it as discussion since this had been offered as an elective to students and it came up in the program that they were missing an elective because they could not take this and there wasn't another elective available then that could be waived in that situation. It would not affect them for graduation because that course was not available.

Professor Timney – That does not exist. The course still exists and is in the Journalism schedule. We were told to cut sections of it because no Comm. student would ever take it again. We were like wait a minute it is in the catalog for past years and if a student came in at least 3 years before would have the option. But no it's waived. What the heck does waived mean? That is what we are seeking clarification for.

Senator Stevenson – One of the things we did discuss and I think this gets more to your question. If a student who is operating under another set of guidelines and wants to take that course and have it count towards their program because it used to count towards their program if they can get into that section because you will be offering fewer sections they still will be able to get that course to count as their elective.

Professor Timney – Great, that's the clarification that we could not get and I assume that nothing is being deleted on line from past catalogs as showing that is still an option. Is that correct?

Senator McDonald – Correct

Professor Timney – Thank you very much and appreciate it. It seemed to be a very radical change in policy and I wanted it very clear. Thank you

Senator Menees – That is what I wanted to add – I just wanted to make sure that this was not replacing the policy about students using the catalog that they come in on and any later catalog. So they can choose to go to newer curriculum but they can stay with the old one if they so choose. I think that was what Mark Timney wanted to emphasize was that you can't erase past catalogs.

Senator McDonald – Does that satisfy your request?

Professor Timney – Yes, and thank you for your investigation.

Senator McDonald – The SEC received a request from the Registrar to change the due dates for Curriculum Proposals. Some of this was the fact that we are considering many curriculum proposals. They have to be put in schedules for the following fall where there may be classes included that technically have not been passed by the Senate. When we looked at this the change in deadlines which moved it from mid December until the current dates we realized they had only been in place for one year. Within the SEC, we voted that we wanted to keep the new timeline as they are now following the Curriculum Committee guidelines. Further study to see if it is causing administrative problems for example: within the Registrar's office we would rather work with them to see if we can do things to help them out on that end rather than changing this and leaving our curriculum process so tied to that December meeting that we have lived with for decades. At this point we are not looking to make a change.

Senator Menees – I just want to second that the curriculum guidelines and deadlines are the purview of the SCC and not the Registrar.

Senator McDonald – We agree with that also and we would prefer to keep it under the guidelines for the Curriculum Committee. If in the future proves that something that needs to be of further study then we will visit that.

Senator McDonald – The ISP task force has been working a long time and they now have the report and admit I have not read it. We did ask the co chairs of the ISP task force to come in and give an executive overview tonight of this process. I would like to point out that we hoped this is an information session and are not going to open it up for discussion. Simply because we have not had ample time to review this and it will be brought up for discussion at next month's meeting once everyone has had time to review it. We have some time sensitive curricular material tonight and we want to make sure that that takes place.

Professor Bassarear – I am going to speak from notes so I can be more concise and respect the time that you all have. When Anne Marie Mallon and I thought about what to say tonight we thought rather than repeat what is in the report we would offer a little bit of contextual information for you. The committee began meeting in early March with sixteen members, and representatives from all constituencies of the college. We decided to spend the first several meetings discussing the charge and making sure that everyone became familiar with the integrative studies program. We had students and we had some administrative staff from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs who were not as familiar and some faculty who have not taught a lot in the ISP. It took a number of meetings, we read the ISP manual and went over that and other related documents along with other things to make sure that we had an understanding of the program and then went through the charge line by line to make sure we came to consensus on the meaning of the charge. As a result of those discussions we sent a slight revision of the charge to the SEC in May, there were no substantive changes but it clarify the charge. The rest of our time we constructed a pilot survey for graduating seniors. That was the first group of people that have been through the whole program. That served as a pilot for the interviews and surveys that we would do this fall. For anyone who has done research the pilot can work out any kinks so that way our surveys in the fall would be more useful. It also allowed all members of the committee to come to a deeper understanding of this very huge complex enterprise, the Integrative Studies Program.

In the fall when we reconvened we spent some time thinking what we could realistically do with the time and resources that we have. We interviewed staff in 9 different departments in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Operating as a committee and as a whole we parceled out this work so different groups would look at the work in drafts of protocols and drafts of surveys and bring it back to the whole committee. Our intention all along, which was realized, was to have a process where there was unanimity moving forward so that all voices were heard during that entire process. We then analyzed that data. As you can see from the report, we have given you an unedited version of the data in three appendixes, the only changes were to remove anything that might identify an individual. If somebody said never take the course with Dr. so n' so, that was edited out. Other than that you have if you wish we have 100 single spaced pages of all the comments that were received. Then we sat down and said here are the 5 categories we are charged with reviewing: governance and structure, mission, communication, assessment and implementation and said here is the data from the surveys and interviews. There are the other documents that bear to this and we started mapping all of that data onto those five categories of the charge, going back and forth with small groups, reading it and saying does everyone agree? Are we representing this accurately and have we missed anything? That's what we did the entire month of November into December. By December when we left our last meeting, which I think was December 14th, we had a rough draft of the overall document. When we came back in January we looked at fine tuning the document and it was a lot of work. Words that came in to describe the work of creating the document were that it was an exhaustive and exhausting process. When we finished we agreed sense of unanimity that everybody's voice was heard and the document that you received is one that all members of the committee do stand by.

Professor Mallon – I would like to build upon what Tom just said and emphasize a few of the major themes that you will find in the document, all of which are embedded there but are certainly worth noting upfront and emphasizing as well. The first thing that we do want to make particularly clear is that we did find overwhelming support for the mission of the ISP from across the constituencies on campus. Much perhaps to your surprise and to some degree ours very few people did say blow it up. They did articulate questions about and problems with the implementation and structure and of the governance of the ISP but many people expressed the desire to help make that mission more evident and for their goal of it becoming part of the campus culture. So, it is important to note the submission of support to the ISP. Secondly, while we found a lot of discontent as I noted with structure and governance we also found, to our surprise, a high level of misunderstanding and misinformation about the program. There might be a lot of challenges and weaknesses noted in the program but it is significant that those challenges and weaknesses across the boards in various areas of the charges in other words come from that misunderstanding and what the program is and how it works. The misunderstanding and misinformation that we as a committee experienced, is clearly shared by the campus. Finally, we noted this very strongly in the Executive summary there is a real need for campus dialog about this program. We recognized that the program was built to be revised. It is time for that revision to occur but in a way that includes all of the constituencies who feel that they have some stake we need to understand what it means to be integrative. So you will see, as noted about the program in our executive summary, that there is a real need to think about the term integrative vs. integrated, and what integration means for Keene State College in particular. If this program is meant to be integrative then we need to understand that term and need to own the process of making it so on this campus. So we want to emphasize the value of this problem and the realization that we came to as a full committee unanimously around this term.

Senator McDonald – We want to thank you for all of your hard work with this and also the other members of the task force who have been working on this for quite some time. I would like to invite you back at next month's meeting when we bring this up for discussion and appreciate you coming tonight to give your report.

Item number five Program Elimination Guidelines. We talked at our last meeting about bringing a revision of the program elimination guidelines to this meeting. At our meeting the other night we were very concerned about the full agenda that is set for tonight's meeting and we wanted to put all the time sensitive items in the front. So the report on program elimination will be brought back to the next Senate meeting. We have not dropped that just putting it off until next month. Item number six and seven kind of go together, we have had some discussion about what is the pathway that curriculum proposals take to go through ISP and the curriculum process altogether. We also tied that into number 7 because there is often times confusion for people putting in a curriculum proposal. They may also have some types of standards considerations that have to be taken care of. We would like to find a way to coordinate this better and ask that we look at some ways possibly on the forms with suggestions like a check list on the front asking if the proposal includes changes in grade or admission policies proposals and to bring them to the floor on the same night rather than having admissions being brought up one month and then curriculum issues on the next one. Part of that was to try and build some flow charts and supporting documents to show people as they were filling out the paperwork for these proposals how to do it. We are asking that later in the semester for the curriculum committee to start working on the revisions and we ask if you would work together with the ASC to bring those together. Any questions on that?

Senator Welsh – It's a great idea and we have been thinking about that in our committee.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – We also wanted to make a change in the bylaws to codify it so as you are looking at both committees try to remember that. We changed some of the language last year for the committees so take a look at both of those to make sure the language is in the bylaws as well.

Senator McDonald – The last item from the SEC a few years ago Keene State had a change in the grading scales from a/ab/b b/c and looking to a more traditional plus/minus scale. We would like to charge the ASC of reconsidering the grade scale from the current model to the plus/minus and ask you to study that. At that time bring it back to the Senate to report on.

Senator Welsh – Is there a time frame for that consideration?

Senator McDonald – We have not developed a time frame. We just want to bring this to the ASC and ask them to reconsider that. I believe we can provide previous information if you would like to have that also. Senator Stevenson, is there anything you would like to say about this where you kind of led the discussion at the SEC meeting?

Senator Stevenson – No, I am good.

Senator McDonald – Any questions on that item?

Senator Denehy – Is there going to be a proposal given to us? I was on the Academic Standards three years ago when we previously researched this and I think that unless someone comes back and says we have looked at the data but that was three years ago and we see this or this or this needing further effort I am not sure what purpose this serves.

Senator McDonald – That is why we are asking the ASC to look at this. We are charging them to study the reports to see if anything has changed to make it where a change should take place and be brought to the Senate for discussion and vote. That is why we are asking the ASC to study that. Are there any other questions? That concludes the SEC report.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator McDonald - We will move to the AOC and I will start with an apology. The attachment for the Physical Education Review Program did not come out with the Senate agenda. Therefore we really cannot discuss that item tonight because of the forty eight hour rule. We apologize to all of the people here that were involved with this including people from PE who are here to discuss this tonight. We will have to postpone this till the next meeting. I apologize that the AOC report and minutes mentioning that there would be a motion tonight however the report itself is not in there.

Senator Blatchly – I just wanted to make sure that people did see that we do have a number of reviews. This of course will push the PE review until next meeting and perhaps looking at the rest of the agenda tonight maybe this is a good thing for today. We'll see if it is a good thing for the next meeting. However, we do have a number of reviews which are under way and the reports have been written and we are looking forward to getting those finished in a timely fashion. I had a conversation with the SEC about trying to schedule those so people are not overwhelmed with it so we will continue to work on that. As you saw we are not making a motion to forward the PE report because you haven't seen it. We are continuing to talk about the AOC procedures in particular with regard to the review of accredited programs. We did send a draft out to the Chairs of accredited programs but I just wanted to make a public note that if people are interested in procedures for this review and if they want to see a copy of the guidelines these things are not secret they can. They will have to come before the Senate for approval at some point. So if people want to have feedback or they want to have input on this process please let me know and I will be happy to send a copy of that information to you.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just a point of clarification the AOC guidelines were revised in the bylaws so that they come to Senate as information just like the SCC guidelines. A Senator could, at the Senate meeting request that there be a vote on them; however, I think we see what happens when the SCC guidelines come forward and rarely does that happen. So know that your committee can do that also.

Senator Blatchly – Thank you

Senator Darby – Under item one of the Senate document from the AOC, there is the line on update on the music program review it states *The music program is being reviewed under the provisional accreditation procedure*. What does provisional accreditation procedure mean?

Senator Blatchly – I think I am referring potentially to the fact that the guidelines for review with accredited programs were incredibly sparse and they allowed simply submission of accreditation documentation without any further input required from the program. We could considerably do that. During the past couple of years we have been essentially piloting the process which explores that process that asks the departments that are involved to provide a little bit more of explanation, a roadmap things like that. So that is the provisional nature of that. It is not in our procedures so we're asking the music program for accreditation material. We have already asked them for the last reviews but technically it is not required. So that is the provision nature of the document.

Senator Darby – Thank you, just as a follow up so that I am clear and forgive me if I misunderstood. The new procedures that you about to enact are related to the AOC reports on accredited programs, those procedures would have to be approved by this body?

Senator Blatchly – I am hearing the answer is no. They have to be approved by the AOC so it would have to be a vote. I think we are going to try our best to do this in daylight. We are not trying to sneak anything in but it sounds like the procedures are essentially as a public community you have the right to see this and we will try to stick with this.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – When you bring it to the floor a Senator could request a vote but it doesn't come as a motion.

Senator McDonald – Can I ask a question? Does this have to do that in the past we have had to try and streamline the process so the people who are accredited don't have to do a second self study because it is not meeting all the requirements in AOC nor am I misunderstanding that?

Senator Blatchly – Let me see if I can give you a brief answer to our woes. The problem is fundamentally the accreditation procedure is not designed for a real comprehensive Keene State program review. Some of the accreditation procedures can serve nicely and there is a really good overlap between what we require and what the accrediting institutions require. Some of them are not. In some cases the accreditation might only actually come to part of the program. So, what do you do in that case? We do have, of course, the other side of this of putting together accreditation documents are a major pain in the neck. Our goal is to keep the work load to a minimum but to try and serve the review process. If a program has outside reviewers coming in and they write a report that is very useful and we would simply use that but in the case where there is no outside reviewer we have similar handling in providing information and we do not want to hamper the value of the information so we are trying to put together a middle ground here. We know it is a lot of work but we also know that we need to provide a comparable process.

Senator McDonald – Basically in our process we have failed to let some of these programs know that your accreditation process doesn't need all the stuff that we need for the academic overview.

Senator Blatchly – The communication is not going to those programs – this is an attempt this year to make that communication and to begin the process, of what will probably be for a number of accredited programs, that we have here a customized process for every accredited program. Everyone is different so we are just going to have to sit down and put together a sort of what do we do for this program. We will keep notes on that and pass it forward.

Senator McDonald – Are there any other questions? Seeing none we will move on to Senator Welsh and the ASC.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Welsh – All of you have a copy of the report, document 12/18, from our month of work and in the interest of time I will not talk about any items that don't generate a motion. You can read those things in your free time due to the space of things that we have coming. There a few items that do generate motions and the first is a charge that we had to take a look at the policy of participation in commencement ceremonies in May. This is a charge we have been looking at for while now and there have been several opportunities for people to contribute and to solicit opinions from people. We have several drafts of policies that we would think about and shared those drafts. After several rounds of this process we have a recommended policy which is on page 16 starting with the line "Commencement Policy" and ending with the [End of proposed policy statement] this is our recommended policy than we generated a report of how we came to this policy. That is intended as attachment A, beginning on page 19 of your minute's packet. To summarize the proposed policy, it restates the current policy with more clarity including the number of credits to cross the stage and that students need to be in good academic standing and need to be within 20 credits of completing the requirements for their baccalaureate degree in the spring semester. One other thing I will point out before making the motion recommended in the report is that the conclusion report expresses part of the reason for the evolution of the report. This is iteration of this policy and it is on the bottom of page 16. After weighing this consideration we believe that the financial and human resources at the college are not yet configured in a way that would permit a more demanding commencement policy than the codification proposed here. That is the input we got. With that in mind we passed this policy and I would like to make a motion.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revision to the College Commencement Policy as drafted and passed by the ASC at its meeting on January 30, 2012 be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – Did you look at the policies of compatible schools? Is it somewhere in this report?

Senator Welsh – We did.

Senator Doreski – I note that it says that more than one in four students who participated in the May 2010 Commencement Ceremony had not completed their degrees when they crossed the stage 245 out of 937? I was astonished by that. I wonder what the figures are at comparable schools.

Senator Welsh – I do not know.

Senator Martin – Ann Miller was able to get communications from other schools. None of the communications were commensurate to each other or with the data of our own institutional research

Senator Welsh - What we got when we asked for data for comparisons from other schools was their policy as opposed to how many of their students cross. Typically it was a mute issue from the other schools, you cross when you have finished your credits. You commence when you graduate. The number for us is the only number here.

Senator Doreski – If we had an extra week before Commencement so that we knew how many students were actually graduating would that change the policy you proposed? We would also have to have a policy managing students that fail a course at the last minute. Would the committee have considered a little bit more demanding policy because this seems like an awful lot of students that are not really graduating?

Senator Welsh –The policy you just described is the policy that basically cut the number down to zero with the exception of well zero if you failed a class you would not cross the stage. That was seen as a possibility in fact when we were collecting opinions most faculty said this is the logical and obvious, it is the standard and it is seemingly, the standard at other schools. What we determined was two things. One, there is a resource issue that does come with that. That you are looking at reconfiguring the timing of graduation, the grading of papers the whole final week of the college. Perhaps we create a senior week. Perhaps we create a May and December and August graduation so that the students that graduate later can also cross the stage. It seems sort of predated and not necessarily proportional to the problem that we are considering here. Plus one other consideration came out of this that was raised by students that there is a culture of wanting to cross with your cohort. Wanting to go to commencement with the people you started with. I think it is a part of a satisfying opportunity that we present because we have configured this way even though other schools do not. I think we are sympathetic to that.

Senator Stevenson – Personal privilege. I am beginning to feel that there is a double standard here. In the past I have brought motions before the Senate that have asked us to consider issues of workload and resources and it seems to me that this policy was developed in a way that it was the primary consideration of this committee. In the past I have been told, the President can correct me if she would so like, the Senate isn't supposed to consider resources in developing policies so I would ask Senator Welsh what would your committee have recommend had they not considered resources because that is what we should be approving. This body should be about making the best policy possible and then seeing if we have the resources. That is management's job to see if they have the resources to implement that policy.

Senator Welsh – I am going to take a crack at that and certainly any members of my committee can jump in. Not considering resources at all I think is a difficult thing to do. It is impossible to not think about what it takes to implement something. I think we would not have been able to do that completely. That said I think the resources and other issues around making a hard and fast graduation policy like I just described is more than our committee had justification for. The policy that we have come up with is the policy we voted on and approved. I can say though that is not an ideal world policy I can say prior to this policy the policy we were considering in which students needed to have 16 credits left and to have some evidence that within a semester they were going to register for and complete those 16 credits. The details of that were fairly complex. They would be within 16 credits of their degree. They have to complete their requirements in the summer or fall semester by showing that they have a clear plan to complete their requirements. If you have a plan and it is documented and it's validated by someone then you can cross. That was the other plan.

Senator McDonald – Other questions or comments?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I am not sure you answered Senator Stevenson's question.

Senator Stanish – I don't know that but I can give you a personal answer maybe. Our committee did consider resources and so to try to guess what the committee would have arrived at in a group without considering resources would purely be a guess. I think Senator Welsh explained the other alternatives that we arrived on and perhaps it would have been one of those so where we didn't actually have the discussion I don't know if we can fully answer your question.

President Giles-Gee – I think Senator Stevenson does raise an issue and I thought the consideration had been the number of majors that exceeded 120 where the student might need to take additional semesters and time to actually finish the degree. I didn't hear that as part of the argument at all. The idea too that last semester was the first time that we offered a summer semester which in fact would allow students the possibility to complete an entire semester during the summer. It would also affirm the 16 hour semester possibilities vs. the 20. Looking at this this is an improvement of what we currently have so a transition to something better and cushioned is what I think Senator Stevenson might be an issue that this is a transitional plan. I thought this might have been something you might have been thinking rather than looking at resources but according to program load summer semester and making the transition to a point where we should be with some of the other work that is going on.

Senator Stanish – To part of your question we did consider education majors. That part of the group of students that are sort of planning to take more than four years. Specially planning to student teach in the fall. Because where students either didn't start their courses right away first semester freshman year and ended up student teaching an extra semester or planned it that way because they wanted to see how a classroom is set up so they deliberately wanted to student teach in the fall semester as opposed to a spring semester. I think that is why we originally landed on the policy of thinking 16 credits so that would accommodate those students and they have a clear plan of how they are going to finish and that is how we are going to accommodate them. We did consider those students I think in determining the policy.

Senator Welsh – Just by way in considering summer courses I think we considered for a while that they could finish in the summer include maybe the number eight in the fall but that seemed less available as an option to students then registering for fall semester in a normal academic fashion.

Senator Martin – There is apparently a financial aid consideration where federal funding is not necessarily available during the summer where students would need financial assistance. If we require that they finish in the summer they would have to pay a premium or not graduate.

Dean Treadwell – Our understanding for summer financial packaging is across a twelve month calendar. It's a different communication strategy but our students can think outside the fall and spring semester as their only packaging. Financial aid can in fact extend across the twelve month window and it is possible for us to work with students to plan their academic schedule across the summer as well and receive financial aid while they are doing that as well.

Senator McDonald – other questions or discussion?

Senator Stemp – I have a follow up question. Do we have data on those students for whatever reason walked without attaining their full load and for whatever reason do not ever finish off their degrees or is this a significantly a small number?

Senator Welsh – We do have that data and perhaps Senator Martin has the data in actual numbers. My summary recollection is that the students...

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I have it right here. For those walking in commencement without completing degree requirements the only significant predictor of eventual completion is the students cumulative GPA. Among those with a GPA of 3.0 or higher at the beginning of the spring semester 36% completed by August 83% by December cumulative and only 5% had still not finished their degree program. On the other hand students who have a cumulative GPA below a 3.0 are significantly less likely to complete their degrees later. 27% by August and 59% by December cumulative and 27% are still incomplete after 16 months.

Senator McDonald – We have reached the end of our fifteen minute discussion and I am going to ask the Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson as the wording is always tricky. We are going to take a vote as to whether to close debate or continue discussion. A positive vote will be to continue up to another fifteen minute discussion and a negative vote will resolve in the motion to call the question.

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to continue discussion on the motion that is on the floor.

Vote: The Senate voted to continue discussion for another fifteen minutes.

Senator Stevenson – I would like to amend this motion to change it to the language that Senator Martin read off of changing it to 16 credits requirement and show that they registered for 16 credits.

Senator McDonald – Can you clearly state the amendment for the record?

Senator Stevenson – They will be within 16 credits of completing the requirements for their baccalaureate degree(s) at the conclusion of Spring Semester and they have registered to complete their requirements during the summer or Fall Semester (thereby showing that they have a clear plan to complete remaining requirements).

Senator Welsh – This would fit in the second bullet of the policy on page 16.

Senator McDonald – I want to check with the Parliamentarian.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – So we have to vote down your motion.

Senator McDonald – I don't think we need to vote down that motion. We can make an amendment to that motion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – We can't amend this. It's a new motion.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Yes, we can. The reason it is not a friendly change per say because it is substantive. A friendly amendment is a logistic change or to make it clearer so this would require a second.

Senator McDonald – Ok we have a motion on the floor to the previous motion so we need a second to that amendment.

Motion: Senator Stevenson moves that the above motion to be amended to read They will be within 16 credits of completing the requirements for their baccalaureate degree(s) at the conclusion of Spring Semester and they will show they have registered to complete their requirements during the Summer or Fall Semester (thereby showing that they have a clear plan to complete remaining requirements).

Senator McDonald – We are now discussing the amendment on the floor. Are there any questions or comments to the above amendment to the motion?

Senator Doreski – I think the amendment is a sensible one because it occurs to me if students are 20 credits shy of graduation at the point that they are in their senior year while there could be a number of reasons for that but one looming reason may be ineptness and those students I think would be less likely to be able to complete 20 credits in a semester if they have not been entirely successful of completing 16 credits every semester all along. It seems to me that that is putting at risk students even more at risk by allowing them to participate in Commencement. The issue raised here is whether allowing students to participate in Commencement in some way demotivates them to properly finish. I am not sure that it does but with this many students, I am really disturbed by this number. That is way more than I expected so I support the amendment.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I have two questions, that given the data about a 3.0 or higher did you consider creating a policy with that as the bar as opposed to 2.0.

Senator Welsh – I don't think so.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Did you consider the resources that are being lost due to these students who don't graduate, that group of 27% or 5% what is that number of students? What are the costs of them in lost revenue for them not completing the courses that they should to graduate?

Senator Welsh – We did not make that calculation.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The only reason I bring that up is that I have a very fuzzy recollection of this. This was originally a presentation that was at an open forum on campus. One of the reasons that we were talking about it was the loss of revenue dollars from these students who never finish.

Senator Welsh – The motivated issue I remember at that presentation was completion in four years, getting students out in a timely fashion. If we can provide the encouragement with a stricter policy we might see that.

Senator Stevenson – That's what really I recall. President Giles-Gee can correct me if she would like to. We were under pressure from the Trustees to lessen time to completion and I think that is why your committee was charged with this to try and develop policies to shrink that time. I think this a modest and reasonable step to move in that direction. This is a model that we can show the Trustees that we are at least acting towards this process.

President Giles-Gee – I must concur with Senator Stevenson it really does have to do with how to achieve their goals. The best way is to develop a plan to have fewer hours and get to the zero. There is more research that we are doing that will show some of the introductory courses that we are now offering that should make students feel successful. Our decision is how to put the resources around making that success a possibility. So again, we'll do our part and I appreciate this.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion on the amendment?

Senator Blatchly – I think there is presumably some concern with some of the majors and that could move us to centralize so I think this plan creates an obligation for advisors. We are talking about people late in their career. It creates an obligation for advisors to assist the students in creating this plan. I would hope that the major work load would be in that place distributed across campus so I would vote that we as faculty would take that charge and responsibility seriously.

Senator McDonald – Additional questions or comments on the amendment?

Senator Welsh – One more detail that was not necessary in the policy as presented but may be necessary in this policy is a date by these appeals need to be issued. There is this possibility that students will come two days before graduation provide all the documentation and need the exception. Perhaps stating something like at the end of the registration period for spring semester or fall semester in the spring whatever date that is they must make their appeal or provide documentation.

Senator McDonald – Is this an amendment to the amendment?

Senator Welsh – It would be.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – We need to vote on the amendment.

Senator McDonald - Any other discussions? We are now voting on the amendment to the previous motion on the floor.

Vote: Amended motion carries.

Senator McDonald – We are now back to the original proposal on the floor with the amendment.

Senator Blatchly – Can I ask the ASC if these deadlines are typically part of the guidelines that you write or whether that is administrative. I understand the need for a deadline but can that be done essentially administratively or does it have to be part of this procedure. I am trying to save you some work.

Senator Stanish – I don't know for sure. Part of our other charges is to look at the formula for deadlines in terms of add drop periods. Looking at our formula for deadlines seems to be a part of our typical work in calendar guidelines so my guess is that it falls under our scope.

Senator Welsh – Here is my need to offer an amendment and so here is the language that I will offer. After the phrase where it says appeals will be decided by the Assistant Dean(s) of the School(s) another sentence will be added the deadline for appeals will be the end of registration for fall semester in the spring.

Senator McDonald – We have an amendment being proposed.

Motion: Senator Welsh moves that the above motion approved to include a deadline. After the phrase *where it says appeals will be decided by the Assistant Dean(s) of the School(s)* another sentence will be added- *the deadline for appeals will be the end of registration for fall semester in the spring.*

Senator McDonald – Discussion on the amendment on the floor.

Senator Denehy – That is an unclear deadline because registration for fall now continues up until June. We have a two week period where advising happens. We open up registration on a day by day basis to certain cohorts. It used to be that it would end at the 2nd Friday.

Senator Darby – Is there a term for that two week period?

Senator Denehy – It is then considered registration but we haven't come up with a term for it since it is standard.

Senator McDonald – Can we refer that back to adjustment period?

Senator Darby – Perhaps yes.

Senator Welsh – Do we just want to make it April 1st?

Senator McDonald – It may be more accurate if we change it to a date.

Senator Denehy – This might actually be a friendly amendment. The two week period is always the 10th and 11th week of classes. So if we were able to change it to the end of the 11th week of classes that would meet what we consider that traditional two week period.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Technically I don't think there is a problem with it if it is agreeable to the person who made the motion. It is outside the regular but it is also acceptable to do it this way.

Motion: Senator Welsh moves that the amendment above add the deadline of the 11th week of class.

Senator Fleegeer – Point of clarification Senator Denehy did you say the registration is extended into June?

Senator Denehy – Yes

Senator Fleegeer – Is that not after graduation?

Senator Denehy – Yes, this is for fall semester

Senator Fleegeer – They could not meet that deadline, if the deadline for approving your case is after graduation.

Senator Denehy – We would just change it to the 11th week of classes.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion on the amendment on the floor?

Vote: Motion of the Amendment carries

Senator McDonald – We are now back to the original proposal with the two amendments. Further discussion on this?

Vote: Motion of the Commencement Policy carries

Senator Welsh – Second item revision to the Nutrition option major. To summarize what it was an addition of a class IN Health Science 175 added to entry requirements into the program we discussed that a little bit then decided that was a good motion and so passed that standard.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revised standards for admission to the Nutrition Option of Health Science Major as submitted be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I am having trouble locating the actual policy in your notes.

Senator Welsh – The actual policy is as submitted in the curriculum proposal that was sent.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Welsh – Third item that was discussed and generated a motion was the program revision to the Athletic Training Education Program. A motion was made to approve language for the standards in that program. Once they were revised a bit per our discussion with representatives from that program that amendment generated another attachment. Attachment B which begins on page 23 of your packet notes. I append those unlike I did not append the other one because we generated changes to these outside the curricular proposal. What you have in the appendix, attachment B is a modification of the program proposal standards. In summary the program proposal called for a grade of C in Allied classes and a grade of BC for major courses as a retention standard certification of EMT. We voted for it and passed the revisions 6 in favor 2 opposed. The opposition was generated by the additional language and technical stance that may generate discussion.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revisions to admissions and retention standards for the Athletic Training Education Program be approved by the Senate

Senator Martin – I would like to register my reservations about some of the technical standards that are embedded in this proposal. The technical standards I understand are derived from language that the national accrediting organization has indicated to programs that are comparable to ours and I am looking at in particular the technical standards 1-9 and I am focusing on standard 1 and standard 3. Where standard 1 specifies that candidates must demonstrate the following technical standards for admission: *The mental capacity to assimilate, analyze, synthesize, integrate concepts, and problem solve to formulate assessment and therapeutic judgments and to be able to distinguish deviations from the norm.* Then item 3: *The ability to understand and speak the English language at a level consistent with competent professional practice.* I am not aware of that level of competence to judge competence is available to the faculty in any of the programs we have on campus and I would like to register my concern that we not adopt language from national organizations that we can't actually implement in a meaningful way at this institution.

Dr. Swiger – Just for a point of clarification these technical standards were approved by the previous Senate when the initial program requested that it be changed from an internship program to a nationally accredited program. This is not actually part of the proposal, it is existing language that is already documented and cataloged and has been so since the program has been since 1999. That being said, to speak to the Senators concerns, the technical standards are there not for us to necessarily evaluate but for the students to understand that if they are unable to meet those technical standards that they must provide the program with the knowledge that they need additional assistance. For instance, if English is your second language there is a mechanism on our campus that students can get additional assistance. This is critical when our students sit for their national boards. If they are requesting additional time, if they are requesting to use their English dictionary the certifying agency will contact the program director which will be me to verify that that student in their time at Keene State had requested that support. If the student has not done so then the certifying agency will not allow that student to have those modifications while sitting for their boards. That is where that language comes from. I just wanted to clarify that I don't know if that answers your reservations but that is why those technical standards are in place.

Senator Martin – I can see that there might be a useful function that these standards provide in giving the point of reference for students during their course of study here but that is not what we are saying we are doing. What we are saying is that the student must demonstrate the following technical standards for admission that means that somebody has to assess the degree to which it has been met formally or not to those standards. So rather than students self reporting the way a presidential candidate would like people to do we're asking somebody to judge the competence of students. That is quite different from the way to the language we have before us which requires a judgment of competency.

Dr. Swiger – Within our formal application the students read the technical standards and then they sign a statement basically stating that they need that or that they don't need that. If they don't need that then here is what they are doing to show documentation. It's in part the accrediting agency basically is telling us what we have to do to make sure that students understand that there are these technical pieces to their profession and if they are unable to meet these that they identify and show a way that they would doing support. In essence we are not evaluating the student. In terms of the application itself the students are required to have a physical to show they have postural and neuromuscular control and number two some of the other items as well. It is really the student that is the one doing a self assessment in essence. We have never not allowed students to not be admitted to the program because they don't meet the technical standards. The piece of that is they either meet the technical standards or they have to request additional support in order to meet those technical standards.

Senator McDonald – any questions or discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Welsh – The third item to generate a motion for our committee was a proposal by the Education Department for a Masters in Education with a Special Education option. The changes that affected our judgment within our committee were essentially a partnership with Granite State College and transfer credits. It was a specification for Keene State Education Graduate courses would need a cumulative GPA of 3.0 before transfer credit could be for Education 612 could be attributed to those transferring students if I articulated that correctly.

Motion: The ASC moves that the proposed revision to the Granite State College Partnership transfer requirements as submitted be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Welsh – Those are the motions from our committee but it is not the only work we have been doing.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees – In the interest of time I am only going to talk about a couple that came up as concerns for us or were of interest for other reasons. Other than that if you have a particular question on a program we have guests here that may be able to answer those for you. Communication Major and Minor were up for review by us and the only issue which is in my minutes was that we felt the Communication and Philosophy options within the Major only differed by a course as they appeared in the catalog. Since those were already in place with revisions to those we decided to go in favor of the program despite we felt that it could have been more substantial.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions of the COMM Major and Minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the ART BA be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the ART BFA be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the English program writing option be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Writing Minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the JRN program be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the FR Major and Minor be approved by the Senate

Senator Martin – The proposal for French Major I think has a wrong word on page 3, paragraph 1 where a student who proposes to study overseas is enjoined to consult with the Global Education Office and Spanish faculty and the minor proposal doesn't have that it has French faculty. I suspect in the effort to make parallel language there is a template to the language and it wasn't changed.

Senator Menees – I am agreeable to that change.

Senator McDonald – So the motion with the correction from Spanish to French.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the SP Major and Minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the German Minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IAART 391 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IHFR 103 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IHSP 103 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IHJRN 101 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the MU BA be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the addition of the Music Composition BM be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the addition of the Music Technology BM be approved by the Senate

Senator Stemp – What clarification for the new technology BM in the Music Composition? They were existing options of the original Music BA on campus.

Senator Darby – That is correct.

Senator Stemp – In transitioning this to a Bachelors of Music was there any external review required or was this something that was accomplished in house?

Senator Darby – It was a recommendation of our most recent National Accreditation review. In effect our now former BA program had five specializations and without burning the Senate's time there were a number of problems with that particularly in the area of low enrolled upper level classes 300 and 400 level. Plus enrollments in all five of those specializations and some of those specializations were rather minimal. There were two specializations within our BA that that did have robust enrollments and in fact those enrollments have been increasing over and over since our ten year last national accreditation review. It was in part based on our accreditors' suggestion also we have been in consultation with the Dean of Arts & Humanities that we made this move.

Senator Stemp – So essentially the reconfiguration of the original Bachelor of Arts to Bachelor of Music you could accomplish without depending on any additional review by external bodies.

Senator Darby – That is correct.

Senator Blatchly – There have been conversations about the issues of time to graduation some of which involved proposing a shorter timeframe so if people decide to choose to begin a Major in their sophomore year is there a clear path to complete that in the three

remaining years. I wonder in putting this major together you have a sense of whether that is possible or impossible. Was that sort of analysis done? Do you have any concerns about time to graduation issues in this major?

Senator Darby – I appreciate your question. I would say because of the accreditation demands the answer would be whether it's our Bachelor of Music or Music Education Program. Currently our recent performance degree which is current with proposals quite frankly the answer is no. Our accreditors require for instance a projection through the entire college career the accumulation of a wide array of skills. However two points with regard to your question, number one our Bachelor of Arts degree is a nationally accredited degree. It is recognized by our accreditors and is approved by them. That is a 120 credit program so a student wishing a nationally accredited degree at this institution could get one through our Bachelor of Arts program. Secondly, with our proposed programs, there is imbedded within the program credits that are applicable to ISP. There is one course in the Music Composition a proposal of that is applicable to ISP. It is proposed at I believe at 124 credit degree with the consideration that a number of credits are applied ISP. In reality it is a 120 degree program. You can complete the requirements in 120 credits. My understanding with music technology in the proposal there are eight credits that are applicable to ISP one is a 100 level course another is a 300 level course so that is in the proposal as 128 credits however with the consideration that eight of those credits are applicable to ISP. I believe it does fall within the mandates of the standards of having a 120 degree program.

Senator Stevenson - How many students come to that major late? I know time to degree completion is a big deal on campus right now. Are there a lot of students that come to that late?

Senator Darby – Which one?

Senator Stevenson – Any of them especially the BA where it is 120. If they come to it in the second year can they really get out in four years?

Senator Darby – The answer is yes. You can complete those music requirements in three years. The Bachelor of Music which is a different degree program the student obligates again with this development of skills competency across the four year college career. So a student coming in late could possibly with work in the summer for instance complete it in four years. I think that would be a challenge but they could. I don't know if that would be the case in Music Education because of the student teaching and the courses that are obligated in the Education Department. If I may, I do have colleagues from the Music Department and invite them to weigh in on that question.

Professor Maura Glennon - Our music majors all enter before their freshman year. They do not declare their degree or major ever in their second year unless they change their majors so we have auditions in the spring in high schools for their senior year. They walk in the door as music majors on a track. If they change tracks it is actually pretty easy. If they took all ISP their freshman year they could still graduate with a BA on time in four years. It is actually a pretty smooth transition.

Senator McDonald – Further questions or discussions?

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Education Leadership post-master's certification option be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that addition of a Graduate Educator certification (Special Education) option be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that revision of the Master of Education-Curriculum and Instruction Option be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that revision of the Master of Education-Education Leadership Option be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that revision of the Master of Education-Special Education Option be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions of the WGS major and minor programs be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that IIECON 320 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – This is one where I am going to generate some discussion. A basic question, it seems like you are considering this one twice. This is a proposal from my department and is exemplary of proposals of how II courses are done on campus and it is an issue that I find on occasion when II courses and II disciplines are up for consideration for the Senate. I was on the Senate when we passed the ISP program and do remember thinking and noticing the II category or classes and I will read the description of the kinds of classes and what the original intent was because this is what sticks in my memory. This category provides faculty of an opportunity to collaborate across traditional boundaries in designing and delivering a challenging and innovative courses. The college supports having a percentage of these courses team developed and team taught the first time you offer them, after initial offering faculty will individually teach the course for a minimum of three semesters over a period of three years. Now my understanding is my own personal knowledge because I know of one course has been designed and originated that way that most of the II courses go in much more direct in an individual proposal through the committees and to eventual approval. I know that is technically possible and not forbidden by the rules so when the opportunity came to sign another II proposal as Chair I signed but I recommended that the member of our department that made this proposal go collaborate with Women & Gender Studies. She should take the proposal to them and show it to them, have a discussion with them and at the very least generate an advisory opinion. My thinking is that the sense of this II category the description is one that honors collaboration and whether or not it's practiced. I think collaboration shows intent to promote instruction in two or more areas delivered at the college level. With the bigger of departments delivering their own classes we get quality control through that rigor of collaboration by teaming on design and presumably some control over a selection of who teaches these courses when you see their background and credentials. As currently practiced it's possible that one instructor can design a course that meets claims for disciplinary content in another discipline get it approved, teach it and have members of that other discipline surprised to find there is this college level instruction in their discipline happens somewhere else. Perhaps instruction that is happening is just fine but perhaps instruction is utilizing resources or working with methodologies or making assumptions that have been debunked or discredited by the discipline itself. With quality control it doesn't seem to be there. There is no necessary provision that requires that quality control and given that I think a minimum bar for me to approve these courses, for me to accent and pass them personally would be that there is evidence of collaborative work between members of the two at least disciplines that are involved in the construction of these courses. Lacking this evidence I intend to vote nay on the II courses.

Senator Stevenson – I would like to concur with everything that Senator Welsh just said and also I would like to add that gender and economic development and globalizing world it very well could be a Sociology class as well and those are the kinds of things that at least the Sociology department should be aware of. I could see a student potentially coming and saying oh you talk about gender, you talk about globalization can I count this towards the Sociology major and then we get into a whole discussion about whether or not this counts. I can't emphasize enough that I think that Senator Welsh has hit the nail on the head that there really is no quality control when it comes to these II courses. Affected disciplines do not know what is being offered out there.

Senator Martin – I have had a conversation with a person who is an exemplary teacher on this campus and who has the skill to teach one aspect of something that crops up in my discipline Political Science. Professor Ferlini has a course before us today IIMATH 315 and the title for the revised version of this course will be voting power and portion and the middle term title is the core concept in my discipline and there is very large literature on it and I know that the mathematics in fact is more obscure than I am able to follow for much of that literature so it is appropriate that a mathematician have an interest in this kind of thing and possibility theory is one of the things they look at. However, this is in no way a collaborative undertaking and as best I can tell we are not provided with a syllabus. It's not Political Science so if it is interdisciplinary with which discipline is it inter disciplinary because it starts out being that with a highly mathematical content but the essential ideas are Political Science so it would be nice to be able to collaborate with somebody that I have high regard for. I don't think we should be designing courses in isolation where the purpose of the course is to be interdisciplinary.

Senator White-Stanley – A point of information there is a committee, the II committee that falls under ISP and has knowledge of interdisciplinary scholarship that may cause the direction of these courses to differ from disciplinary takes on the same material. There are intensive conversations being held about the variations that are being brought up. I just wanted to ask if it would be appropriate to have representatives from that committee here when these courses are being discussed.

Senator Welsh – I think having a representative in any discipline on any issue before the Senate when they are being discussed is appropriate and useful. I don't gather that those representatives are here now. If there is a desire to wait until they can be present I don't have any problem with that. I would like to add one additional item though to the point that Senator Martin just made. The course about voting power that we will be looking at does seem to popular with someone in great background in these terms of whether it is political science is a judgment I think that the discipline should at least weigh in on. One of the concerns I would have even if we as political science said this individual is quite qualified to teach this IIMath course in interdisciplinary reference in

political science is what happens if this individual goes on sabbatical. This individual retires or something. This course is still on the books there is a course in interdisciplinary political science content that math will be staffing and hopefully they will find someone that has that particular double specialty however there is nothing in the way that we set up II classes right now that we control the quality of instructors. We should be concerned as to who is going to teach existing courses as II on the books.

Senator Stanish – I guess we are technically on the IIECON proposal I am really concerned about the IIMath so my first question is is it appropriate to respond at this time or shall I wait till we get to that particular course proposal.

Senator McDonald – Please wait until we get to that particular course proposal. Any other questions on the IIECON 320 proposal on the floor?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We have reached the 6:00 point and our Senate bylaws state that typically we would be done at 6:00pm unless we have a motion to continue discussion.

Motion: Senator Menees moves that discussion continue past the 6:00pm timeframe and stated in our bylaws.

Senator McDonald – Must be by ballot

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We continue with the Curriculum Committee.

Motion: The SCC moves that IIFILM 380 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – Which were the disciplines that collaborated or which disciplines are combined in this course?

Senator Darby – I think Senator White-Stanley's point made earlier is well taken. Perhaps we can reach out to an II representative to answer such questions. I assume the question that Senator Welsh and others have with regard to II and collaborative nature of those proposals perhaps the II committee Chair can answer those questions. Maybe we should move the II Course proposals to the March meeting.

Senator White-Stanley – This is my class that I wrote and I have put through four drafts in response to this committee. My PHD is in both areas in film and literature and I am working on a book that combines my specialty in both of these areas. I think that the skepticism about the interdisciplinary classes is both unfair to the committee that so extensively reviews and backs these materials and also to the professors who have had to do back flips and really think hard about their interdisciplinary methodology. I think if all of these classes have been vetted as my class was, we are all probably all the better for it.

Senator Blatchly – I think I saw Senator Menees anticipating my question. I presume the interdisciplinary committee saw this and wrote something down somewhere did they communicate that to you?

Senator Menees – She provided us with a syllabus and a focus. There is a lot of additional information and there was an extensive syllabus presented.

Senator Blatchly – What was the vote? While Senator Menees is looking for that information, does anyone know how to describe the membership of the II Review Committee?

Senator Doreski – I was on the ISP too when the original definition of interdisciplinary was passed, but I think there was discussion about this within the ISP, and ultimately within the II committee and I know that that definition of interdisciplinary was amended and that an interdisciplinary method within a discipline became a point of discussion. That committee decided that was also an appropriate way of looking at it if you were looking at interdisciplinary so that if someone has a program like Women's Studies or American Studies and some others that were developed after the traditional disciplines were distinguished are able to present interdisciplinary courses. In Film Studies, we have the use of both film and literature in the same course and that certainly comes under the designation of interdisciplinary method. I think if there are any serious doubts about this we could take up with Senator Darby's suggestion as a motion and table these until Mike Antonucci, who I believe is the Chair of the II Committee, can explain this for us.

Senator Menees – I have a vote from the II subcommittee. It was 4-0-0-1

Senator Welsh – The point of the vetting and the qualifications of an individual, the interdisciplinary qualifications of the individual I have no doubt about that there has been a great deal of work and there might have been a great deal in background within the individuals proposal again this still raises the possibility that when someone goes on sabbatical, when someone retires we have a course on the books that is in a department that makes claims to disciplinary content in two disciplines. There are no controls necessarily that the second discipline will have any say over participation in the continuing staffing of that course. To Senator Doreski's observation about changes in the ISP interdisciplinary category, I would just question whether those changes actually came before the Senate to be approved or were those changes made within the committee and if that is the case which policies hold. The Senate approved policies or the committee's policy. I would ask if the changes withhold the spirit of interdisciplinary team taught collaboration or whether they hold to the spirit of expediency and the desire to get things done. I think when the Senate approved the ISP proposal which was April of 2006 they were thinking of interdisciplinary collaborative higher goal than that. With that in mind I guess I would be most comfortable to follow Senator Darby's last suggestion. Lack of that but it is still a nagging issue on this proposal virtuous as it is that would not allow me to move forward.

Senator McDonald – I will ask the Parliamentarian about to table this motion.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – That was a suggestion, is there a motion? I did not hear a motion.

Senator Darby – We do have Senator White-Stanley here and she is very capable to speaking to her own proposal. I would personally like to see this particular proposal move forward. If there are any other faculty sponsors of the II proposals that are listed here perhaps we could move forward with those and if not other than Professor White-Stanley proposal, I would make the motion. I think we should vote on this.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion?

Senator Darby – Then we can revisit about moving forward with the other proposals.

Senator Harfenist – I am not sure about the relevance of what I am about to say but a couple of years ago I had my II Physics Music course approved and it just seems to me like now somebody wants to do an II course there is almost a different standard then the standard back then. It just seems like we are doing things differently than in the past. The Senator said there is a committee around that to view all of these things. I understand our concern but at the same time don't they deserve our deference to that?

Senator Stanish – A comment that I agree with is the concerns expressed about the II courses and would liked to have seen the original intent of collaboration and team developing happen, however exactly as Senator Harfenist just said that hasn't been a reality that happened. I will speak to the II math course when we get there that these courses were developed in good faith and attempted to follow all the proper curricular procedures and if the curricular procedures are not correct than we should correct them but it doesn't seem the time to do that in the middle of a course proposal that did follow the procedures.

Senator Welsh – I don't doubt that they are following procedure and that procedure offers it's rigorous points of review, what I am doubting is that, I, in good conscious offer votes of yes on courses that I think might present serious quality control issues either as they begin to be offered with the disciplines effected or the future when they are still on the books and other instructors need to be found so they can be taught.

Senator Stemp – A follow up comment, I don't doubt that the II committee does in fact work to the best of their abilities with the proposals that they see but I think the ability to vet some better than others will depend on the composition of that committee. So if you happen to be presented with an II proposal that contains what would be considered disciplinary content that is somehow not following within the range of those evaluating the proposals they may or may not be able to review those as well as they could others. That is obviously a reality of the composition of the committee you can't ensure that a representative of every discipline is on that committee. It does speak to this issue of quality control for certain proposals however well intentioned they are. For specific proposals I suspect that the vetting process is quite good in particular the one we were just discussing about film. The person proposing it is on the committee and knows a lot about what is being vetted and so there is a good match there but in other instances, particularly based on the composition of the committee and the backgrounds of those people on the committee, proposals must be coming to them that they do not have as much knowledge in terms of the background content that is required for vetting. This is not a criticism of the committee itself. I think it is a product of the potential mechanism by which we are creating the composition of the committee. The ways that these proposals come from such broad backgrounds and having to go through a common committee to get approved. I am not questioning the abilities of the II committee itself, I am just saying that they are probably better able to deal with some proposals than with others based on the composition of that particular committee that happens to be in any given year. Maybe there is a flaw somehow in the system there that makes this issue of quality control and it is difficult to assess in some ways. Perhaps one potential safeguard to that is the idea of collaboration where two faculty members from those disciplines aren't necessarily the decision makers on whether or not a course goes forward but they provide a second pair of eyes, a third pair of eyes, a fourth pair of eyes to the proposals that is positively more difficult to deal with. Clearly there are certain proposals that a while ago came to my committee and

that came to me, I don't know if I put in good hunches to know enough about what the content packet happens to be or what the contact areas happen to be to know whether they are good proposals or not. I would like to think I put in those instances but there are certainly some areas that I would be hard pressed to be able to say that I understand and I think that this is something that works together so maybe this is slightly larger issue that we probably can't address to the full degree that it should be here but still it is a long term question particularly based on this notion on entirement in terms of how we do things to approve and not what qualifications or criteria you are looking for. How come a course two years ago was judged on these merits so now this is judged on somehow second set of merits? It seems like let's say multiple issues associated with the process and I guess unless those are addressed we will continue to have the same issues that keep returning. I don't know what to do to solve these now.

Senator McDonald – We are at the end of our fifteen minute discussion period.

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to continue discussion on the motion that is on the floor.

Vote: The Senate voted to not continue discussion.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees -

Motion: The SCC moves that IIMATH 315 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Senator Stanish – I am not the proposer of this course and I was actually on sabbatical when the course was proposed but I will try to give what knowledge I do have as the current Math Department Chair. Exactly as Senator Menees just pointed out, this course is already on the books as Math and Social Institution which had a slightly broader course description and so this is an attempt to give it a more descriptive title and make it a more accurate course description what actually happens within the course. In response to the lack of collaboration to political science I would say this is something we are discussing and I wish the curriculum process had encouraged that before now. I regret that didn't happen. It is the spirit of collegiately and it should have happened. Moving forward we would like that to happen to collaborate better with colleagues in Political Science about this course, just in terms of development of this course and future staffing as we've said. As there was mentioned there is one particular faculty member who is teaching this course who does have expertise in the mathematics and theory of mathematics is how we look at Political Science. This is an expertise that I think that in terms of planning for a sabbatical and that kind of thing within the department that is required. We do this often. Mathematics is such a specialized field that there are many courses that if you ask me to teach right now I could not but I would develop that expertise if I needed to in a planned absence. I would be happy to cover.

Senator Martin – For the reasons I stated earlier and perhaps out of turn, I have serious reservations about teaching core content from one discipline by a faculty member with qualifications in another discipline. To teach content in neighboring fields and we defer to each other within our very own discipline. So in a cross disciplinary sense the meaning of our vast literature and associated with it the historical literature with all that language shows up in the description. I have absolute confidence in Professor Ferlini's ability to teach the course from a mathematical perspective and probably exclusively from that perspective and so I am going to be voting against in order to register my reservations against this whole process and in the hope that if this course does pass it does continue to get taught in the semester and so on. I think we know enough now about the problem with II courses and it's time for us to create a study that would remedy the problem.

Senator Stevenson – I would like to suggest to the Chair of the SEC that perhaps we draft a charge to the SCC when they are done with all the regular course proposals that they look into the II process.

Senator McDonald – We can address that at the next SEC meeting.

Senator Welsh – I would offer of second to what Senator Martin just said and a second to everything that Senator Stanish said. With the exception of staffing and I think when these courses are on the books maybe an implicit promise to students that make these selections that there is this high level multi disciplinary content here and that's special. I think we need someone or some quality control there. If this were on the other hand an ISMath 315 course instead of an IIMath 315 course promising only one discipline making no promises of two or more disciplines taught at the college level, I would have no reservations at all around this. Of course where this has a political science component to it I would like to have discussions with the people interested in teaching and taking that course but I don't have any long term reservations about the availability of that course on the books and the propriety to continue quality of delivery.

Senator Stemp – My question was if the university was in agreement with evidence of this course that could easily be taught by Dr. Ferlini based on Mathematics content why then must it be an II course? Why is it not a stand-alone math course or why isn't it an ISMath course? Why is it an IIMath course?

Senator Stanish – It actually was a standalone math course originally. It is a four credit conversion. To be honest we had never considered bringing it as an IS course because when the integrative studies program came out looking at the IS perspective outcomes did not seem to meet the outcomes of this course. There is no other category in integrative studies in which mathematical outcomes exist. This was our attempt to find area in which we felt we could meet the outcomes as stated by the Integrative Studies Program.

Senator Welsh – Ideally what is driving this course is not interdisciplinary at all. It's finding the right package that it fits into and II is the envelope that this particular course fits into.

Senator Stanish – I would say yes and no. Yes there is certainly the aspect of finding the right packaging absolutely that has made it a sore subject with the math department. I do think that we felt that it fits the interdisciplinary outcomes as written in that is looking at the field, the field outside of mathematics is through a mathematical lens. So there was that view of interdisciplinary but if that is the correct view or correct procedure is a different question.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion

Senator Darby - Is it your main judgment of looking at staffing? How unreasonable is it to tell students that there is a chance that this specialty course may not be offered?

Senator Welsh – I have an array of concerns and one revolves around staffing and when we have courses on the books and fit one particular instructor very well and that instructor goes then the particular challenge of finding a someone to teach that especially if it is an interdisciplinary course is very great and involves two departments. The search for the individual who is likely to do that is probably not going to fall to that default to and we are going to have political science content which or whatever discipline being taught by someone who was vetted by another discipline and that is a staffing concern. I also have sort of continuing concerns about overall quality, college level quality in the material itself. That is my staffing concern.

Senator Doreski – I have heard the word used multi-disciplinary and I think one of the problems surrounding the whole II thing has been the confusion of interdisciplinary method as opposed to multidisciplinary which may relate to team taught courses. I fear that some of these courses had to in some way as multidisciplinary courses rather than courses that are taught by someone incorporating interdisciplinary method. This has been one of the big problems that the II committee has had to wrestle with and I am not sure that they succeeded. I actually believe it is appropriate for the SEC to take this on and to meet with the II people and discuss this further because of when this started there has been a contention but the problem as Senator Stanish correctly pointed out is that all of these ISP courses are to a great extent shaped by outcomes. That is not necessarily appropriate for any particular course but is rather generalizations that come out of various subcommittees of the ISP in which we are trying to live with and try to juggle the courses one way and it's just not working out. Again, I almost think it is appropriate to table these courses and take another look at them because this is causing so much confusion and I think for good reason.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IIWGS 210 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – This already being on the books perhaps someone knows the answer to this question. Which of the disciplines that are combined in this II course? The answer is not essential to moving it forward.

Senator Menees – I am sure it was addressed by the II subcommittee.

Senator Darby – I don't have the answer to that but I can read the course description if desired. The interdisciplinary examinations to the issue of abortion of the United States can one be a feminist and post legal access to abortion. Students will explore the legal theological and social issues at performing the abortion theme with the theme to appreciate why resistance to reproductive choice exists and persists.

Senator Welsh – So Law, Religion and Philosophy. We don't have a law program or a religion major – we do have philosophy discipline. I don't know whether they were contacted or collaborated with in this and not only that but again, discomfort with approval.

Senator Doreski - I think I missed an SCC meeting when this was discussed but isn't it a rule that in the ISP program cannot have prerequisites for ISP courses other than ITW.

Senator Menees – That is not true. All the 300 level courses have ITW 101 and IQL101

Senator Doreski – Are those specific?

Senator Menees – They have to complete both of those and have 24 credits in ISP.

Senator Doreski – I know about the 24 credits.

Senator Menees - You have to have both of those courses.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that IIWGS 220 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – Same question as last time not necessary to research it thoroughly anticipating the same answer.

Senator Menees – Exploring the differences in the areas of interdisciplinary and disciplinary knowledge in the areas of focused studies in Psychology, Sociology and Literature.

Senator Welsh – Psychology, Sociology and Literature were there collaborative efforts made among these departments in designing this course?

Senator McDonald – Does anyone wish to address that?

Senator Blatchly – I have separate issues but suggest that you look at the rationale especially about media frequency in regard to consumption. It seems like that is tailor made for someone who has been through IQL. It seems like a bad idea to take the IQL out of this.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IIWGS 230 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – Wondering which disciplines were part of the collaborative mix that designed this course.

Senator Darby – From the course description an interdisciplinary exploration of spirituality with sexuality joined through history in religion as well as Women's & Gender Studies. Key questions: How are institutions of religion socially constructed? How do they affect women's ways of knowing? What are new ways of representing spirituality as a social entity?

Senator Welsh – History, Religion and Methodology are appropriate for disciplines for integrative courses?

Senator Stevenson – I just want to add that sexualities are recognized sub discipline of Sociology.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IIWGS 240 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Darby – From the course proposal we've taken the participatory approach to studying representations of genders as well as class races in sexuality and mass media in culture and literature from culture studies communication, sociology are the disciplines explored ideologies and how they are perpetuated or not in the media process.

Senator Welsh – So I hear Sociology primarily and I understand there is a person trained in Sociology in the Women and Gender Studies so again increased comfort level there. But along the same lines if there is a time that we have to replace that person or offer that course preceding a sabbatical, are we going to have the same potential quality?

Senator Menees – I just want to state that is true in any course where sabbatical or if someone needs to be replaced. I don't think that is a reason or issue with the course if they got somebody teaching it. I have not been able to teach a course that I teach since I have been Chair of the SCC for two years. Nobody is teaching it. I think that is an issue not just with II courses but any departmental course as well. I don't think we should hamper or hinder the courses because they have an II in front of them.

Senator Welsh – If I may this is a special array of courses that do have a disciplinary tag on the end of them and they do make a promise to the disciplinary content at the college level in more than one discipline. The folks in say Psychology, when a Psychology professor goes on sabbatical we know the basis of the particular course taught by a Psychology professor so they are equipped to replace that individual. If they also find that they are on the books as a course in which they also made promises about Sociology or Mathematics or something like that then they may not be equipped to make judgments about the qualifications of the individual. My sense of comfort will be increased about this II course as opposed to IS or perspectives courses. If the personnel to staff these II courses if it were necessary to go to the disciplines involved and to make sure that the credentials of the individual were such that they could teach at the highest level in a college setting and we don't get that kind of teamwork right now.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IIWGS 290 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – I think I know the answer to my question on this one. Being a topics course but again my lack of ease is the art of approving an interdisciplinary course without knowing at all what the disciplines are that are going to be taught. All departments should have a 290 course it is sort of a necessary feature of the view of classes taught that the department offers but it seems that an II 290 in this case is too blanket an application. I think Women's Studies are situated in Humanities and IHWS 290 would be appropriate, with a designation of IA.

Senator Darby – This is out of my area of expertise and I hope that I am not speaking out of turn. I have been here twelve years and one thing that I was surprised when I came to Keene State College is that in the 21st Century we have a wonderful public liberal arts institution that didn't have a Women's Studies Program and I believe it was a year or two ago when this department was formulated and the department is called Women's & Gender Studies. It's possible that those are two separate disciplines. I don't know if that helps your comfort level. I get your points and all of our colleagues have spoken about the II and I think the points are well taken. Women Studies and Gender Studies are two separate disciplines. Professor Hottinger and Professor Mallon, among others, came before this body a year or two ago to propose this program and emphasized that.

Senator Menees - I second that. That did come forward a year or so ago as a new department and its merits are that it is truly and interdisciplinary department IH.

Senator Welsh – I was on the Senate then too and I remember asking questions and then seeking some clarity at that point about which perspective of the perspectives array the default would be for classes from this department thinking that there are rules, the proposal, the classes, the vetting of instructors things like that with the perspective classes that are different than the rules for classes with II and thinking that perhaps if there is a growing tendency situated in an entire department within an interdisciplinary category which is not designed for departments it is designed for collaborations across disciplines by individuals. We need to rethink that and in the absence of that that it would be most proper to find the school within which that discipline situates most comfortably Arts & Humanities and make those the perspectives courses that you offer.

Senator Doreski – Once again there is such a thing that is interdisciplinary method. We practiced it in American Studies for many years. It is an interdisciplinary method because it is a method that had to incorporate materials such as art, music and literature that have been traditionally studied in separate disciplines. Women Studies is in the same position. The II Committee discussed this at great length over a period of two years and I do believe it came back to the Senate about two years ago with a revision of this issue. It is the very nature of Women & Gender Studies and it has to deal with materials that were in the past dealt with by separate disciplines and it does require considerable knowledge of more than one discipline on the part of people who practice it but that is the nature of the discipline.

Senator Stanish - I just had a clarification for Senator Menees. Again this is the case where we are changing the prerequisites from ITW and IQL to something ITW.

Senator Menees – Yes

Senator Stanish – Are these are courses already on the books?

Senator Menees – Yes

Senator McDonald – Further discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Athletic Training Major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the HLSC Major be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Blatchly – A number of the advisory opinions shows that there was concern about finding sufficient seats in the ISPHYC312 course that was required. I wondered if you had sense or if someone else could reassure me that that was settled because it is a difficult thing sometimes to do on our campus to really set aside ISP seats. There is not a smooth mechanism for it to be done and I am curious if your assembly has enough capacity or if there is a mechanism in place for this or if there is a plan to get that.

Senator Menees – That is a new course that was actually requested from the nursing program that were separate courses. More people are demanding those. We have someone to teach IS312 as an adjunct. We all feel that there are enough sections as we can.

Senator Blatchly – I see that it was a concern of Psych part. It looks like we are crossing our fingers and hoping?

Senator Menees – We wanted them to be aware that with staffing issues it is an IS course and they could choose between a major course and an IS course and we were short we had to choose a major course.

Dean Treadwell – During the discussion with the nursing program we created the ISPHYC312 course. There was actually a lot of discussion about it and resources in the psychology department that is part of and why they are spending the additional money that was added this year to help offset some of the staffing issues associated with this. We have had a number of conversations with the chair of the department about the number of seats in health science and I believe with collaborative efforts we are well on our way. I feel at least the psychology department conversations are reassuring and we believe we have put a number of resources in place and hope that will continue to fair well.

Senator McDonald – Other comments?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – Would it be appropriate that in the future if we have II proposals coming up to notify members of the II subcommittee if they would like to attend they could?

Senator Menees – The only issue I have with that is that we are selecting them out separately. I guess it is unique for them. It's different.

Senator McDonald – We obviously have some concerns.

Senator Darby – Senator Doreski asked an interesting question earlier about what is the composition of that ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee. I couldn't find it in the ISP manual. I couldn't find it on the ISPC website. I am not sure who the committee would reach out to unless maybe professor Antonucci.

Senator McDonald – I do have a concern when we start talking about why if we don't have someone here to teach a class. We have always had this little sub rule in the Senate that we are not supposed to make our decisions based on resources. I think it is hard for the Senate to make decisions based on that type of where it's a resource issue such as what happens if someone gets run over by a bus tomorrow – who is going to teach those classes. I think it is kind of difficult for the Senate to start making decisions based on that and where it is a resource issue with unpredictable issues in the future. I am just commenting on the resource issue not on the II.

Senator Welsh – If I may, my concern is not resource specific. I would assume there are colleagues and if they would find appropriate people to teach but these are particular kinds of courses where the implied necessity is that there are two disciplines being taught here and one discipline has charge over the title of the course and will be in charge of finding a person to teach that specific one that has been approved. Those individuals that demonstrate that has special emphasis, that special multi-disciplinary background. It would seem that it would be necessary to get the people from all the disciplines involved to make sure that again we find someone with that special quality or someone that can be trained with that special quality. As far as the appearance of the Senate meetings I think I am less concerned with the presence of someone from the II committee because I think the II committees job is to make sure that these have been collaborated and they are truly interdisciplinary instead have individuals from the departments that are involved in this

multi or interdisciplinary proposal so those two or more people can say yes this is a great class likewise any combination, people that are involved in that would be more interesting to hear from them then the committee.

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment 7:03

Minutes
for the 418th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, March 7th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 4:08
- II. Roll Call
Excused: Provost Mel Netzhammer
- III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 417th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – Just a couple of word modifications. On page 23 I made reference to when the Senate has to meet April 6th I was intending I think to refer to of when the Senate approved the ISP proposal which was April of 2006 and not when we meet on April 6th. In that same paragraph, I was describing the likelihood that proposals will be very well put together and staffed by excellent professors but a nagging concern about staffing with the absence of professors so rather than the word magnum issue it should be a nagging issue. Likewise one last one on page 25, there is a phrase 3 lines into a quote by me *implicit promise to students that make these selections that there is this bi-level multi disciplinary content* I thought I said high level.

Senator Stanish-A slight correction on a quotation of myself, on page 24 towards the bottom, it should read *Exactly as Senator Menees just pointed out, this course is already on the books as Math and Social Institution*. In that same paragraph where it starts *there is one particular faculty member who is teaching this course who does have expertise in the mathematics and that is the theory of mathematics how we look at quantitative*. Not sure what I said but my guess is *who does have expertise in the mathematics and that theory of mathematics is how we look at Political Science*.

Senator Harfenist – On page 23 where it says indifference should be deference.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as revised

- IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing to report

- V. Subcommittee Reports

Senator McDonald – We have a very busy agenda today so please keep your comments to 2 minutes or less. If we have someone who has already spoken on an issue we will give someone who hasn't had the opportunity to speak first before we move back in that direction. We have a number of items that need to be finished today so I am going to bypass the Executive Committee report until the end of the meeting and move directly to the AOC report.

• **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly – We have completed the outside review process for the Geology program so we are looking forward to putting that together. We are looking to get it into the last meeting of the year. We might miss that deadline and move it to next fall. Math and Music should be ready for the next meeting as far as I understand. We are going to reorder the events a little bit. We get to produce a report for the Senate and just a reminder about what the role of the AOC is and the process that we go through. We are charged with taking documentation from a program and a self study program which is typically constructed under fairly extensive guidelines. Organizing an outside review for that program we call in typically 2 people from the outside, people who have a professional standing but not associated with Keene State. We ask them to come in and look at the program, write a report and we consolidate those two reports into a report to the Senate. What you will be seeing from us is our documentation based on the documentation we have received from the program and outside reviewers. We consolidated that and brought it forward with recommendations. What I think is helpful to remember is the other side of that, what happens after you accept a report? In the old days the report would go to the library and sit gathering dust. I believe this is an initiative from Provost Netzhammer that in the past few years there has been an explicit process instituted after the report has been completed. We send our reports to the Provost, the Provost will then take those and send them back to the Chair and/or the Dean of the program to create an explicit action plan which addresses the recommendations we make in the report. A big part of the report, are recommendations that come out of the report. These recommendations are to be

address explicitly by the Dean of the program. There are progress check-ups after a year or so to make sure people have addressed all of the concerns. We hope in the very least that the intention is that there will be some concrete result from this. That is our plan and we are not an investigative body. We are restricted largely to the documentation that comes into us and just to give you a little context to the role. I am going to start with the Physics Report. We did review the Physics on schedule, we had a self study that came in September, the outside reviewers came in December and we received a report from the outside reviewers and produced what you will see in the documentation as the Academic Overview report on Physics. I would like to ask a process question, I think it has been customary for the people involved with the report to present the major findings. Is it better to do that presentation before making a motion or after? Is there a preference?

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Discussion happens after the motion is made.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Physics Program be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Blatchly – I am going to ask Senator Fleegeer to give a brief summary of the findings of the report because he was Chair of the subcommittee.

Senator Fleegeer – The subcommittee looked at the Physics Program included Ann Miller, Kelly Welsh and I. The Physics program currently offers degrees in the Sciences and Social Sciences in Chemistry/Physics and Mathematics/Physics. They currently operate as a joint department with Geology and have 2 Tenure Track Professors, 6 Adjuncts and 1 part time technician. The outside reviewers found strengths for the Physics program that they have some innovative degree offerings and feels that those are a good attraction for the Physics Program and that they have a substantial administrative support and adequate budget for the current program. They are really sensitive to student needs and have excellent advising. They are impressed with the program and achievements of the graduated students of the program. They feel they are strong contributors to the Integrative Studies program on campus. Some of the challenges that the Physics department faces identified by the outside reviewers were lack of full time faculty and lack of student research facilities. They have minimal office support staffing including running and maintaining the lab without a fulltime technician and they are challenged by offering upper division programs and courses to attract students into the major and also with developing a community of majors by providing opportunities for student internships and research. Recommendations that were made by the outside reviewers and concurred upon by the committee led to four areas which are lack of a fulltime lab technician, the need for additional fulltime faculty, additional space for student and faculty projects and a concern that the Physics faculty are overextended. Recommendations to those specific concerns are fulltime faculty should be added as soon as possible and plans should be made to replace Dr. Wolfe when he retires. The department should be allocated a fulltime laboratory technician and student and faculty research space should be developed in the existing facilities and that the departments hybrid bachelor degrees should be exploited and encouraged because they are regionally attractive to Keene State College, and that the departments should invest time in redesigning the department webpage to make it more attractive to students. Additionally, the committee felt that it was important to recommend that because many of these recommendations are repeats from the last time the program was reviewed, that the Administration provides specific response to these recommendations to the programs and that they can engage in planning for the future.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Blatchly – This followed the same process as the above report.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Library Information Literacy Program be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stemp – I will give a brief summary of the report. More or less the external and internal report tended to agree on most things. I will attempt to emphasize the major points. For those of you who are not necessarily quite clear on what the information literacy program does, it is housed within the library but it is sort of a separate entity and is primarily responsible for a set of transferable skills to help individuals be critical consumers of information. Information literacy skills include searching, accessing, evaluating, analyzing and ethically using information. The most significant change to this program since 2002 was the implementation of the ISP program on campus. This created additional and new demands on the library as well as their faculty and resources. As such, many of the comments both for in terms of strengths and terms of challenges really tend to revolve around ISP not the only concern but it is one of the primary concerns. Strengths of the program were recognized both internally and externally. From the external review a statement reads “*this particular program should be considered a model for other schools*”, which we thought was clearly a very obvious recommendation worth mentioning. They also point out the integration of information literacy into the lower level ISP classes was a strong point for this program. This was perceived by the external reviewers to be significant and well done. They also saw at the same time the library staff primarily through information literacy were still able to maintain good relationships with the existing departments and still able to provide support for those disciplinary programs that exist on campus. In this sense the ability to integrate and adapt to the new demands of ISP while still managing to meet the demands of the existing programs is generally seen as strength to this particular program. Like we saw in the Physics program, there also seem to be some challenges. The challenges are not what I would say as unexpected. They tend to relate to loss of a tenure track position that was later replaced by a full time adjunct position. There is the concern that there may not be adequate staffing in order to deal with both the ISP requirements as well as the existing departmental demands. In terms of recommendations, one recommendation is to add another position as a full time tenure track as

well as keeping a similar position that would fill the current adjunct position as it exists. The development of a core curriculum for ISP upper level courses although what exists is currently recognized as good. The extension of the successes of the lower level ISP course level into the upper level disciplinary courses was thought to be an area that should be expanded upon and the way in which the assessment of this particular process for use of the ISP courses and departmental courses in relation to information literacy is thought to needing more comprehensive assessment strategy. That being said we have a series of recommendations; the first of these has to do with personnel levels currently available and the suggestion that these should be increased. This is primarily based on responsibilities concerning the ISP and lower and higher level as well as serving the departmental programs on this campus. Maybe some revision of information literacy outcomes and policies specifically how they relate to the ISP program this is partly because of the growth process. Finally, as I said before, an attempt to focus on creating an assessment plan that provides data that can be used to provide information to better understand how we use information literacy on campus and to provide further support to that particular program.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Blatchly – The next one relates to the review of the Physical Education Program and has a little bit longer to set up than I had thought but will try to be as brief as I can. If you look back at the Senate documents from last spring the review was supposed go through at that time but it was delayed and the explanation was that the self-study document did not have enough documentation. There were some additional materials provided during the spring and during a meeting or two with the current AOC subcommittee which included two people whose terms ended at the end of that spring. The expectation was that we would be able to write something in the fall and bring it forward. At that point as it turns out the entire process was left to Senator Harfenist as he was the only one left on the subcommittee. We have been trying to give him some support along the way. The AOC report is based on materials submitted to us in the past. The procedure, as it turns out for the Physical Education program, is one of those programs which are subject to accreditation. It is a little more complicated and at the time we were reviewing this it was a standalone accredited Teacher Certification program and the procedures for reviewing accredited programs were not looked at. In the grand tradition of political theatre I need at this point to blame the previous Chair of this committee who was just as much in the dark as the rest of us. We did not have clear procedures for requesting documentation. There was a single line in the procedures that said just give us your accreditation stuff and we will find something to do with it, not very satisfactory, not very clear and not very helpful to the program. If there are troubles with this report the AOC in its previous committee make up needs to own some of that trouble. Some of it is our fault. We did work as hard as we could to put together a report and we made a draft and brought that by the program and was reviewed by the program. There was an additional meeting in December to try and make some corrections and there were a few corrections made before we released the final report. It is worth remembering the process of the AOC review allows a program to comment and to correct any errors present and in the documentation you will see such a comment. It is worth remembering that the destination of these reports is to try and that we produce some recommendations that will be mapped by the appropriate Dean and the program. We will be getting an overview of the material from Senator Harfenist but I wanted to give you a little background.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Physical Education Program and responses be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Harfenist – The Physical Education department offers courses that serve both PE majors and Athletic Training [AT] majors and activity courses as electives for non-majors to acquire basic knowledge, skills and techniques in a sport or leisure activity including: aquatics and lifeguard training, physical conditioning, individual sports and first aid and CPR. The PE program contributes to the Integrative Studies Program through two upper-level interdisciplinary courses, IPE310: Psychosocial Aspects of Sport in American Culture and IPE311: Outdoor leadership. The PE department also contributes to the Health Sciences major (Exercise Science option) through 2 required courses, PE200: Kinesiology and PE201: Physiology of Exercise. Seeing that I do not have external reviewer recommendations I would just go to the conclusion of the recommendations. Two of the most important challenges to the department are the number of full-time tenure-track faculty who support the Physical Education Teaching Certification program and monetary resources, including making the department's Administrative Assistant a full-time position. Having received national recognition through accreditation for the PETC program, the department has greatly enhanced the ability of KSC students to enter the workforce as highly skilled and trained physical education teachers. It is recommended that more full-time tenure-track lines for this program be secure to enable the department to increase the capacity of students yearly admitted into the program, which is now limited to 18 to stay within accreditation requirements. The Physical Education Department must regularly replace expendable equipment and cover costs incurred for transportation needed in various courses for the use of facilities outside of the college. Now that the Exercise Science option is moving into the PE Department, equipment totaling approximately \$15,000 will need to be acquired over the next several years. Having a total yearly budget of approximately \$7400 appears to be quite inadequate for the services they provide to their majors and to the college. It is recommended that their departmental budget be increased sufficiently to allow them to regularly replace expendable, and afford them to invest in more durable, equipment.

Senator Blatchly – I just want to make sure that people notice that there was a response there and to a large extent the endorsed response in particular as I mentioned before there is a comment about needing more input from the AOC for constructing self-studies and for providing appropriate material. We wholeheartedly agree with that. You will notice the last item on our report is a mention of guidelines which are in progress and we are trying to correct that. It was a difficult circumstance for everybody to work with and so we were trying to do the very best we can with this report. It is not a perfect report but we feel it is pretty much the best we can do.

Dr. Smyth, Chair of the Physical Education Department – First I want to thank my colleagues on the AOC and Senator Harfenist for your hard work. As Senator Blatchly mentioned, this is a piloted review of a nationally accredited program and the review process was not clearly indicated. I have chaired the AOC in the past and was also Chair of the subcommittee for NEASC on the academic curriculum. I clearly understand and have an appreciation for program review. I am concerned that the report in its current form basically lacks substance as it relates to the charge of the AOC. There are factual errors in the report and again given the volume of self-study for an NCATE review is perhaps easy to overlook some things and might be more relevant to the PETC program. With further guidance could provide further information for the report. I also want to emphasize that in the addendum to the self study materials as requested by the AOC subcommittee that we did respond to every single request in the guidelines for program review. On page 44 these are the kinds of information that I did provide. Again, with due respect to my colleagues the PETC Faculty respectfully request that this AOC report be tabled until it has been redone because it is going to be a source for us as pointed out for decision making for action.

Senator Harfenist – I believe the Accreditation documentation was first gathered together in 2006. It was a final form early on that so as I went through Dr. Smyth's critique and what they call errors well I think things have changed in the two to three years since then. I did make a typo or two, all the information did come out of here and I think that points to the flaw in the system of what we have been more or less discussing. If your accreditation was done two or three years prior to the review there is going to be a lot of changes that have occurred. Personally I feel if the PE department would like to see a further review they should do it the old fashion way, a self study and outside reviewer come in. That would be my recommendation.

Senator Blatchly – What we thought carefully about the requests from the Physical Education Program to delay this further and decided against it largely, not because we thought there were no errors in the report, as I said essentially I endorsed their responses on the program and I am not trying to argue against this but we looked at the standard for delaying further a report that is already delayed by a year. We looked at whether the changes that were made could not essentially be corrected by the response of the program. If there are errors in the program it can be corrected by the response. The big question for me was do the changes that are suggested and the difficulty suggested by the response, does that change any of the conclusions that we would come to in the document. It didn't seem to me that the changes that were made would really change our conclusions. In fact the conclusions essentially came from the addendum and we thank the department that was fundamentally extra work to produce an addendum. It is not clear to me that the recommendations would really change as a result of any of the difficulty with the report. Again, we are not trying to say this is perfect.

Senator Welsh – I have a question of the meaning of acceptance. I detect a difference of opinion and I wonder if accepting a report constitutes weighing in as a Senate on that difference of opinion.

Senator McDonald – My understanding is no, that it is just being accepted in its structure by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I served on the AOC for several years and with the NEASC accreditation I guess what I would default to with the NEASC process there was an opportunity for the college to respond to the strength and weaknesses document after the site visit and correcting factual errors. The report is a snapshot in time of an institution. A program should be accurate because it is what we will be judged on 10 years from now by NEASC in this case. I think these changes have been identified and it doesn't seem like a difficult task to revise the AOC report to accurately reflect the program within its year of review. It becomes a permanent document of the college that is a part of the NEASC document moving forward in our records room. I am a bit perplexed as to why we wouldn't want to correct the document so that it is as accurate as possible understanding that the recommendations may not change at all but so that factually we have a record for the next AOC that needs to do a review.

Senator Stanish – I was thinking largely the same thing just in terms of the factual errors. I do agree that it doesn't seem like it would change the recommendations at all which I think is the main point. Programs themselves use these documents as sort of a record of their history and what was happening in that snapshot in time because faculty change, staff change and so this is a record of what we have. It seems if we have any ability to make it as accurate as possible that would be a service to the college and department. I noticed one thing and this is just from reading this, in the response provided by the Physical Education faculty report that Dr. Smyth referred to - the second bullet in bold where it says ***(p. 1, Charge) the remainder of the program (especially the Exercise Science option) is described from information obtained from the last self-study and AOC report (AY 2005–2006). (During the 2005-06 review periods, Exercise Science was not an option within the Physical Education major.)*** It goes on to say that the sentence is not accurate in the 2005-2006 review which I am hearing from Senator Harfenist was the attempt to capture that snapshot in time. Just looking at this there seems to be some confusion over the time period that ultimately should be corrected.

Senator Stemp – I think part of the problem would be avoided if you were not relying on a document that is that old. If it was for the necessity for the department to formulate an updated document then they would provide it based under their own initiative I suppose the most accurate updated information for their programs and therefore this issue that we are having would hypothetically be avoided.

Senator Smyth – Absolutely and the NCATE review process begins in 2005 and 2006 and is then followed up with 2008 and then in 2009 under the timeline. We are asked to write a self-study based on our NCATE report and review from 2008 which does include

some material from 2005 and 2006 so I do apologize for that confusion. So that process started in 2009 with 2008 materials. It has been postponed with the patience of the AOC as well.

Senator McDonald – Dr. Smyth, you had made a request that it be tabled. Could you briefly tell us what you hope that would accomplish?

Dr. Smyth – In my response we asked that it be tabled because it needed to be developed so that the factual errors are corrected as well as perhaps some more substance related to some of the major topics within the AOC guidelines be addressed more fully and developed especially with the student outcomes, which is a major part of the NCATE process. There is a very small section on that but it is a key piece of our program as opposed to some other sections that may or may not be as important. That would be my hope.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – While I understand this had been postponed I think I have been on the Senate and have voted on this a few times. I think the outcome here is that we want the best report and the best perspective for the program going forward. I don't know what the purpose would be to accept something that was less than that for the academic standards to not be as high as they could be for the future given what are considered administrative things that have happened. If we had the opportunity to do this and I think it is up to us to decide that. I would want to especially for a program that seems to have so much review put into it that our own institution would want to add that voice.

Senator Denehy – Just a question about procedure. I understand the difficulty of the motion to accept the report in its current form but that part that is not accepted than what do you do? Wouldn't it make sense to have a motion to table the report?

Senator McDonald – Would a negative vote be to table the report or do we need a motion to table the report.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – If there is a motion to table which is not debatable then the group would vote that up or down. If it were voted up the Chair of the Senate does have the ability to indicate that it be sent back to the committee to where the report came and provide a certain date or not.

Senator Stanish – Hearing that both sides would like more substance in this report in terms of not feeling satisfied with it and what to do with that and hearing from the AOC that perhaps filling out a sort of doing the old fashion self-study and filling out the self-study documentation instead of using the accreditation document which is a fair amount of work, absolutely but it might be helpful to the AOC. I am wondering if that is something the Physical Education faculty would be willing to do to get the substance. It seems if you are going to table this motion then we might want to know what should happen next.

Dr. Smyth – It is my understanding that Dr. Treadwell volunteered our program earlier than our intended review process which was reviewed by the AOC in 2006 as a pilot. If we were to do it the old fashioned way I would recommend that we go back to our schedule. That being as a pilot that we would perhaps we would proceed with the pilot and the AOC would have some substance but if the recommendation was to do away with the self-study then we would go back to the timeline and that would be 2016.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I would like the report be tabled to allow the AOC an opportunity with PE to figure out a procedure going forward that would be amendable to both sides.

Vote: Motion is tabled. The chair will determine a timeline to reconsider this motion.

Senator McDonald – I will discuss with the Chair of the AOC about a time to bring this back.

Senator Blatchly – The end of the report I didn't really anticipate discussion on the revised procedures. There are two sets of revised procedures; one is to clarify what will be done with accredited programs and as you can see clearly there is a need for that. Also to revise our document storage, right now they are held on Blackboard which is not a very good place for them to be. I put this out there so people have a sense of what we are working on. This is not a final document. We do hope to bring the final guidelines for you to see by the next meeting. If people have comments on this, especially those who are part of the accredited programs and want to give us some feedback on it please forwards your comments. I really didn't intend to discuss this today.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Welsh:

Motion: The ASC moves the Senate accept the following changes:

From Catalog description of “Film Studies Admissions Criteria”, remove underlined existing language:

As cultural interest in motion picture analysis and production increases, entrance into the Film Studies major at Keene State College is becoming similarly competitive. In response, the Film Department has implemented a portfolio process to facilitate admission into the program and application for its annual scholarship award. Upon acceptance to the College, any prospective Film student must submit an application via the following process:

I. Portfolio Requirements

1. A completed Film Program Application form (available online)
2. Two letters of recommendation (in Word format if submitted electronically).
3. Submission of one (1) analytical essay on a topic in film criticism, and/or (1) properly formatted screenplay of no less than thirty pages, and/or one (1) 3-5 minute video of the applicant’s work in Quicktime format accompanied by a brief synopsis of the filmmaker’s intention behind the video. All written materials should be in Word format if submitted electronically.
4. It is preferred that applicants send all portfolio materials in electronic format attached in a single e-mail to:

tcook@keene.edu

If necessary, physical samples (papers, DVDs, etc.) may be sent to:

KSC FILM – MS 4000
ATTN: Application Committee
229 Main Street
Keene, NH 03435

5. Application deadline is March 1. Portfolios will be reviewed and applicants notified of Committee decisions no later than April 1.

Replace with language below:

- I. Any student may declare Film Studies as his or her major by formalizing a Film faculty member as his or her advisor and then filling out a formal Declaration of Major form with the Academic Advising Office.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh – The current catalog language for current graduate level courses is one that excludes undergraduate’s use of 600 level courses. There is a proposal by the Safety Studies Program to permit certain undergraduate students with permission to enroll in 600 level courses. There was discovery that the catalog language prohibited that and we were asked as the ASC to consider that prohibition and rule on whether it can be modified. We discussed the modifications to the 500 and 600 level courses and policy describing who are admitted and who are not. After a month of research and other schools practices and discussion we came up with the decision to approve the following motion.

Motion: The ASC moves that the following language in the KSC Course Catalog be stricken,
500-level courses are graduate courses but are open to senior undergraduates with permission of the appropriate divisional dean. 600-level courses are graduate courses only; they are not open to undergraduates.

And replaced with the following:

500 and 600-level courses are graduate courses but are open to senior undergraduates with permission of the appropriate academic program chair and/or school dean.

Discussion: Senator McDonald – Since this is my proposal I will transfer the gravel over to Vice Chair Senator Stevenson.

Senator Blatchly – I am wondering where we see the word and/or construction, is this intended to pick the one that is closest or is there some kind of hierarchy.

Senator McDonald – It is in the proposal that you can have the Dean or the Department Chair approves that.

Senator Blatchly – Should we strike the word and? I move that we strike the word “and” from the forth to the last position or do we need a motion?

Senator Stanish – You have to ask the creator of the motion if he approves of the change.

Senator McDonald – That language was developed by the ASC as they fine tuned this out of the original proposals.

Senator Welsh – It was language that was suggested and yes it was language that the ASC approved. I don't think we are tremendously wedded to the word and I don't think we would consider the elimination of the word anything but friendly.

Friendly Amendment: The ASC moves that the following language in the KSC Course Catalog be changed to 500 and 600-level courses are graduate courses but are open to senior undergraduates with permission of the appropriate academic program chair *or* school dean.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh – The safety program has forwarded and the ASC considered revisions to the Safety Honors Program standards. Specifically, the program creates two tracks, an Honors Research Track and an Advanced Study track. The second of these permits undergraduate students to enroll in two SAFE courses at the 600-level. Discussion centered on standards that would permit students to participate in these tracks and in the possibility that courses might count toward graduate work if students later enroll in the department's Master's program. A motion was made and seconded to accept these revisions and approved by the ASC with a vote of 8 in favor and none opposed. The following policy motion is

Motion: The ASC moves that the revisions to the admission requirements for the Safety Honors Program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh - The committee then considered revisions to the requirements for a degree in the Master of Science, Safety and Occupational Health and Applied Sciences degree. Discussion centered around a feature of the requirements permitting students who had taken (scoring a B or better) two 600-level program courses at KSC as Honors Track undergraduates to count that work toward their graduate degree. The discussion focused on that for a month or so and we decided to accept that and offer the following motion.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revisions proposed to the degree requirements for the program leading to a Master of Science, Safety and Occupational Health and Applied Sciences be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh – The last item that did generate discussion and did generate a motion was a discussion that came up with revisions that were approved to the admission standards for the nursing program. We are ready to go with that but we would like to table discussion and vote on that for the full Senate until the entire program is put forth to the Senate April. I would like to table that motion.

Senator McDonald – The Chair of the Nursing Program also agreed to that.

Senator Welsh – Do I need to withdraw the motion?

Senator McDonald – There was no motion made so there is nothing to do.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees – We met a couple of times and have some motions for you.

The following IH course proposals were approved by the SCC (5-0-0-1):

IHFILM 190 Myths and Archetypes in Film and Literature

IHFILM 342 Topics and Genres

Motion: The ACC moves that the above IH Course proposals be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

The following IA course proposals were approved by the SCC (5-0-0-1):

IAFILM 331 Storytelling in Video

IAFILM 332 Creative Digital Non-Fiction

Motion: The ACC moves that the above IA Course proposals be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Menees – Senator Joe Darby was unanimously elected as Chair for the 2012-2013 year. On our next proposals we had Safety program which we didn't address until the ASC addressed the issue of graduate courses.

Motion: The ACC moves that the revision of the MS in Safety and Occupational Health Applied Sciences be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The ACC moves that the revision of the SAFETY Honors program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald:

Motion: The SEC moves that the "Program Elimination Guidelines be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stanish – I want to make two points. The first point is when we brought this draft forward about the definition of an academic program; Senator Darby at that point had found a definition in the course catalog of academic program. I just want to clarify for myself what that definition was and I couldn't find it myself in the course catalog. My internal definition of academic program would mean a major any options within the major as well as the minor. I was wondering if it would be more possible to make it clearer and have that definition in this document. My second comment was in reference to a question that I had asked when we saw the draft of this. Programs that are true subsets of other existing programs would not probably meet the qualifications for criteria. Provost Netzhhammer provided the example of the BS and BA. We have a similar thing in mathematics with an option middle school and high school teaching that is a subset of other options. These are courses that are truly used by other programs that do not have a resource for them of their own. I agree with Provost Netzhhammer saying that it could be handled very easily and these programs would not be considered for elimination. Is it possible to add a little point to say something to that effect? If we could add something like the program consist entirely of courses used by other programs and necessary to other programs that do have at least 10 declared students and at least five graduates then no further action will be taken.

Senator McDonald – I cannot speak for the Provost in this case but I will bring it back for feedback when we discuss it in the SEC meeting. Does that meet within what our discussions guidelines are? This would not be a friendly amendment.

Senator Stanish:

Motion: Senator Stanish moves to amend the document to add a second bullet point under initial steps that would read *if a program consists entirely of courses necessary for other programs that do have at least 10 declared students and at least 5 graduates then no further action will be taken* be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Blatchly – I hesitate to say this but I have alternate wording. I can just pop this out and see what people prefer and figure out a procedural way to do it. Is that ok with you?

Senator Stanish – Absolutely

Senator Blatchly – What I would suggest is in the first bullet at the very end we would add the following...*with the exception of programs exempted by the Provost from this process because they are essentially a subset of another viable program, or for other substantial reason.* The idea is that essentially programs that don't even show up on the list because everybody knows it is fruitless to go through this process.

Senator Stanish – I withdraw my motion to make an amendment to the document.

Motion: Senator Blatchly moves to amend the report using the language to add to the end of the first bullet point as follows: *with the exception of programs exempted from this process by the Provost by virtue of being essentially a subset of another viable program, or for other substantial reason* be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Menees: Is there a list?

Senator Blatchly – The list is generated by the first part of that bullet point. It says the Office of Institutional Research will create the list every year.

Senator Menees – The list of programs that are exempt.

Senator Blatchly – The Provost will create that.

Senator Menees – He does not have one right now?

Senator Blatchly – There is no list of any kind.

Senator McDonald – There had been none to my knowledge.

Senator Menees – Are we charging the Provost to keep a list of exempt programs?

Senator Blatchly – yes

Senator Menees – That seems different than the list generated by the Institutional Research.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That could be a bullet all on its own in the initial steps that the Provost needs to develop that list.

Senator Blatchly – One could imagine the Provost scanning the list and we hope of course that every year the list has 0 items on it. The list of programs threatened with elimination. If the list does show up and presumably it's short the Provost can scan it and say it doesn't make sense to push this one forward because they are a subset. We will not take any further action with that program we will just move on to the ones that we need to take action on. That was my thought. Not so much that there is a formal list but the list produced by Institutional Research could be pruned by some common sense.

Senator Menees – What defines a program being a subset with another program.

Senator Stanish – My definition was a program that consists entirely of courses necessary for other programs. That was my definition of a subset. My question was in Senator Blatchly's amendment he used the word essentially and I used the word entirely. I am not tied to either word but entirely has a clear cut definition and essentially doesn't. That may leave gray area that we are happy with or we are not.

Senator McDonald – Other comments?

Senator Martin – By virtue of there being, the five words is not entirely clear to me and I would love to substitute forwards because they are. I really don't understand by virtue of there being as a formulation. You could say because they are, I think that is more direct.

Senator Blatchly – Sounds acceptable to me.

Senator Stanish – I wonder where we do not have the Provost here tonight I wonder if you ask Dean Leversee if you have any feeling from an administrative standpoint how difficult it would be to enact this amendment.

Dean Leversee – Back to your original point the definition of a program it seems to me that we might have a list of all the programs. The total list and some that would be programs that the Provost would say some of these are subsets of by whatever definition. To me it is going to feel a little operational. It is going to be a first effort to list those programs and there would be discussion. I expect when the Provost comes back he may ask for some clarification. That is the best that I can do

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There was also the words essentially and entirely. I don't know if it needs to be resolved or if we came to a conclusion on that point or not.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Does that represent a substantive change in your mind?

Senator Blatchly – If I can explain to the word essentially. There are tiny bits of wiggle room here and to be perfectly honest I think I would like to give the Provost every excuse to not eliminate a program. Essentially allows, I think, a reasonable choice that is defensible and it doesn't require that every single course be exactly the same. I am just trying to save ourselves a little bit of work.

Senator Stanish – I am happy with the word essentially. Given what Dean Leverage said. It gives the Provost and campus room to define essentially. If we find that those definitions don't work, the campus and Provost can bring this back to the Senate.

Senator Sapeta – There seems that the Provost already has a way to say yes or no.

Senator Martin – I think the reference to the Provost's discretion at the bottom of the program elimination process takes place in the fifth year and the language we are deliberating on with respect to the new amendment is annual. We would be asking the Provost to intervene after a possible four years of ambiguity of a program might be useful. To eliminate that ambiguity from these courses can be exempted because they are essential to another program as I read the distinction between the initial steps and program elimination steps. I think the timing is important.

Senator Sapeta – If you look at this from the perspective that you have fewer than five graduates. Wouldn't you want to go through that process and actually allow that program to make changes before you go to the fifth year and eliminate the program?

Senator Dolenc – I agree with Senator Blatchly that we really want to create the freedom of wiggle room to only start this process in situations where there is a possibility of a program elimination happening. It seems to me that any program that feels like it might be in danger always has the option of going to the Dean and going to the Provost, seeking out resources on campus for assistance and strategic planning. This doesn't include that, by using the language of the amendment – we don't start a clock on folks in Math or Chemistry that really aren't vulnerable to program elimination because of the way they are connected to other stuff.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just to reiterate this came out of the document the Trustees asked us to create with regard to time to graduate strategies. This allows us to give a category to the Board of Trustees of programs that are different and say yes these have shown up on the list every year but here is a very clear definition of why and why they won't be eliminated. I think there is an audience for this that we need to consider as well.

Senator Doreski – I think we need to be careful about using language like subset. It doesn't really have any catalog viability. Whenever we use a term like this it always comes back to haunt us and I wonder if there is a clearer way with that.

Senator Stanish – Could we replace the word subset with a phrase? What if we said because they essentially consist of courses used by other programs in place of the word essentially a subset?

Senator Denehy – Is there a need to vote on this today? Does it make more sense to take this word smiting and bring a vote up at the next meeting?

Senator McDonald – In order for it to be in effect it would have to be passed today. That is not a reason to pass that.

Senator Stanish – So if we passed it in April would it still be able to be in effect for next year?

Senator McDonald – It was my understanding that we needed to have this voted on by this meeting.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – My understanding is that the catalog policies have been updated on a continual basis based on a timeline that we set. If we approve this at the very last meeting in April and say effective as of 12/13 academic year that is fine, the curriculum pieces are the ones that need to meet the catalog deadline. We have actually enacted policies effective once we made the decision. We just need to specify.

Senator Doreski – What if we just said because the courses meet requirements of other academic programs. If we say, for example, that they served other academic programs it sounds like they could still be done away with. I think we are really talking about programs that have courses that are actually required by the programs and if so then we should say so.

Senator McDonald – It seems like we are trying to do a lot of wordsmithing here which is probably a dangerous thing to do.

Senator Dolenc:

Motion: Senator Dolenc moves to table the above motion be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think it would be good to collect any feedback so when it comes back we can have everything. I would postpone the motion to table to make sure we have captured Senator Stanish's comments about what is program and if there were any other and then please make a motion.

Parliamentarian Atkinson: Motions to table on not debatable.

Senator Blatchly – I believe we are still talking about my amendment.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Motion to table would trump your amendment if it were to pass. If it fails to pass then it would return to your amendment.

Senator Blatchly – I think we should finish discussion relevant to this motion and then I would be willing to withdraw my amendment.

Senator McDonald – May I suggest that we vote on whether to table.

Senator Welsh – A motion to table that passes means that we are done with this. A motion to table that does not pass means that we may continue the discussion until we have gotten our edits clear and then we can table.

Senator McDonald – Correct.

Vote: Motion does not carry

Senator Blatchly – Some of this may depend on the definition of program. The examples that we have that include the 2 Chemistry majors which share courses. I don't know that you can really say that the courses are required for the other program if they are a standalone program where they share most of their course work. One could get around that by saying all of chemistry BA and BS that is just one program which is not clear yet. Or you can say for those students separate majors because they share courses they are really sharing resources so that is the idea of a subset was you have 9 courses required by this major and 7 required by the other one you really shouldn't threaten the one that has 7 courses. That was the intention not so much a service as it is a natural sense of shared courses. We have difficulty with the wording so if we can finish the discussion and perhaps it is appropriate to hand that back.

Senator Menees – The elimination of a program does not necessarily mean that their courses go away. That distinction would have to be made when the program disappears what courses are being used elsewhere in other programs. I don't know how that would weigh in on the argument but something that should be considered and I think that is a distinction that is missing.

Senator McDonald – That was part of the discussion in the SEC meeting.

Senator Blatchly – It is certainly true that the courses would not necessarily go away but what would go away is an option for students trying to combine Chemistry with something else and not having to deal with another major. The point of this is to conserve resources. The idea of this is to identify programs for which the elimination would not conserve resources. If the courses are going to stay but you get rid of the program you really are not saving resources and are taking options away from the students.

Senator McDonald – we have reached the 15 minutes of discussion for the amendment

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to continue discussion on the amendment

Vote: Motion does not carry

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We are now back to discussion on the motion about the program elimination guidelines

Senator Stevenson – I have a point of clarification. Under program elimination process 3rd bullet about half way down starting on the right side. It states if the Senate decides to formally vote or recommend for or against the program elimination under consideration the vote should be so on and so forth. My question for clarification centers around if the Senate decides, does the Senate have to vote? Does there need to be a motion made? I don't think the process is clear. Personally I would like to see us vote anytime a program is to be eliminated so I would be in favor of changing the language to include that the Senate will vote to recommend for or against the program and this vote should take into account educational considerations. I just think that it is not clear.

Senator Menees – It is not clear whether the SCC provides any vote on that either.

Motion: Senator Schmidl-Gagne made the motion to table the Program Elimination Guidelines be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We will look at this and bring it back to the next meeting. In the meantime if you have any suggestions please email those to Senator Schmidl-Gagne, Senator Dolenc or myself so we can include that in discussions at the next SEC meeting. We will bring back a revised copy of this to the next Senate meeting.

Motion: The SEC moves that the ISP Task Force Report be accepted into the record of the Senate be approved by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – How will discussion continue on this?

Senator McDonald – We will bring it back to the next meeting.

Vote: Motion carries

VI. New Business

Nothing to report

VII. Adjournment 5:48pm

Minutes
for the 418th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, March 7th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 4:08
- II. Roll Call
Excused: Provost Mel Netzhammer
- III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 417th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – Just a couple of word modifications. On page 23 I made reference to when the Senate has to meet April 6th I was intending I think to refer to of when the Senate approved the ISP proposal which was April of 2006 and not when we meet on April 6th. In that same paragraph, I was describing the likelihood that proposals will be very well put together and staffed by excellent professors but a nagging concern about staffing with the absence of professors so rather than the word magnum issue it should be a nagging issue. Likewise one last one on page 25, there is a phrase 3 lines into a quote by me *implicit promise to students that make these selections that there is this bi-level multi disciplinary content* I thought I said high level.

Senator Stanish-A slight correction on a quotation of myself, on page 24 towards the bottom, it should read *Exactly as Senator Menees just pointed out, this course is already on the books as Math and Social Institution*. In that same paragraph where it starts *there is one particular faculty member who is teaching this course who does have expertise in the mathematics and that is the theory of mathematics how we look at quantitative*. Not sure what I said but my guess is *who does have expertise in the mathematics and that theory of mathematics is how we look at Political Science*.

Senator Harfenist – On page 23 where it says indifference should be deference.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as revised

- IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing to report

- V. Subcommittee Reports

Senator McDonald – We have a very busy agenda today so please keep your comments to 2 minutes or less. If we have someone who has already spoken on an issue we will give someone who hasn't had the opportunity to speak first before we move back in that direction. We have a number of items that need to be finished today so I am going to bypass the Executive Committee report until the end of the meeting and move directly to the AOC report.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly – We have completed the outside review process for the Geology program so we are looking forward to putting that together. We are looking to get it into the last meeting of the year. We might miss that deadline and move it to next fall. Math and Music should be ready for the next meeting as far as I understand. We are going to reorder the events a little bit. We get to produce a report for the Senate and just a reminder about what the role of the AOC is and the process that we go through. We are charged with taking documentation from a program and a self study program which is typically constructed under fairly extensive guidelines. Organizing an outside review for that program we call in typically 2 people from the outside, people who have a professional standing but not associated with Keene State. We ask them to come in and look at the program, write a report and we consolidate those two reports into a report to the Senate. What you will be seeing from us is our documentation based on the documentation we have received from the program and outside reviewers. We consolidated that and brought it forward with recommendations. What I think is helpful to remember is the

other side of that, what happens after you accept a report? In the old days the report would go to the library and sit gathering dust. I believe this is an initiative from Provost Netzhammer that in the past few years there has been an explicit process instituted after the report has been completed. We send our reports to the Provost, the Provost will then take those and send them back to the Chair and/or the Dean of the program to create an explicit action plan which addresses the recommendations we make in the report. A big part of the report, are recommendations that come out of the report. These recommendations are to be address explicitly by the Dean of the program. There are progress check-ups after a year or so to make sure people have addressed all of the concerns. We hope in the very least that the intention is that there will be some concrete result from this. That is our plan and we are not an investigative body. We are restricted largely to the documentation that comes into us and just to give you a little context to the role. I am going to start with the Physics Report. We did review the Physics on schedule, we had a self study that came in September, the outside reviewers came in December and we received a report from the outside reviewers and produced what you will see in the documentation as the Academic Overview report on Physics. I would like to ask a process question, I think it has been customary for the people involved with the report to present the major findings. Is it better to do that presentation before making a motion or after? Is there a preference?

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Discussion happens after the motion is made.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Physics Program be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Blatchly – I am going to ask Senator Fleeger to give a brief summary of the findings of the report because he was Chair of the subcommittee.

Senator Fleeger – The subcommittee looked at the Physics Program included Ann Miller, Kelly Welsh and I. The Physics program currently offers degrees in the Sciences and Social Sciences in Chemistry/Physics and Mathematics/Physics. They currently operate as a joint department with Geology and have 2 Tenure Track Professors, 6 Adjuncts and 1 part time technician. The outside reviewers found strengths for the Physics program that they have some innovative degree offerings and feels that those are a good attraction for the Physics Program and that they have a substantial administrative support and adequate budget for the current program. They are really sensitive to student needs and have excellent advising. They are impressed with the program and achievements of the graduated students of the program. They feel they are strong contributors to the Integrative Studies program on campus. Some of the challenges that the Physics department faces identified by the outside reviewers were lack of full time faculty and lack of student research facilities. They have minimal office support staffing including running and maintaining the lab without a fulltime technician and they are challenged by offering upper division programs and courses to attract students into the major and also with developing a community of majors by providing opportunities for student internships and research. Recommendations that were made by the outside reviewers and concurred upon by the committee led to four areas which are lack of a fulltime lab technician, the need for additional fulltime faculty, additional space for student and faculty projects and a concern that the Physics faculty are overextended. Recommendations to those specific concerns are fulltime faculty should be added as soon as possible and plans should be made to replace Dr. Wolfe when he retires. The department should be allocated a fulltime laboratory technician and student and faculty research space should be developed in the existing facilities and that the departments hybrid bachelor degrees should be exploited and encouraged because they are regionally attractive to Keene State College, and that the departments should invest time in redesigning the department webpage to make it more attractive to students. Additionally, the committee felt that it was important to recommend that because many of these recommendations are repeats from the last time the program was reviewed, that the Administration provides specific response to these recommendations to the programs and that they can engage in planning for the future.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Blatchly – This followed the same process as the above report.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Library Information Literacy Program be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stemp – I will give a brief summary of the report. More or less the external and internal report tended to agree on most things. I will attempt to emphasize the major points. For those of you who are not necessarily quite clear on what the information literacy program does, it is housed within the library but it is sort of a separate entity and is primarily responsible for a set of transferable skills to help individuals be critical consumers of information. Information literacy skills include searching, accessing, evaluating, analyzing and ethically using information. The most significant change to this program since 2002 was the implementation of the ISP program on campus. This created additional and new demands on the library as well as their faculty and resources. As such, many of the comments both for in terms of strengths and terms of challenges really tend to revolve around ISP not the only concern but it is one of the primary concerns. Strengths of the program were recognized both internally and externally. From the external review a statement reads “*this particular program should be considered a model for other schools*”, which we thought was clearly a very obvious recommendation worth mentioning. They also point out the integration of information literacy into the lower level ISP classes was a strong point for this program. This was perceived by the external reviewers to be significant and well done. They also saw at the same time the library staff primarily through information literacy were still able to maintain good relationships with the existing departments and still able to provide support for those disciplinary programs that exist on campus. In this sense the ability to integrate and adapt to the new demands of ISP while still managing to meet the demands of the existing programs is generally seen as strength to this particular program. Like we saw in the Physics program, there also seem to be some challenges. The challenges are not what I would say as unexpected. They tend to relate to loss of a tenure track position that was later replaced by a full time adjunct position. There is the concern that there may not be adequate staffing in order to deal with both the ISP requirements as well as the existing departmental demands. In terms of recommendations, one recommendation is to add another position as a full time tenure track as well as keeping a similar position that would fill the current adjunct position as it exists. The development of a core curriculum for ISP upper level courses although what exists is currently recognized as good. The extension of the successes of the lower level ISP course level into the upper level disciplinary courses was thought to be an area that should be expanded upon and the way in which the assessment of this particular process for use of the ISP courses and departmental courses in relation to information literacy is thought to needing more comprehensive assessment strategy. That being said we have a series of recommendations; the first of these has to do with personnel levels currently available and the suggestion that these should be increased. This is primarily based on responsibilities concerning the ISP and lower and higher level as well as serving the departmental programs on this campus. Maybe some revision of information literacy outcomes and policies specifically how they relate to the ISP program this is partly because of the growth process. Finally, as I said before, an attempt to focus on creating an assessment plan that provides data that can be used to provide information to better understand how we use information literacy on campus and to provide further support to that particular program.

Note: Motion carries

Senator Blatchly – The next one relates to the review of the Physical Education Program and has a little bit longer to set up than I had thought but will try to be as brief as I can. If you look back at the Senate documents from last spring the review was supposed go through at that time but it was delayed and the explanation was that the self-study document did not have enough documentation. There were some additional materials provided during the spring and during a meeting or two with the current AOC subcommittee which included two people whose terms ended at the end of that spring. The expectation was that we would be able to write something in the fall and bring it forward. At that point as it turns out the entire process was left to Senator Harfenist as he was the only one left on the subcommittee. We have been trying to give him some support along the way. The AOC report is based on materials submitted to us in the past. The procedure, as it turns out for the Physical Education program, is one of those programs which are subject to accreditation. It is a little more complicated and at the time we were reviewing this it was a standalone accredited Teacher Certification program and the procedures for reviewing accredited programs were not looked at. In the grand tradition of political theatre I need at this point to blame the previous Chair of this committee who was just as much in the dark as the rest of us. We did not have clear procedures for requesting documentation. There was a single line in the procedures that said just give us your accreditation stuff and we will find something to do with it, not very satisfactory, not very clear and not very helpful to the program. If there are troubles with this report the AOC in its previous committee make up needs to own some of that trouble. Some of it is our fault. We did work as hard as we could to put together a report and we made a draft and brought that by the program and was reviewed by the program. There was an additional meeting in December to try and make some corrections and there were a few corrections made before we released the final report. It is worth remembering the process of the AOC review allows a program to comment and to correct any errors present and in the documentation you will see such a comment. It is worth remembering that the destination of these reports is to try and that we produce some recommendations that will be mapped by the appropriate Dean and the program. We will be getting an overview of the material from Senator Harfenist but I wanted to give you a little background.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Physical Education Program and responses be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Harfenist – The Physical Education department offers courses that serve both PE majors and Athletic Training [AT] majors and activity courses as electives for non-majors to acquire basic knowledge, skills and techniques in a sport or leisure activity including; aquatics and lifeguard training, physical conditioning, individual sports and first aid and CPR. The PE program contributes to the Integrative Studies Program through two upper-level interdisciplinary courses, IPE310: Psychosocial Aspects of Sport in American Culture and IPE311: Outdoor leadership. The PE department also contributes to the Health Sciences major (Exercise Science option) through 2 required courses, PE200: Kinesiology and PE201: Physiology of Exercise. Seeing that I do not have external reviewer recommendations I would just go to the conclusion of the recommendations. Two of the most important challenges to the department are the number of full-time tenure-track faculty who support the Physical Education Teaching Certification program and monetary resources, including making the department's Administrative Assistant a full-time position. Having received national recognition through accreditation for the PETC program, the department has greatly enhanced the ability of KSC students to enter the workforce as highly skilled and trained physical education teachers. It is recommended that more full-time tenure-track lines for this program be secure to enable the department to increase the capacity of students yearly admitted into the program, which is now limited to 18 to stay within accreditation requirements. The Physical Education Department must regularly replace expendable equipment and cover costs incurred for transportation needed in various courses for the use of facilities outside of the college. Now that the Exercise Science option is moving into the PE Department, equipment totaling approximately \$15,000 will need to be acquired over the next several years. Having a total yearly budget of approximately \$7400 appears to be quite inadequate for the services they provide to their majors and to the college. It is recommended that their departmental budget be increased sufficiently to allow them to regularly replace expendable, and afford them to invest in more durable, equipment.

Senator Blatchly – I just want to make sure that people notice that there was a response there and to a large extent the endorsed response in particular as I mentioned before there is a comment about needing more input from the AOC for constructing self-studies and for providing appropriate material. We wholeheartedly agree with that. You will notice the last item on our report is a mention of guidelines which are in progress and we are trying to correct that. It was a difficult circumstance for everybody to work with and so we were trying to do the very best we can with this report. It is not a perfect report but we feel it is pretty much the best we can do.

Dr. Smyth, Chair of the Physical Education Department – First I want to thank my colleagues on the AOC and Senator Harfenist for your hard work. As Senator Blatchly mentioned, this is a piloted review of a nationally accredited program and the review process was not clearly indicated. I have chaired the AOC in the past and was also Chair of the subcommittee for NEASC on the academic curriculum. I clearly understand and have an appreciation for program review. I am concerned that the report in its current form basically lacks substance as it relates to the charge of the AOC. There are factual errors in the report and again given the volume of self-study for an NCATE review is perhaps easy to overlook some things and might be more relevant to the PETC program. With further guidance could provide further information for the report. I also want to emphasize that in the addendum to the self study materials as requested by the AOC subcommittee that we did respond to every single request in the guidelines for program review. On page 44 these are the kinds of information that I did provide. Again, with due respect to my colleagues the PETC Faculty respectfully request that this AOC report be tabled until it has been redone because it is going to be a source for us as pointed out for decision making for action.

Senator Harfenist – I believe the Accreditation documentation was first gathered together in 2006. It was a final form early on that so as I went through Dr. Smyth's critique and what they call errors well I think things have changed in the two to three years since then. I did make a typo or two, all the information did come out of here and I think that points to the flaw in the system of what we have been more or less discussing. If your accreditation was done two or three years prior to the review there is going to be a lot of changes that have occurred. Personally I feel if the PE department would like to see a further review they should do it the old fashion way, a self study and outside reviewer come in. That would be my recommendation.

Senator Blatchly – What we thought carefully about the requests from the Physical Education Program to delay this further and decided against it largely, not because we thought there were no errors in the report, as I said essentially I endorsed their responses on the program and I am not trying to argue against this but we looked at the standard for

delaying further a report that is already delayed by a year. We looked at whether the changes that were made could not essentially be corrected by the response of the program. If there are errors in the program it can be corrected by the response. The big question for me was do the changes that are suggested and the difficulty suggested by the response, does that change any of the conclusions that we would come to in the document. It didn't seem to me that the changes that were made would really change our conclusions. In fact the conclusions essentially came from the addendum and we thank the department that was fundamentally extra work to produce an addendum. It is not clear to me that the recommendations would really change as a result of any of the difficulty with the report. Again, we are not trying to say this is perfect.

Senator Welsh – I have a question of the meaning of acceptance. I detect a difference of opinion and I wonder if accepting a report constitutes weighing in as a Senate on that difference of opinion.

Senator McDonald – My understanding is no, that it is just being accepted in its structure by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I served on the AOC for several years and with the NEASC accreditation I guess what I would default to with the NEASC process there was an opportunity for the college to respond to the strength and weaknesses document after the site visit and correcting factual errors. The report is a snapshot in time of an institution. A program should be accurate because it is what we will be judged on 10 years from now by NEASC in this case. I think these changes have been identified and it doesn't seem like a difficult task to revise the AOC report to accurately reflect the program within its year of review. It becomes a permanent document of the college that is a part of the NEASC document moving forward in our records room. I am a bit perplexed as to why we wouldn't want to correct the document so that it is as accurate as possible understanding that the recommendations may not change at all but so that factually we have a record for the next AOC that needs to do a review.

Senator Stanish – I was thinking largely the same thing just in terms of the factual errors. I do agree that it doesn't seem like it would change the recommendations at all which I think is the main point. Programs themselves use these documents as sort of a record of their history and what was happening in that snapshot in time because faculty change, staff change and so this is a record of what we have. It seems if we have any ability to make it as accurate as possible that would be a service to the college and department. I noticed one thing and this is just from reading this, in the response provided by the Physical Education faculty report that Dr. Smyth referred to - the second bullet in bold where it says (***p. 1, Charge) the remainder of the program (especially the Exercise Science option) is described from information obtained from the last self-study and AOC report (AY 2005–2006). (During the 2005-06 review periods, Exercise Science was not an option within the Physical Education major.)***) It goes on to say that the sentence is not accurate in the 2005-2006 review which I am hearing from Senator Harfenist was the attempt to capture that snapshot in time. Just looking at this there seems to be some confusion over the time period that ultimately should be corrected.

Senator Stemp – I think part of the problem would be avoided if you were not relying on a document that is that old. If it was for the necessity for the department to formulate an updated document then they would provide it based under their own initiative I suppose the most accurate updated information for their programs and therefore this issue that we are having would hypothetically be avoided.

Senator Smyth – Absolutely and the NCATE review process begins in 2005 and 2006 and is then followed up with 2008 and then in 2009 under the timeline. We are asked to write a self-study based on our NCATE report and review from 2008 which does include some material from 2005 and 2006 so I do apologize for that confusion. So that process started in 2009 with 2008 materials. It has been postponed with the patience of the AOC as well.

Senator McDonald – Dr. Smyth, you had made a request that it be tabled. Could you briefly tell us what you hope that would accomplish?

Dr. Smyth – In my response we asked that it be tabled because it needed to be developed so that the factual errors are corrected as well as perhaps some more substance related to some of the major topics within the AOC guidelines be addressed more fully and developed especially with the student outcomes, which is a major part of

the NCATE process. There is a very small section on that but it is a key piece of our program as opposed to some other sections that may or may not be as important. That would be my hope.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – While I understand this had been postponed I think I have been on the Senate and have voted on this a few times. I think the outcome here is that we want the best report and the best perspective for the program going forward. I don't know what the purpose would be to accept something that was less than that for the academic standards to not be as high as they could be for the future given what are considered administrative things that have happened. If we had the opportunity to do this and I think it is up to us to decide that. I would want to especially for a program that seems to have so much review put into it that our own institution would want to add that voice.

Senator Denehy – Just a question about procedure. I understand the difficulty of the motion to accept the report in its current form but that part that is not accepted than what do you do? Wouldn't it make sense to have a motion to table the report?

Senator McDonald – Would a negative vote be to table the report or do we need a motion to table the report.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – If there is a motion to table which is not debatable then the group would vote that up or down. If it were voted up the Chair of the Senate does have the ability to indicate that it be sent back to the committee to where the report came and provide a certain date or not.

Senator Stanish – Hearing that both sides would like more substance in this report in terms of not feeling satisfied with it and what to do with that and hearing from the AOC that perhaps filling out a sort of doing the old fashion self-study and filling out the self-study documentation instead of using the accreditation document which is a fair amount of work, absolutely but it might be helpful to the AOC. I am wondering if that is something the Physical Education faculty would be willing to do to get the substance. It seems if you are going to table this motion then we might want to know what should happen next.

Dr. Smyth – It is my understanding that Dr. Treadwell volunteered our program earlier than our intended review process which was reviewed by the AOC in 2006 as a pilot. If we were to do it the old fashioned way I would recommend that we go back to our schedule. That being as a pilot that we would perhaps we would proceed with the pilot and the AOC would have some substance but if the recommendation was to do away with the self-study then we would go back to the timeline and that would be 2016.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I would like the report be tabled to allow the AOC an opportunity with PE to figure out a procedure going forward that would be amendable to both sides.

Vote: Motion is tabled. The chair will determine a timeline to reconsider this motion.

Senator McDonald – I will discuss with the Chair of the AOC about a time to bring this back.

Senator Blatchly – The end of the report I didn't really anticipate discussion on the revised procedures. There are two sets of revised procedures; one is to clarify what will be done with accredited programs and as you can see clearly there is a need for that. Also to revise our document storage, right now they are held on Blackboard which is not a very good place for them to be. I put this out there so people have a sense of what we are working on. This is not a final document. We do hope to bring the final guidelines for you to see by the next meeting. If people have comments on this, especially those who are part of the accredited programs and want to give us some feedback on it please forwards your comments. I really didn't intend to discuss this today.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Welsh:

Motion: The ASC moves the Senate accept the following changes:

From Catalog description of "Film Studies Admissions Criteria", remove underlined existing language:

As cultural interest in motion picture analysis and production increases, entrance into the Film Studies major at Keene State College is becoming similarly competitive. In response, the Film Department has implemented a portfolio process to facilitate admission into the program and application for its annual scholarship award. Upon acceptance to the College, any prospective Film student must submit an application via the following process:

I. Portfolio Requirements

6. A completed Film Program Application form (available online)
7. Two letters of recommendation (in Word format if submitted electronically).
8. Submission of one (1) analytical essay on a topic in film criticism, and/or (1) properly formatted screenplay of no less than thirty pages, and/or one (1) 3-5 minute video of the applicant's work in Quicktime format accompanied by a brief synopsis of the filmmaker's intention behind the video. All written materials should be in Word format if submitted electronically.
9. It is preferred that applicants send all portfolio materials in electronic format attached in a single e-mail to:

tcook@keene.edu

If necessary, physical samples (papers, DVDs, etc.) may be sent to:

KSC FILM – MS 4000
ATTN: Application Committee
229 Main Street
Keene, NH 03435

10. Application deadline is March 1. Portfolios will be reviewed and applicants notified of Committee decisions no later than April 1.

Replace with language below:

- II. Any student may declare Film Studies as his or her major by formalizing a Film faculty member as his or her advisor and then filling out a formal Declaration of Major form with the Academic Advising Office.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh – The current catalog language for current graduate level courses is one that excludes undergraduate's use of 600 level courses. There is a proposal by the Safety Studies Program to permit certain undergraduate students with permission to enroll in 600 level courses. There was discovery that the catalog language prohibited that and we were asked as the ASC to consider that prohibition and rule on whether it can be modified. We discussed the modifications to the 500 and 600 level courses and policy describing who are admitted and who are not. After a month of research and other schools practices and discussion we came up with the decision to approve the following motion.

Motion: The ASC moves that the following language in the KSC Course Catalog be stricken, 500-level courses are graduate courses but are open to senior undergraduates with permission of the appropriate divisional dean. 600-level courses are graduate courses only; they are not open to undergraduates.

And replaced with the following:

500 and 600-level courses are graduate courses but are open to senior undergraduates with permission of the appropriate academic program chair and/or school dean.

Discussion: Senator McDonald – Since this is my proposal I will transfer the gravel over to Vice Chair Senator Stevenson.

Senator Blatchly – I am wondering where we see the word and/or construction, is this intended to pick the one that is closest or is there some kind of hierarchy.

Senator McDonald – It is in the proposal that you can have the Dean or the Department Chair approves that.

Senator Blatchly – Should we strike the word and? I move that we strike the word “and” from the forth to the last position or do we need a motion?

Senator Stanish – You have to ask the creator of the motion if he approves of the change.

Senator McDonald – That language was developed by the ASC as they fine tuned this out of the original proposals.

Senator Welsh – It was language that was suggested and yes it was language that the ASC approved. I don't think we are tremendously wedded to the word and I don't think we would consider the elimination of the word anything but friendly.

Friendly Amendment: The ASC moves that the following language in the KSC Course Catalog be changed to 500 and 600-level courses are graduate courses but are open to senior undergraduates with permission of the appropriate academic program chair *or* school dean.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh – The safety program has forwarded and the ASC considered revisions to the Safety Honors Program standards. Specifically, the program creates two tracks, an Honors Research Track and an Advanced Study track. The second of these permits undergraduate students to enroll in two SAFE courses at the 600-level. Discussion centered on standards that would permit students to participate in these tracks and in the possibility that courses might count toward graduate work if students later enroll in the department's Master's program. A motion was made and seconded to accept these revisions and approved by the ASC with a vote of 8 in favor and none opposed. The following policy motion is

Motion: The ASC moves that the revisions to the admission requirements for the Safety Honors Program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh - The committee then considered revisions to the requirements for a degree in the Master of Science, Safety and Occupational Health and Applied Sciences degree. Discussion centered around a feature of the requirements permitting students who had taken (scoring a B or better) two 600-level program courses at KSC as Honors Track undergraduates to count that work toward their graduate degree. The discussion focused on that for a month or so and we decided to accept that and offer the following motion.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revisions proposed to the degree requirements for the program leading to a Master of Science, Safety and Occupational Health and Applied Sciences be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Welsh – The last item that did generate discussion and did generate a motion was a discussion that came up with revisions that were approved to the admission standards for the nursing program. We are ready to go with that but we would like to table discussion and vote on that for the full Senate until the entire program is put forth to the Senate April. I would like to table that motion.

Senator McDonald – The Chair of the Nursing Program also agreed to that.

Senator Welsh – Do I need to withdraw the motion?

Senator McDonald – There was no motion made so there is nothing to do.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees – We met a couple of times and have some motions for you.

The following IH course proposals were approved by the SCC (5-0-0-1):
IHFILM 190 Myths and Archetypes in Film and Literature
IHFILM 342 Topics and Genres

Motion: The ACC moves that the above IH Course proposals be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

The following IA course proposals were approved by the SCC (5-0-0-1):
IAFILM 331 Storytelling in Video
IAFILM 332 Creative Digital Non-Fiction

Motion: The ACC moves that the above IA Course proposals be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Menees – Senator Joe Darby was unanimously elected as Chair for the 2012-2013 year. On our next proposals we had Safety program which we didn't address until the ASC addressed the issue of graduate courses.

Motion: The ACC moves that the revision of the MS in Safety and Occupational Health Applied Sciences be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The ACC moves that the revision of the SAFETY Honors program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald:

Motion: The SEC moves that the “Program Elimination Guidelines be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stanish – I want to make two points. The first point is when we brought this draft forward about the definition of an academic program; Senator Darby at that point had found a definition in the course catalog of academic program. I just want to clarify for myself what that definition was and I couldn't find it myself in the course catalog. My internal definition of academic program would mean a major any options within the major as well as the minor. I was wondering if it would be more possible to make it clearer and have that definition in this document. My second comment was in reference to a question that I had asked when we saw the draft of this. Programs that are true subsets of other existing programs would not probably meet the qualifications for criteria. Provost Netzhammer provided the example of the BS and BA. We have a similar thing in mathematics with an option middle school and high school teaching that is a subset of other options. These are courses that are truly used by other programs that do not have a resource for them of their own. I agree with Provost Netzhammer saying that it could be handled very easily and these programs would not be considered for elimination. Is it possible to add a little point to say something to that effect? If we could add something like the

program consist entirely of courses used by other programs and necessary to other programs that do have at least 10 declared students and at least five graduates then no further action will be taken.

Senator McDonald – I cannot speak for the Provost in this case but I will bring it back for feedback when we discuss it in the SEC meeting. Does that meet within what our discussions guidelines are? This would not be a friendly amendment.

Senator Stanish:

Motion: Senator Stanish moves to amend the document to add a second bullet point under initial steps that would read *if a program consists entirely of courses necessary for other programs that do have at least 10 declared students and at least 5 graduates then no further action will be taken* be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Blatchly – I hesitate to say this but I have alternate wording. I can just pop this out and see what people prefer and figure out a procedural way to do it. Is that ok with you?

Senator Stanish – Absolutely

Senator Blatchly – What I would suggest is in the first bullet at the very end we would add the following...*with the exception of programs exempted by the Provost from this process because they are essentially a subset of another viable program, or for other substantial reason.* The idea is that essentially programs that don't even show up on the list because everybody knows it is fruitless to go through this process.

Senator Stanish – I withdraw my motion to make an amendment to the document.

Motion: Senator Blatchly moves to amend the report using the language to add to the end of the first bullet point as follows: *with the exception of programs exempted from this process by the Provost by virtue of being essentially a subset of another viable program, or for other substantial reason* be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Menees: Is there a list?

Senator Blatchly – The list is generated by the first part of that bullet point. It says the Office of Institutional Research will create the list every year.

Senator Menees – The list of programs that are exempt.

Senator Blatchly – The Provost will create that.

Senator Menees – He does not have one right now?

Senator Blatchly – There is no list of any kind.

Senator McDonald – There had been none to my knowledge.

Senator Menees – Are we charging the Provost to keep a list of exempt programs?

Senator Blatchly – yes

Senator Menees – That seems different than the list generated by the Institutional Research.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That could be a bullet all on its own in the initial steps that the Provost needs to develop that list.

Senator Blatchly – One could imagine the Provost scanning the list and we hope of course that every year the list has 0 items on it. The list of programs threatened with elimination. If the list does show up and presumably it's short the Provost can scan it and say it doesn't make sense to push this one forward because they are a subset. We will not take any further

action with that program we will just move on to the ones that we need to take action on. That was my thought. Not so much that there is a formal list but the list produced by Institutional Research could be pruned by some common sense.

Senator Menees – What defines a program being a subset with another program.

Senator Stanish – My definition was a program that consists entirely of courses necessary for other programs. That was my definition of a subset. My question was in Senator Blatchly's amendment he used the word essentially and I used the word entirely. I am not tied to either word but entirely has a clear cut definition and essentially doesn't. That may leave gray area that we are happy with or we are not.

Senator McDonald – Other comments?

Senator Martin – By virtue of there being, the five words is not entirely clear to me and I would love to substitute forwards because they are. I really don't understand by virtue of there being as a formulation. You could say because they are, I think that is more direct.

Senator Blatchly – Sounds acceptable to me.

Senator Stanish – I wonder where we do not have the Provost here tonight I wonder if you ask Dean Leverage if you have any feeling from an administrative standpoint how difficult it would be to enact this amendment.

Dean Leverage – Back to your original point the definition of a program it seems to me that we might have a list of all the programs. The total list and some that would be programs that the Provost would say some of these are subsets of by whatever definition. To me it is going to feel a little operational. It is going to be a first effort to list those programs and there would be discussion. I expect when the Provost comes back he may ask for some clarification. That is the best that I can do

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There was also the words essentially and entirely. I don't know if it needs to be resolved or if we came to a conclusion on that point or not.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Does that represent a substantive change in your mind?

Senator Blatchly – If I can explain to the word essentially. There are tiny bits of wiggle room here and to be perfectly honest I think I would like to give the Provost every excuse to not eliminate a program. Essentially allows, I think, a reasonable choice that is defensible and it doesn't require that every single course be exactly the same. I am just trying to save ourselves a little bit of work.

Senator Stanish – I am happy with the word essentially. Given what Dean Leverage said. It gives the Provost and campus room to define essentially. If we find that those definitions don't work, the campus and Provost can bring this back to the Senate.

Senator Sapeta – There seems that the Provost already has a way to say yes or no.

Senator Martin – I think the reference to the Provost's discretion at the bottom of the program elimination process takes place in the fifth year and the language we are deliberating on with respect to the new amendment is annual. We would be asking the Provost to intervene after a possible four years of ambiguity of a program might be useful. To eliminate that ambiguity from these courses can be exempted because they are essential to another program as I read the distinction between the initial steps and program elimination steps. I think the timing is important.

Senator Sapeta – If you look at this from the perspective that you have fewer than five graduates. Wouldn't you want to go through that process and actually allow that program to make changes before you go to the fifth year and eliminate the program?

Senator Dolenc – I agree with Senator Blatchly that we really want to create the freedom of wiggle room to only start this process in situations where there is a possibility of a program elimination happening. It seems to me that any program that feels like it might be in danger always has the option of going to the Dean and going to the Provost, seeking out resources

on campus for assistance and strategic planning. This doesn't include that, by using the language of the amendment – we don't start a clock on folks in Math or Chemistry that really aren't vulnerable to program elimination because of the way they are connected to other stuff.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just to reiterate this came out of the document the Trustees asked us to create with regard to time to graduate strategies. This allows us to give a category to the Board of Trustees of programs that are different and say yes these have shown up on the list every year but here is a very clear definition of why and why they won't be eliminated. I think there is an audience for this that we need to consider as well.

Senator Doreski – I think we need to be careful about using language like subset. It doesn't really have any catalog viability. Whenever we use a term like this it always comes back to haunt us and I wonder if there is a clearer way with that.

Senator Stanish – Could we replace the word subset with a phrase? What if we said because they essentially consist of courses used by other programs in place of the word essentially a subset?

Senator Denehy – Is there a need to vote on this today? Does it make more sense to take this word smiting and bring a vote up at the next meeting?

Senator McDonald – In order for it to be in effect it would have to be passed today. That is not a reason to pass that.

Senator Stanish – So if we passed it in April would it still be able to be in effect for next year?

Senator McDonald – It was my understanding that we needed to have this voted on by this meeting.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – My understanding is that the catalog policies have been updated on a continual basis based on a timeline that we set. If we approve this at the very last meeting in April and say effective as of 12/13 academic year that is fine, the curriculum pieces are the ones that need to meet the catalog deadline. We have actually enacted policies effective once we made the decision. We just need to specify.

Senator Doreski – What if we just said because the courses meet requirements of other academic programs. If we say, for example, that they served other academic programs it sounds like they could still be done away with. I think we are really talking about programs that have courses that are actually required by the programs and if so then we should say so.

Senator McDonald – It seems like we are trying to do a lot of word smiting here which is probably a dangerous thing to do.

Senator Dolenc:

Motion: Senator Dolenc moves to table the above motion be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think it would be good to collect any feedback so when it comes back we can have everything. I would postpone the motion to table to make sure we have captured Senator Stanish's comments about what is program and if there were any other and then please make a motion.

Parliamentarian Atkinson: Motions to table on not debatable.

Senator Blatchly – I believe we are still talking about my amendment.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Motion to table would trump your amendment if it were to pass. If it fails to pass then it would return to your amendment.

Senator Blatchly – I think we should finish discussion relevant to this motion and then I would be willing to withdraw my amendment.

Senator McDonald – May I suggest that we vote on whether to table.

Senator Welsh – A motion to table that passes means that we are done with this. A motion to table that does not pass means that we may continue the discussion until we have gotten our edits clear and then we can table.

Senator McDonald – Correct.

Vote: Motion does not carry

Senator Blatchly – Some of this may depend on the definition of program. The examples that we have that include the 2 Chemistry majors which share courses. I don't know that you can really say that the courses are required for the other program if they are a standalone program where they share most of their course work. One could get around that by saying all of chemistry BA and BS that is just one program which is not clear yet. Or you can say for those students separate majors because they share courses they are really sharing resources so that is the idea of a subset was you have 9 courses required by this major and 7 required by the other one you really shouldn't threaten the one that has 7 courses. That was the intention not so much a service as it is a natural sense of shared courses. We have difficulty with the wording so if we can finish the discussion and perhaps it is appropriate to hand that back.

Senator Menees – The elimination of a program does not necessarily mean that their courses go away. That distinction would have to be made when the program disappears what courses are being used elsewhere in other programs. I don't know how that would weigh in on the argument but something that should be considered and I think that is a distinction that is missing.

Senator McDonald – That was part of the discussion in the SEC meeting.

Senator Blatchly – It is certainly true that the courses would not necessarily go away but what would go away is an option for students trying to combine Chemistry with something else and not having to deal with another major. The point of this is to conserve resources. The idea of this is to identify programs for which the elimination would not conserve resources. If the courses are going to stay but you get rid of the program you really are not saving resources and are taking options away from the students.

Senator McDonald – we have reached the 15 minutes of discussion for the amendment

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to continue discussion on the amendment

Vote: Motion does not carry

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We are now back to discussion on the motion about the program elimination guidelines

Senator Stevenson – I have a point of clarification. Under program elimination process 3rd bullet about half way down starting on the right side. It states if the Senate decides to formally vote or recommend for or against the program elimination under consideration the vote should be so on and so forth. My question for clarification centers around if the Senate decides, does the Senate have to vote? Does there need to be a motion made? I don't think the process is clear. Personally I would like to see us vote anytime a program is to be eliminated so I would be in favor of changing the language to include that the Senate will vote to recommend for or against the program and this vote should take into account educational considerations. I just think that it is not clear.

Senator Menees – It is not clear whether the SCC provides any vote on that either.

Motion: Senator Schmidl-Gagne made the motion to table the Program Elimination Guidelines be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We will look at this and bring it back to the next meeting. In the meantime if you have any suggestions please email those to Senator Schmidl-Gagne, Senator Dolenc or myself so we can include that in discussions at the next SEC meeting. We will bring back a revised copy of this to the next Senate meeting.

Motion: The SEC moves that the ISP Task Force Report be accepted into the record of the Senate be approved by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – How will discussion continue on this?

Senator McDonald – We will bring it back to the next meeting.

Vote: Motion carries

VI. New Business

Nothing to report

VII. Adjournment 5:48pm

Minutes
for the 420th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 18th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 4:05
- II. Roll Call
Absent: Senator Stemp and Senator Dolenc, Senator
- III. Secretary's Report
Nothing to report

- IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Stanish – Another announcement from the faculty staff development campaign. You should have received an email for the breakfast which is next Wednesday the 25th from 7:30-9:00am so if you donated to the college this fiscal year you are more than welcome to the breakfast. If you would like to donate between now and then you can still come to the breakfast.

Senator Daley – We are having a carnival from 3:00-9:00pm tomorrow along with Mexican food from 4:00-7:00pm on Appian Way. Everyone is invited to come and join in the festivities.

- V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – Over the past several years we have been keeping verbatim meeting minutes transcribing all conversation. At the end of the meetings Cheryl will transcribe up to thirty pages of minutes and it is actually in Robert's Rules of Order that this is not required. The requirements are standard motions and results of the votes to be required to be recorded. With this we had a request from one of the Dean's that we try to lessen the time that we have Cheryl working on this.

Motion: The SEC moves that the revision to the Senate Minutes format as required within the Robert's Rules of Order be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – I have been giving this a great deal of thought but it strikes me that the more optimal the configuration of the minutes might be somewhere between those two extremes. I think verbatim, is too much and doesn't necessarily capture the intent of what is said as well ironically as paraphrase which I think can be done. I would be hesitant to vote for recording of the vote and reading of the motions because I do think there is discussion that comes before a vote that includes things like one is for one is against and being this is the record of the college Senate's actions on particular things. It is useful for the official record to display some evidence of the depth of the conversation that transpired to get to that vote. I would think a preferred option for me would be some paraphrase of the discussion and if I were to characterize the paraphrase when people talk there should be an indication of the essential points of what those people said. You're not recording everything that was said but if a Senator finds it worth their while to speak at a meeting then there should be a record of what they said at the meeting in the minutes.

Senator Darby – The archiving of voice recordings, I am curious what the quality is of the current recording. This is a very difficult room to record voices in. It is a wonderful room but a disaster of a room to hold a meeting. If we move forward with the motion we might investigate having a better recording system if we are going to archive those recordings. Again, this is a very challenging room to have a meeting in and I assume it is a challenge to record voices in this room – acoustically, this room is a disaster.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think Cheryl could speak best to this but even though we use this to make the transcripts I think the problems that you see in the minutes which are minimal – usually it is a word that could be similar are the problems that we have. I don't think they are excessive the kind of flip floppy words don't change a lot of the substance of

it. Cheryl could probably speak better to that. It is key that people say their names, speak up as best you can and there will be very very minimal issues. These have worked effectively for us. It could be better of course and the quality as I listen to it is as good as speaking. If people could speak up a little louder it would solve a lot of the problem. It is usually because somebody is a little bit softer.

Senator Daly – I have to agree with Senator Welsh on this. I think if we were able to accurately narrow down all of the minutes and Cheryl you may be able to attest to this, do you feel as though you would be able to accurately do that if someone is talking that you would be able to do that and anyone reading the minutes could still have an accurate interpretation of the minutes? Would that be easy enough for you to do?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I think the question would be is it possible to have thirty people agreeing on what essence of the meeting will get into the minutes. If I start to pick and choose the essence of the meetings I believe this would pose another problem.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That is exactly why we went to the transcript of the minutes because we were spending a great deal of time in the Senate with people disagreeing with what the spirit of the conversation was. Cheryl and I have worked together on both extremes, the extreme we are doing now and the middle ground which is just a summary and defaulted too because it actually saved time in Senate to have a transcript and just fixing semantic kinds of things but if we recorded the motions and we already do keep these and are already being archived, we felt that that would save time in the Senate and also save time transcribing.

Senator Martin – I think there are a variety of intermediate steps that should be considered so that we can ascertain in a printed record what the legislative intent is of this legislative body and what the deliberations were prior to a piece of legislation and prior to a non decision. That is important information that we do not want to disappear into a sound archive that would be very difficult to search. We need the capacity to research our own actions especially since the institutional memory of this body tends to be fairly short. In fact there is a motion before the Senate to ensure that there be turnover among at least in faculty members. They are making sure that many members of the Senate don't know what a prior Senate did do and would have no recourse or way in which verbal research legislative intent and deliberations. Here is a proposal, instead of summarizing the gist of a conversation that the recorder engages actively to paraphrase closely everything that is said. I said paraphrase rather than capture verbatim of the speaker.

Provost Netzhammer – I just have to say that capturing verbatim will be a less time consuming process than paraphrasing. That requires basically listening to the whole thing and then writing an acceptable summary. In the same way with our students sitting down and copying out of a textbook is a much easier thing to do than reading what's in the text, making sense of that in a different form. If this is about workload reduction I don't think that solves the issue that the SEC was trying to solve.

Senator Martin – I think the information that we might lose is too important to lose in a verbal archive so I would suggest with the false economy to save on one person's time and then have other Senators have to engage in an extensive search of a two hour meeting in order to ascertain what did get said at said prior meeting that they did not even attend.

Senator Blatchly – Could you speak to how the recordings would be archived? Is it by a meeting block or would it be broken up by motions somehow? The problem I see is searching back for the conversation and having to kind of guess where in the recording the conversation would be or may even have to travel over to someone's office to pull a tape or CD out. I am a little concerned we are going to lose the information that is in here and is the information searchable?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is stored on the Q-drive. It would be accessible anywhere you can get to the Q-drive. It is not the most convenient thing but it would be open to you when you were on campus. It is a folder that is accessible to everyone.

Senator Blatchly – So it is accessible to everyone on campus?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I believe it is but I would have to double check. At least it is the Senate. Everyone on the Senate, at one point it might have been open but that might have been for NEASC. It is just a block so if it is a 2 hour meeting than it is a 2 hour recording. I don't think we have looked into different ways to record it so that it could be marked in different ways but is something we could explore.

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – It is blocked and timed so that it shows hours/minutes/seconds on the recording so let's say a discussion becomes more detailed before or after the motion there could be a spot where you could post the timestamp from the tape, so you could fast forward to say 19 min and 23 sec and that would bring you to that motion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – They are digital files so there is not a CD or something.

Senator Shalit - There is a number of automated recorders with software, Have you looked into any of them?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I researched extensively about halfway through my first year doing this verbatim and came across Dragon. The problem was it will only recognize one person's voice which means I would actually have to repeat everything that was said on the tape so that it could at least take it from my voice. I just don't know how much time that would save and after a number of programs they all seem to work the same way in that regard.

Senator Shalit – Recently?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I believe it was two years ago.

Senator Shalit – Technology has improved

Senator Darby – Maybe the addition of time codes in the minutes as proposed here. The time code posted would help with a search of the files such as when the SEC starts their part of the meeting you could put the time stamp next to their report. A Senator wishing to review would know where to go on the tape.

Senator Martin – Hypothetical question, so somebody has spent several hours searching in an audio archive how does that information get communicated back to the Senate in an informative manner. Let's say I would like to repeat this conversation but there is only an audio archive. It would be nice to be able to cut and paste a text with this and share it with my colleagues. How would I communicate the audio archive?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If we mark it then you should be able to mark the paragraph even more efficiently. Like Cheryl said, if the discussion of a certain motion occurred at 5.05 in the tape and you went there and it was off by a little bit you could find the exact time and share that with the Senators who could also access the audio file and they wouldn't have to do the search that you did if they could move the little scroll bar right to the exact time and begin listening there. What we are saying in the motion is that the audio files become a record of the meeting and that they are the same thing as paper.

Senator Doreski – I don't know the solution to this but we had a recent discussion here in which Senator Welsh raised serious issues about the nature of interdisciplinary courses and the ensuing discussion I think several people touched on really important points. Other people who are not in the Senate read the transcript of this and are really interested in and pursuing these issues. This is the kind of thing that will get lost because it doesn't show up in a motion.

Senator Denehy – Clarification question – The packet that comes out for each meeting, does that get archived? Does that include the ASC report and the SEC report and so on? So we have some record of this meeting.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Yes. What you will find on the Senate website is for the last 7 years for every years worth of Senate meetings are uploaded as one document. It is the entire Senate packet and I believe I also started uploading, since I have been the Secretary, a separate document that is compiled motions of the year. I believe I have put both up there and if I haven't I meant to and I will get to it.

Senator Stevenson - I guess if the audio tape does become the official record of this body I would like to see some provision in there that any Senator at any time can request a written transcription of a particular section should it become necessary and given some reasonable timeframe. You can't request it 4 minutes before a meeting but there should be some way to request a written transcript of sections they want to discuss.

Senator Welsh – This reflects back on several issues that we have discussed in the Senate over the past couple of months and that is certainly good college policy is often at odds with the resources available. To enact that college policy especially in a constrained environment and I think you find yourselves anticipating resource issues as we are thinking

about the policy we should follow and there are times when I think that the resource issues are that its necessary to reconsider available resources and if there are not resources available then find the resources to enact the policy. I think with good written records and I am talking about verbal transcription but good written records the colleges Senate meetings are important and if resources are an issue than we should find the resources to make this possible.

Senator Coleman – I believe Ann Atkinson has some papers in her book marked so I was wondering if she could let us know what her take is from Robert’s Rules about this whole idea. I know that has been a lot of different options but I would like to see what Robert’s Rules suggest.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Robert’s Rules indicate that the Senate runs on action and so it is the actions that the Senate takes so motions and votes are the most critical.

Senator Fleeger – I was wondering if you could share some information on how much time is involved.

Senate Clerk – Cheryl Martin – I can give you a rough estimate. It really depends on the speed of the speaker, the volume of the speaker, the clarity of the speaker, what’s discussed and if there are breaks between the discussions. What I find is a one hour meeting averages ten hours of transcription. The reason for this is because I transcribe from the tape into the shorthand that I take during the meetings. Where there is so much discussion, I want to make sure that what I typed is what I heard so I listen to the tape again. After that I proofread and align text and then send it to Kim for proof reading. Before it actually gets into the minutes it has been touched five or more times.

Senator Fleeger – So ten hours for every hour of meeting?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – Yes, estimating, obviously at the beginning of the meeting where there is the roll call or the Secretary’s report it’s much quicker it’s when it gets into in depth a discussion that’s where it takes a lot of time. Again, it depends on the volume of the speaker it depends on the speed of the speaker. There are some people that when they speak I actually have to download their voice into another program all together to slow it down because I can’t listen and type verbatim that fast. That is where it is time consuming.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – After Cheryl is done with it I usually spend another 2-4 hours with it and then it goes back to Cheryl to track the changes on and she double checks what I have checked before it gets into your hands and there are still errors.

Senator Fleeger – Thank you, it is important to know what type of time issues are involved here.

Senator McDonald – We are at the end of our 15min discussion, is there a motion to continue with this discussion?

Motion: The SEC moves that discussion continue on Senate Minutes format on the above motion.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish – There does seem to be a feeling that a written record or at least some sort of written record is important. I was going to say that it seems we ought to stick with the verbatim record until the Senate Clerk let us know what is involved. I had no idea the amount of time that is involved in this. I am thinking about some of the middle ground that have been proposed, in theory I think having a summary is a good one except that puts a burden on someone to come up with that summary and then we end up debating that summary. I don’t think anyone in the room would ever fall into this but it does give someone power to put their own interpretation in the summary that and I don’t think we want to open that door at all. I actually like Senator Stevenson’s compromise that any Senator or maybe open it to any campus community member that requests a transcript of a particular motion that way as an example that Senator Doeski gave in the interdisciplinary discussion we could have requested that transcript. The Senate Clerk could only do the pieces that are requested and therefore put a compromise on this.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If the Senators want to make what I think is a friendly amendment that is fine however we pull it off.

Senator Stevenson –

Motion: Senator Stevenson moves to include the ability for any member of the Keene State community to request a written transcript of any particular motion to the above motion be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – This transcript, would that then become a more detailed version of the minutes?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It would be what you currently get for that motion.

Senator Welsh - A current practice at each following meeting is the opportunity to review and correct the minutes. It strikes me that before this written transcript became a document and distributed and considered an official record as the minutes are that I think they would require the review of and approval of as we do the minutes.

Senator Blatchly – If I heard the amendment correctly it extends the privilege to the campus community which I support. I think that gives us an obligation then to make those recordings available to the campus community so that technical problem is a foul line. I don't think we need to add that to the motion but it does have that implication that we should recognize and move towards a technical solution.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That is not a problem. The Q-drive folder can be assessable to the GAL if we like to use that term.

Provost Netzhammer – I think with the overhaul of the Web site happening over the next several months the opportunity to even post the audio files on the Senate Web site will be available. I think the spirit of this whole discussion is that if we are going to go to an audio recording as the record of the meetings we want the widely available to people. I think taking them out of the Q-drive and putting them into a place where people can access them without needing permission makes a lot of sense.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think I can do that now because it can accept media. I would have to play with it a little bit.

Senator Stanish – I was going to ask if Senator Welsh's point of approval of any written transcript would be a friendly amendment to the amendment for or is it already in the amendment.

Provost Netzhammer – Point of order, I don't think there is anything necessarily done. He is right in his observation that a transcript would need to be approved.

Senator Martin – I really hesitate to add reservations but I have taken minutes for a variety of different meeting over several years and Cheryl's experience as summarized here is comparable my personal experience as well. I am speaking with sympathy of the real difficulty of this. Is it possible for us to consider that the very specific skill of creating a transcript isn't a skill that exist on this campus and that would be contracted out for the very limited purpose of the 2 hour meetings that we have for this body and have the transcriptionist which would be fast and at less cost to the institution than the existing application. Could we study that?

Provost Netzhammer – Point of order, we are talking to the amendment and not the motion.

Senator McDonald – On the amendment is there any other conversation?

Senator Shalit – What are we talking about if we just record the actions?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – If we just record the motions, votes and roll call I could probably get most of it done during the meeting and then it would be just cleaned up after.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I actually currently do that so Cheryl would not need to do it at all. As we vote on the motions by the time the meeting finishes up I forward the motions and the attendance to both the Provost and Cheryl, so it's done.

Senator McDonald – I would ask that we return to our amendment. After the amendment we can go back to the discussion on the motion.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We are now back to the discussion on the motion.

Senator Denehy – To Senator Martin – I am not sure that is necessary I listen to the NH Legislative State House and there are times when I look at the journal of how the House is done and I want to listen to something I just start jumping through the audio. I don't think it is necessary for us to do a transcription when the ability is possible under the audio.

Senator McDonald – Any other questions or comments?

Vote: Motion carries as amended

Senator McDonald – We now move forward with the SEC report.

Motion: The SEC moves to eliminate the Academic Overview Committee (AOC) from the Senate, effective July 1, 2013. Furthermore, all references to the AOC are to be stricken from the By-Laws on or about July 1, 2013, including the following passage.

D. The Academic Overview Committee (AOC) shall be responsible for establishing the process for, and the reviewing of, all curricular programs (those that offer majors, minors, certificates, graduate programs or other academic courses) on a periodic (not more than 10 years) basis. The committee shall be comprised of 13 members of the Keene State College community drawn from the following constituencies:

- Seven members of the Senate (one of the seven must be a student)
- Three non-Senate faculty members (one from each school)
- One non-Senate PAT member (as selected/appointed by that group)
- One non-Senate Student (as selected/appointed by that group)
- One non-Senate member of the campus community designated by the Provost

All members of the AOC shall have full voting rights within the AOC; however, only the seven Senators shall vote in the Senate. The AOC should appoint a Chair and a Vice Chair who serve staggered, two year terms. The Chair and Vice Chair must be members of the Senate. The Chair will oversee the program review process, lead the committee and report to the Senate. The Vice Chair shall assist the Chair and serve as Chair as necessary. If a senator wishes for the Senate to discuss and/or amend a document (such as the review calendar or guidelines) created by the AOC, a motion and second are require

All programs on the calendar for review during 2012-2013, with the exception of ISP shall go forward with the standard review process.

The SEC requests that the Provost provide the 2012-2013 SEC with an outline for an administrative program review process no later than June 1, 2012.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – Under review of non credit programs the Dean will work with the department to begin the process but there doesn't seem to be a role in getting the Dean in the process of accredited programs, is that correct?

Provost Netzhammer – You are referring to the document that Senator Blatchly commented on? That is correct, for accredited programs generally that process starts as a relationship between the accrediting agency and the department.

Senator Doreski – What on earth is netted data, literally it would be data about data.

Senator Blatchly – That is what it is. Netted data is just a little bit further detail on data so it is kind of like tags that are put on things that are sort of they are faster defined in a specific format so they go into a data base in particular place and are easier to find. So they would have descriptions on the report, the author the kinds of things you would find in a card catalog.

Senator Stanish – I appreciate that the Provost put together the sort of draft of what may happen for this administrative function and we are not actually voting on the draft. We are just voting on the proposal to eliminate the AOC. I think it is important that the Dean is very involved in self study. My suggestion is with having the Dean being in the process in the department, on one hand that makes a lot of sense the Dean's are very in touch with departments but one of the benefits of having the AOC is that it is a committee across campus so that departments in different schools are all sort of given the same time limit to work on it, all processes work in the same way and everyone plays with the same ground rules. If you leave it up to the Dean's it will it be different depending on how they interpret it. Will they all start a timeline in the same way? I would love to see something involving the Provost's office where it crosses all schools and the Dean's taking it from there. It is just a suggestion.

Senator Blatchly – I think it is pretty remarkable that we were able to ask the Provost last week for a draft of some procedural material and we got it essentially by Sunday in my hands to take a look at and further the conversation. I think that is very responsive and applaud the effort. It is pretty clear that he spent some time thinking about this and I have tried to spend some time over a few hours thinking as deeply as I could about how to put together a process or procedure. I am little concerned that we are going too fast even still. One thing that occurred to me just in the last day or so is that have got nothing in the revised proposal for any sent review with discussion of the procedures by which were produced would be handled. If you look at the AOC procedures you will realize they are fairly detailed and anyone who has been on that committee in the last couple of years there is a lot of stuff in there. What needs to be part of the review, how the reviews are handled, how the external reviewers are chosen? There is a lot of stuff that could potentially affect the outcome of the review and that is not really part of the revision that we have. It seems like we are jumping ahead a little bit. I am not sure why we need to jump into this as quickly as it is purposed. I notice there a couple of people who are worried that it is not going to happen and I can understand that concern. Given some of the valid points about comparative institutions that function this way, I think it is a very reasonable thing to consider replacing the Senate roll in the AOC with something that is a little bit smaller but this is a time in which we have control over the procedures by which this review is done. It seems to me that until we have the ability to see what the replacement is it is a little bit premature and really doesn't treat the AOC in the context of the whole Senate Curriculum Committee structure. I would urge that we look at the whole package.

Provost Netzhammer – Thank you for your comments. I think that as we have thought about this that this isn't supposed to be the perfect plan and would not be the ultimate version of what we would use. I think as Senator Blatchly and I were talking about one thing that does concern us both is what is the faculty and staff voice in this process. It is clearly not described in the draft and I think if you take a number of different formats, for example, in some institutions a faculty member at our institution could be a faculty member on the Senate would be an internal member of the site team that visits the departments. This means that someone on the Senate would have access to the self study right at the beginning and serve as an evaluator of the program and could really participate in those deliberations. In some way it would provide a richness that we might not even get today in the way that we do this process. My sense and you know I never vote and the fact that we came together as the SEC around this issue is that the idea behind this proposal is a strong one that every member of the SEC supported and that the details of what this new process would look like would involve consultation with the Senate.

Senator Darby – I have a question about Senator Blatchly's response under external review under column 3. An additional quote to accreditors make necessary that outside this review process can a response to the accreditors still be entered into the record or would that still be submitted as part of this process even though it is not necessary. The program response to the accreditors report is a very important document and I would assume that would be entered into consideration.

Provost Netzhammer – Yes, from my perspective the intent of what we are talking about absolutely. If I could just elaborate, the reason you see Senator Blatchly's comments in blue is because there is other language in this document in which he and I agree. I don't think we were Seeing Eye to eye on what happens with accredited programs and it might be helpful for us to articulate that in this forum. My own sense was that the accrediting process for our accredited programs is as rigorous as our internal programs and the need for saying this is not particularly there we go to an administrative process rather than the AOC process. My own sense in writing this was that it is already rigorous enough for our accredited programs to go through that process. To then create another step for them to draft a self study based on that seemed, in my view, to be superfluous and unnecessary. As you can tell from the material in blue Senator Blatchly has a very different perspective on that.

Senator Denehy – Is this a special document that I received?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I sent it last night to the full Senate. It was separate from the minutes.

Senator Blatchly – First of all it is important to realize that these are not yet official procedures. We are still talking about a draft so that may cut the tension down a bit. I think when I have a conversation about the accreditation standards it is important to note that no one is arguing about the rigor of an accreditation process. They are very rigorous; the argument is more about the fit between the program review process and the accreditation material. I can talk about it from a Chemistry point of view and I am hoping we will be accredited in the next 6 months or so. The accreditation process does not look at all of the courses that we provide support for example the Professional and Graduate Studies. They do not look at the qualifications of the faculty; they do not look at the way the courses are treated or what the assessment process is. It is just outside the purview so any college wide support submission is typically not part of an accreditation process. As we talked about this that was the reason why we lean very much towards asking the accredited programs at the very least provide us with some of the accreditation documents. We also have had to deal with accreditation documents that have 600 files in them and it was difficult to navigate so we are hoping to find some sort of middle ground. It is not an extreme process but that it would be pretty typically handcrafted for an accredited program and people would sit down and try to find some way to make the most efficient path of getting a reasonable package.

Senator McDonald – Any other questions or comments? Keep in mind that this is a bylaw change and will take a majority vote to pass.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – Continuing with the SEC report;

Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate adopt the “Time to Graduation Waiver” form

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves to eliminate all term limits from the By-Laws effective immediately

Senator McDonald – I must point out that this was not presented in written form at last week’s meeting. It can be presented today but the only way this can pass is by unanimous vote of the Senate. I do want to point out that this does not benefit me because even though I am at the end of my term limit I am not running for any open seats on the Senate for next year. I just feel that if we have people that want to volunteer on the Senate then they should be able to and not have term limits. If you do not want that person on the Senate then you would not vote them in.

Senator Stanish – If we do approve this bylaw change by eliminating term limits then would we no longer need to vote on separate bylaw changes in article 3 section G where we were changing “no elective member of the Senate shall serve more than 6 consecutive years of an elected faculty member of the Senate.

Senator McDonald – That would supersede that. By the way the Article 3 was given in writing last week and I kept this separate because it was not given in writing.

Senator Blatchly – Does anyone know why the term limits were imposed?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – My understanding is that there used to be a great deal of competition for seats on the Senate. It was also a way to make sure that there was turnover and people had opportunity.

Senator McDonald – When I first ran for the Senate about 21 years ago we actually had to campaign in front of an assembly of faculty.

Senator Denehy – Since this has to be a unanimous vote my understanding is abstention is not a unanimous vote. So if someone abstains it is not unanimous.

Senator McDonald – Correct.

Senator Martin – I would like to speak in favor of the motion because my study of governance since 1969 strongly suggest and I think there is a literature and people could disagree with me says exist that it is antidemocratic to have term limits. If

people want to be represented by somebody an arbitrary limit on their capacity to be represented by that person places an obstacle that prevents them from having the person they want. I will be voting in favor of this because I would like to ensure that people are being represented by the representatives that they choose rather than the ones that they are forced to accept as a result of an arbitrary term limit. The antidemocratic piece is also complimented nicely by the development of institutional memory. I think with a great deal of turnover on a body it becomes very difficult to develop expertise and knowledge of both the business and the history of that body. I believe the development of institutional memory will be served by this amendment.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – The SEC did discuss the grading policy and was tabled until next year. Some people did ask that this be moved forward and we discuss that and we determined that we did not want undercut the motion of the Standards committee and bring that to the table. This will return to the Senate next year for discussion. We now move to all of the other bylaw changes that we have. Senator Schmidl-Gagne sent out a request last week to see if any of these needed to be brought up for discussion. It turns out someone wanted every one of these brought up for discussion. We are going to go through each of these and bring them up one by one to discuss except the ones that by previous votes have already been passed.

Motion: The SEC moves to remove any remaining "gendered" language from the bylaws to be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Denehy – I support the idea of the motion however I don't believe we can put an open change to the bylaws. My understanding is that we would have to have a list of each item that would be changed.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – When Parliamentarian Atkinson and I spoke, this was actually something that we voted on last year as well and in my review of the bylaws I missed one section at the very end when I updated it. A similar motion came forward last year and it wasn't a list of all the places that the language needed to be changed it was intent to. Because these are all administrative changes and not substantive Parliamentarian Atkinson said that was an ok way to do it. I did not want to change more language in the bylaws without having the Senate know that that was happening but I did find a section that I missed in my original review of the bylaws. That's why it appears the way it is and in a very technical sense I suppose I could just change them because we already have the approval from last year to do that but that wasn't what I had wanted to do. I wanted to make sure that people knew more words needed to be changed.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves to Article IV, B: Remove "and shall (with the assistance of the Secretary) submit a year-end report to the President of the College. This year-end report shall include a chronological list of Senate legislation for the past academic year and is due no later than one week after Commencement."

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just for clarity this is in the Vice Chairs job description and since the Secretary already does what the Vice Chair has been charged to do in the job description, you will see that the Secretary job description would more accurately reflect that I do that anyways and that the Vice Chair doesn't do it so it is just a swap of who does what because it is already happening in a certain way. For example, I did it all and forwarded it to Pete and that just seems to be an extra step in the process.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article IV, C: Add "The Secretary shall submit a year-end report to the President of the College. This year-end report shall include a chronological list of Senate legislation for the past academic year and is due no later than one week after Commencement" be accepted by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article V, A: Add "If a Senate agenda does not include motions to be voted on, it is the purview of the Senate Chair to determine, after consultation with the members of the SEC and other Committee Chairs, to propose an online motion and vote to cancel a meeting" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – It sounds wonderful to me but I just want clarification. The online motion and vote, would that be among the entire Senate?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Last year's bylaws included in it how to do an online vote and it is the entire Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article V, A: Remove "Three (3) such absences from any one of the above groups of the Senate shall." Replace with "Three (3) such unexcused absences from any one of the above groups of the Senate or Senate Meetings shall" be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Sapeta – Is this for 3 absences per year?

Senator McDonald – Per year.

Senator Stanish – I am wondering if we have or do we need a definition of unexcused. Who does the excusing? Is it the Senate Chair? What does excused mean?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – They are in the Senate bylaws.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Article V, A: Remove "upon notification by its chair, require an appearance by the senator before a regularly scheduled meeting of the Executive Committee." Replace with "upon notification by its chair and/or the Secretary of the Senate, be removed from the Senate and/or committee" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Let me explain, in the bylaws there currently exists a statement that if the Chair of the SEC is informed that a person has missed 3 meetings it says they come before the SEC. It doesn't say what the SEC does; it doesn't say there is any sort of review process so it wasn't clear. It seemed that as opposed to something in there that we could say that there are just 3 unexcused absences and it is very easy to get excused absences that someone would no longer serve on the Senate.

Senator Blatchly – Could you remind me what the *it's* refers to. Is that the SEC or the actual committee where the absences are taking place?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It refers to actually the motion above; any 3 meetings of the Senate or their standing committee.

Senator Blatchly – It says *it's* chair. What is the *it*?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is the standing committee's Chair.

Senator Stevenson – Are they called before the committee and they say see ya?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There is no clarification of when you get called before the SEC what would happen. It just said you would get called before the SEC.

Senator Stevenson – So now it is just see ya.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Now it is just see ya

Senator Stevenson – This now expands the power of the role of the Chair of the Senate and to the Secretary?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The notification.

Senator Stevenson – I am not entirely sure of the Chair saying see ya.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It doesn't need to be. If there are 3 absences you are done.

Senator McDonald – 3 unexcused absences.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – 3 unexcused absences you are done.

Senator Stevenson – There is no due process?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If we do what say and say what we do – we can change this, the thing that was there that sort of bothered me was that if you got called before the SEC and there was nothing that said what happened. I don't know do we go into some sort of room that the lights are off? I tried to create something that was clear and unambiguous. We can do whatever folks want but I don't think we can just call folks to the SEC.

Senator Welsh – Is this because of this year's Senate and someone was removed from the Senate because of a string of absences?

Senator Menees – Yes, a string of absences did occur this year.

Senator Welsh – Was that Senator removed?

Senator Menees – Yes

Senator Welsh – It seems like that part of the system worked.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Nobody came before the SEC.

Senator Menees – I don't know if they went before the SEC but I never saw them.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – So they just never ever appeared. There was no official action taken they just never were here.

Senator Menees – They were momentarily heard from in an email, after that never heard from them.

Senator Welsh – You keep using the pronoun they, were they asked to come before the Chair of the Senate?

Senator McDonald – Nobody reported to the SEC that I am aware of.

Senator Menees – Yes you did. You said it was ok to remove them and we already had a new Senator that was on the floor.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It could be that some of the students took care of that problem on their own.

Senator Blatchly – I love the irony of requiring someone who can't show up for meetings to show up before the SEC but I think I share Senator Stevenson's concern for due process and not have a Chair just decide on someone who is absent. It seems from this bylaw that there is no recourse for the Senator to show up and say look I really did show up, this person that disagrees with me is trying to remove me from the committee. If we are going to change the bylaws it is not unreasonable to specify the expected outcome but also to add a little bit of due process, give them the opportunity to petition to the SEC. That is not in here so I am a little concerned about it. It seems like the process was working.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I don't think there was a process. Maybe we should leave this one and move onto a different one so we can work on something. We can vote this down and revisit it in the fall.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: Article VI, F: Remove "In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals." Replace with "It is within the purview of the chair of the SCC to bundle courses and curriculum packages into motions as they feel is appropriate. In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – Which should be that?

Senator Welsh – A technical question, *may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies*, which implies that the Curriculum committee will be presenting Standards motions and I am not sure what the presentation of standards policy would be appropriate from the Curriculum committee. This implies that Standards passed these and then they are presented as one. I am not sure I understand that sequence. A general concern, I think this is a motion in which is likely to lead to the bundling of proposals in a more expedited way. It puts the burden on an individual Senator to get a majority vote of the rest of the Senate to vote to discuss specific issues if they are bundled. I think that is less appropriate than a delivered body such as ours than an opposite attachment would need for a motion to be made to bundle an array of classes within the proposals. That motion is a deliberate choice by the body of the Senate to not have discussion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There is language that allows a Senator to unbundle it once it comes to the Senate.

Senator Welsh – My concern is that it comes bundled and becomes the responsibility of a Senator or a small group of Senators to convince the rest who may not approve the entirety of the packet. The opposite way is more conducive to make available for discussion.

Provost Netzhammer – To your first point, I think that was the idea. We have had so many conversations at the Senate where either the ASC saying, well we are getting ahead of Curriculum Committee or we will be later. We wanted to create an opportunity where the SCC and the ASC could come forward so that those issues of Standards and Curriculum could be considered at one time rather than at very different parts of a Senate meeting.

Senator Welsh – I do understand the desire to do this but it strikes me that the language here looks as if the SCC is making the proposal, a motion for the ASC. I am not sure if that is appropriate or how we authorize the SCC to unblend one of our motions. It is not clear in this language.

Senator Stanish – I share Senator Welsh's concern about sequencing of when the standards policies are looked at versus the curriculum, proposals. The way this motion is written currently it does seem to put the responsibility on the SCC Chair to sort out what are Standards motions and what are not. I think this year that people from the ASC were saying that it doesn't have to be the SCC Chairs job. It seems the two Chairs working together is a better process and then if the Chairs agree to unbundle the proposals then that makes some sense. It seems to me that we need slightly different wording here that might make more sense.

Senator Denehy – We have the same issue in a later motion where those of the ASC being allowed to bundle SCC items. I understand the intent but it seems we should at least look for language that is clearer that says the idea that when there are proposals that have gone to different committees that come to the Senate at the same time. The intent is good but this language does not achieve that intent and could create confusion between committees.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VI, J, 2: Remove "Section J, 6." Replace with "Section J, 8" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is another administrative change that I didn't catch but again didn't want to alter anything in the bylaws without folks realizing I was doing it.

Senator Welsh – When I download the bylaws I see it already says J8.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I don't know what happened then. The fact of the matter is we are moving the AOC and all of that probably scrambled everything. It is quite possible that other things will change so we can leave that one alone. We can vote it down and move on.

Senator Martin – When it says remove section J,6, is the effort to remove the entire section with its code or just the letters.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just the article. I thought it was inaccurately sending you to J6 when it should have sent you to J8. I don't have it open in front of me and I have forgotten my hard copy.

Senator Blatchly – It's already there.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I don't get how that happened but great. It says two informational reports send you to J6 and I believe you want to go to J8 – the 48hour rule. We wanted to change from J6 to J8 to send you to the right section. That's all.

Senator Martin – It says J2.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I meant J2. I suppose you have different versions of the bylaws than I do but it does need to be updated.

Vote: Motion carries.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VI, L: Remove "All policies, resolutions and recommendations formally adopted by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Chair of the Senate to the President of the College." Replace with "All policies, resolutions and recommendations formally adopted by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the President of the College or designee" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Currently as I said earlier I forward all motions voted on to the Provost who talks with the President I am sure so that is why it changes to Secretary and changed to President or designee.

Senator Stanish – I am fine with this but just had a question if it made sense to replace President with the Provost because that is our practice.

Provost Netzhammer – I think it is President or designee. I think there are some issues that the Senate has dealt with that the President has wanted to keep as her own but when they are curriculum she has designated me to handle it. I think this policy that we have used though has been much more efficient. Approvals are coming out to a wider distribution lists and a more responsive way and I think this reflects what we are doing and the practice over the last 2 years that we have been doing it this way has really been beneficial to the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries.

Senator McDonald – On the next item change I am speaking for members of certain committees and it does in fact effect people or more likely a person on that committee and that person was not notified in advance of this change. Generally I catch anything but I didn't catch that. It was not intentional.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII, B: Remove "The Registrar shall serve as an ex-officio member." The SEC requests that the SCC review their guidelines and revise to include an "administrative review" of proposals. This review would be designed to ensure that all prerequisites and policies are accurately reflected in the curriculum and course proposals be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Denehy – It doesn't make sense to me that the Registrar who is the person responsible for overseeing the college curricular policy implementation would be removed from this committee. What I am proposing is to get an explanation as to why this Senate suggested it.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – This is interesting it was on the list of bylaw revisions from the fall that we started collecting. I can't point out who suggested it so to answer that part of the question, I do not know. It came and I have been keeping a log and I apologize but I do not have that information. My understanding was the suggestion was that it focuses the SCC on curriculum and not on policy.

Senator Denehy – This is a curriculum committee on curriculum is a bad thing?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – No if we remove the Registrar it will cause the SCC to concentrate on curriculum. That was the rationale that was provided.

Senator Darby – I have a problem with this particular proposal in changing the bylaws and not quite sure what the problem is. I am not sure with the administrative review which is in quotation marks within quotation marks what that entails. I am also a little bit of agreement with Senator Denehy about the role of the Registrar at the point of the SCC's deliberations. In short it's helpful because there is turnover in that committee and the Registrar does provide an institutional memory which does help in my opinion guide the members of that committee toward better decisions. I am also a little bit concerned that an administrative review, where does this review happen? Does it happen at a point prior to the SCC? Does it happen afterwards? The answer is afterwards. I think this change would have the opposite effect of a transparent process that I do feel that we have. I am also a little concerned about the inefficiencies of this change. In effect if the SCC reviews something and keep it in mind that the SCC is populated with faculty and students who are specialists in their area but they may not be specialists in adhering to complex curricular policy. The Registrar in my opinion has provided that guidance. As a faculty member unless someone can produce evidence to me I don't see the Registrar's place at that table as an imposition on faculty control of the curriculum. The Registrar is Ex-Officio and in my observation the Registrar does provide guidance to the faculty and students who are on that committee. I am a little miffed at the inefficiencies if the point of review is post SCC. I imagine a flurry of emails and repeated visits by sponsors of programs even greater than what it is now.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The SEC added the SCC the request for administrative review. I think our thought was that it would happen before the SCC received a curriculum packet but we are going to leave it up to the SCC to write the guidelines that worked for the SCC around what that review process would be and what the timing of it would be. In my own mind that is before that they got it but I don't think we wanted to legislate to the SCC how that would happen. I would guess that that makes more sense. So it would go through its process then hit the Registrar to identify any issues but again we wanted to leave it to the SCC to help identify guidelines.

Senator Stanish – Without really serving on the SCC but in the current guidelines for the SCC it shows the Registrar as serving as the Ex-Officio and I have served on different committees where Ex-Officio means different things and I don't know if I know what the definition for Ex-Officio means here. Does the Registrar have a vote in the SCC? What is the role of the Registrar?

Senator McDonald – No vote

Senator Doreski – I have served on the SCC for many years and Chaired the SCC for a while and I have some institutional memory and remember a previous version of the controversy over the Registrar's role. For a while the Registrar did not sit on the SCC and it created a lot of problems. No faculty member has the overview of the curriculum that the Registrar has. That is just a fact of life. We ended up having to go to the Registrar and lot of back and forth that delayed some curriculum proposals. It just created more problems than what it was worth. I think having the Registrar there at the SCC meetings saves a lot of time and trouble and does not interfere in my opinion in open and frank discussion. I don't see this as a problem at all and I am really opposed to the notion of putting an administrative review in the middle of a curricular review process. I think that could act as a negative filter and I think the SCC should be as much of a faculty process as possible. Certainly it is an administrative review prior to the process and the Dean is involved at the beginning of the process so I don't see the need to mess with something that seems to be working rather well.

Senator Peters - I am part of the SCC and I think it is important to have the Registrar there not only because he knows about the curricular and says a lot concerning the students that even though I am a student I don't know. I would also be against it.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII, B: Remove "This includes working with the School Curriculum Committees and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools." Replace with "This includes working with the School Curriculum Committees, the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools" be approved by the Senate.

Provost Netzhammer – Please make the editorial change of Integrative Studies.

Senator Stevenson – It appears this would legitimize the Interdisciplinary Studies committee in the bylaws. I would like to know where and when Interdisciplinary Studies committee was created and how they got the power they did because there is no reference to such a committee in the original ISP.

Senator Stanish – I do not recall but going to make a guess and see if it triggers someone's memory. I was on the Senate when the original Integrative Studies program was here and I agree with Senator Stevenson that there was no mention of any subcommittees that we currently deal with at that time. However the Integrative Studies Program Committee also looked very different at that time. I seem to recall during the time I was off the Senate there was a proposal made by the Integrative Studies Committee to divide into the Integrative Studies Council and the Integrative Studies Advisory Board and I am wondering if in that proposal there was something with definitions of subcommittees.

Provost Netzhammer – Your recollection is correct but I do not know the document well enough with accuracy about the subcommittees.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I have them pulled aside because you so often need them. If you give me a minute I can look because I moved them all into a folder so I know where they are. Is that helpful?

Senator Welsh – What are we looking for, Senate approval for the reconfiguration of committees?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It sounds like Senator Stevenson was asking how this got created. Is that accurate?

Senator Stevenson – Correct, my concern is legitimate existence of the subcommittees.

Senator Darby – Is the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee the committee responsible for the approval of II courses?

Senator Stanish – My point was I am wondering if when that restructure was approved by the Senate of the Integrative Studies Program Committee, part of that approval was the creation of these other subcommittees.

Senator Darby – Senator Stevenson's point is well taken however as I read this, this was in effect to bring into line in essence the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee because I think with my experience in the SCC we have had some challenges around some of the II proposals and some confusion about those proposals that may have been alleviated with better communication of that committee. This is how I interpreted this was to help charge the SCC with maybe to facilitate better communication with that committee.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – In the motion of the 386th meeting of the Senate, Professor Nielson advised on the correction in the chart of the proposed composition column are as follows; sixth row down and eight row down in a mention of the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee so I need to go back to 2008-2009.

Senator Blatchly – I guess this raises the question of what we are referring to in this motion. Do we know for certain whom the Chair of this Subcommittee is? What the membership is? We are referring to something in a motion and it would be good to know who this committee is.

Senator Doreski – I wonder if this is the committee or if this is still a subcommittee of the ISP, the one that is chaired by Mike Antonucci. If so, this seems elevated from being part of the ISP and a separate entity.

Senator Welsh – I wonder if this raises significant issues that we are having trouble answer right now at this meeting and there for it might be worthwhile to table this motion.

Provost Netzhammer – I would support that. I think this whole discussion could take place in the context of the ISP task force report or the organizational structure that we put in place for the ISP and try to pick off this piece when we are all struggling and trying to figure out what we are talking about doesn't make a lot of sense.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC move that Article VII, B: Add "In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – What is different with this?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – This is language in a different part of the bylaws. If we approve one, we could approve the other. That is all with this one. I think the next one is a little bit different.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC move that Article VII, C: Add "If a standards package includes curricular changes, these changes shall be forwarded to the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee. In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If we do not want to approve this, this is two things in here. There was the SCC in the bylaws already has the ability to bundle a curriculum package however they like, so part of this was meant so that the ASC could do something similar. Maybe it just all needs to wait.

Senator Welsh – I was considering that this seems similar to the other motion again.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is but there is a subtle difference about the SCC can bundle anything they want and the ASC can't. The SCC can put together a curriculum package together as one motion, if there were policies that you wanted to put forward as one motion that is part of this. If we vote this whole thing down at some point we might want to revisit the ASC allowed to bring forward policies that go together, together. Does that make sense?

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII D: Delete, motion to include the timeline of the end of the spring 2013 semester be accepted by the Senate.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VIII, B: Remove "All of these constituencies must notify the Senate Vice Chair and Senate Clerk of the results immediately upon conclusion of the election. Replace with "All of these constituencies must notify the Senate Vice Chair and Senate Secretary of the results immediately upon conclusion of the election" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Martin - I cannot find this in my copy of bylaws. I am looking at the ones that are currently available on the website and they say revised 1/20/10, is there a version of our bylaws on the website that more recently.....

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Yes, there is. Somehow or another there is still an active link to an old Senate website. If you can find that link and email it to me I would appreciate it. We need to get rid of that link. There is a new Senate website and I can't figure out what that link is that people sometimes find so if you can I would like that. There were approved bylaw changes made May 1st of last year in 2011. I apologize

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – That concludes the report of the SEC and we have reached 6:00pm and we still have the AOC report.

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that the Senate extended past the 6:00pm meeting deadline be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Parliamentarian Atkinson – That is supposed to be a ballot vote

Motion: Senator Denehy moves that the Senate suspend the rules and take a hand vote to extend the Senate meeting be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that the Senate extended past the 6:00pm meeting deadline be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion to extend the meeting carries

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly – We have only one order of business here and would like to present for you the review of the Mathematics Program and I will make a motion and ask Senator Harfenist to give a very brief summary of the material.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Math Program and the response from the department be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Harfenist - Keene State College (KSC) has offered courses in mathematics since its inception as the Keene Normal School in 1909 for the training of prospective teachers. Mathematics grew to become a major area of concentration by the time that the newly named Keene Teachers College began offering the Bachelor of Education degree in 1939. Mathematics became a major and minor concentration option for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees soon after 1963, when the school adopted its present name. The Mathematics Department grew along with the College as it began to expand its mission beyond educating teachers and presently offers two major concentrations, Mathematics and Mathematics Education for Elementary Teachers. The latter concentration offers three potential options; mathematics, secondary teaching and middle/junior high teaching. It additionally offers minors in Mathematics and Statistics. In conjunction with the Computer Science Department, a Computer Mathematics Major is offered as well as a Mathematics-Physics Major in conjunction with the Physics Department. At present, the Mathematics Department makes a fundamental contribution to the Integrative Studies Program by offering a college-wide foundational quantitative experience, IQL 101 (Quantitative Literacy), an interdisciplinary, theme-based course. The Department has one of its tenure-track and many of its adjunct faculty develop and teach sections of the course, with several tenure-track faculty involved in the assessment of IQL 101 sections. Two new full-time tenure-track (FTTT) faculty have been hired since the last program review in 2000-2001 and none have left since then, but two positions were lost in 1999 and 2000, so that has left the Department with eight FTTT positions.

Recommendations:

Curriculum

1. The external reviewers addressed the issue of breadth vs. depth in terms of the courses offered to students. They suggested that picking topics that deliberately build on previous courses would produce the effect of having a yearlong

sequence. It should be acknowledged that this is a difficult issue given limitations on the number of courses that students can realistically take and given that such a move would limit, to some extent, the breadth of the students' knowledge.

2. The external reviewers recommend that the department needs to better coordinate its 100-level multi-section statistic and pre-calculus courses in terms of the technology and textbook that students are expected to use. This consistency would create a more unified experience for the students and instructors and would more effectively support those students who work in the Math center and are currently expected to deal with multiple technologies and multiple texts for the same course.
3. Both the self-study and the external reviewers recommended that the department needs to work with Computer Science and Physics in assessing and possibly revising the joint programs so that they remain current. More generally, through increased collaboration across campus, the Math Department can be more proactive in making other departments aware of the benefits to some of their students in taking certain Math courses.
4. The external reviewers recommend that the 3+2 program would perhaps do well to replace 4 credits of physics elective with 4 credits of a Math elective such as MATH 361: Differential Equations. Since the department expressed a willingness and desire to be an active part of the engineering preparation program, they should consider pursuing this sort of idea.

Faculty

5. Both the self-study and the external reviewers recommend making the addition of a statistician to the Math department a priority in any upcoming planning. The self-study provided a well-conceived rationale for this important recommendation though neither the department nor external reviewers listed this as an urgent priority
6. As reflected in the self-study, at the time of the last program review the Mathematics Department had no consensus on standards for promotion and tenure. In particular, the department was deeply divided on standards in the area of scholarship and related professional activity. Recently, however, agreement on departmental P&T was reached. The self study goes on to say that the varied professional interests and activities, teaching styles, and areas of expertise of Department faculty are strengths that greatly enhance the ability of the Math department to deliver a quality curriculum to a wide range of students. The faculty hope to do a better job of recognizing the value of each others' contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service, even though they may be different from their own.

Adjuncts

7. The external reviewers recommended that the adjuncts should be reviewed and given professional feedback on a regular basis.

Student Experience

8. The external reviewers found some indication in the self study that there is a lower expectation for Math minors, as evidenced by the statement "Students completing the Math Minor are expected to achieve these same competencies, though not at the same level as students completing the major." Their recommendation was that as a general rule it is important for all students to be judged equally and action should be taken if this statement suggests that major and non-major students are judged by different standards.
9. While student advising is generally a Department strength, the self study recommends developing an advising checklist for faculty that would assist advisors in better monitoring advisee progress, help students do better long-range planning, and provide intervention strategies for students who are not meeting program expectations.

ISP

10. The self-study shows that while responsibility for the delivery and coordination of IQL 101 exists outside the Mathematics department through the ISP structure – a configuration the department agrees with -- the department still has more to offer IQL 101 than it can currently make available. The recommendation is for the Department to consult with, among others, the IQL 101 Coordinator to determine what would be helpful and feasible (especially as determined from IQL 101 pre/post test data and feedback from IQL 101 faculty), articulate a plan, and then follow through on implementing the plan. For example, the external reviewers recommended that the department work with the IQL director

to create a course format that involves a semester-long project. This would mirror the ITW courses and would help alleviate concerns about there not being enough “Q” in the IQL courses.

Assessment

11. The department has developed a clear assessment plan to which they seem committed. The external reviewers recommended that they need to continue to maintain that commitment and make adjustments to their programs as indicated by the assessment.
12. The external reviewers recommended that the College as a whole should work with the Math department to assess senior and junior quantitative literacy to see if there is a need for students to take additional Math. Then, if there is, the College should work with the department to help address this issue. In particular, the Math department in that instance should work with other departments to find ways to help the other departments’ students improve the quantitative literacy in a way that is meaningful for their students’ goals.
13. The external reviewers recommended that the NCATE assessment process should be more transparent for the certification students. When these students are being assessed, they should be given the assessment rubric ahead of time, so they know what is expected of them. It should be clarified that how an instructor grades an assessment for class purposes may be different from how that instructor grades an assessment for NCATE purposes.

Facilities

14. The external reviewers found that the teaching space for education classes and the office space for adjuncts are "adequate though less than ideal". It’s recommended that the department solicit better space for both cases.
15. The external reviewers recommended that the Math Center should have some additional computers in it, especially if technology is to play a bigger role in the department’s courses. The same is true of the computer lab on the first floor and the computer classroom on the second floor.

General

16. Both the self-study and the external reviewers addressed the limited departmental budget. For the Department to maintain programs that incorporate best practices relative to student learning, the Department budget must include funds to support the specialized Math software and Math education "manipulatives" that help students learn concepts from visual, numerical, and hands-on perspectives. The department should look to alleviate some of the economic burden of procuring software by collaborating on the purchase with other departments at KSC and other state schools.

The Department looks forward to the wider implementation across the campus of a student portfolio management system such as TK-20, as this will permit students to better maintain more of the work produced in their classes and more easily draw from it, and reflect on it, for the purposes of individual and programmatic assessment. The Department urges the KSC Administration to provide monetary support for this initiative.

17. The Math certification programs have received National Recognition from NCATE and the external reviewers recommend that this achievement be publicized on their website and on the “planning sheets” for the Math certification programs.

Vote: Motion carries

VI. New Business

Senator Denehy – Last week the Provost talked about the 20 credit change and moving to the 18 credit model and I was stunned that something the Senate had dealt with three years ago was just sort of sitting on the Provost’s table for three years. My recommendation to the new Senate is to come up with a process for tracking recommendations so we don’t have another situation like that where a recommendation whether is it accepted or not accepted sits for three years.

VII. Adjournment 6:07pm

Minutes
for the 420th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 18th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 4:05
- II. Roll Call
Absent: Senator Stemp and Senator Dolenc, Senator
- III. Secretary's Report
Nothing to report
- IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Stanish – Another announcement from the faculty staff development campaign. You should have received an email for the breakfast which is next Wednesday the 25th from 7:30-9:00am so if you donated to the college this fiscal year you are more than welcome to the breakfast. If you would like to donate between now and then you can still come to the breakfast.

Senator Daley – We are having a carnival from 3:00-9:00pm tomorrow along with Mexican food from 4:00-7:00pm on Appian Way. Everyone is invited to come and join in the festivities.

- V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – Over the past several years we have been keeping verbatim meeting minutes transcribing all conversation. At the end of the meetings Cheryl will transcribe up to thirty pages of minutes and it is actually in Robert's Rules of Order that this is not required. The requirements are standard motions and results of the votes to be required to be recorded. With this we had a request from one of the Dean's that we try to lessen the time that we have Cheryl working on this.

Motion: The SEC moves that the revision to the Senate Minutes format as required within the Robert's Rules of Order be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – I have been giving this a great deal of thought but it strikes me that the more optimal the configuration of the minutes might be somewhere between those two extremes. I think verbatim, is too much and doesn't necessarily capture the intent of what is said as well ironically as paraphrase which I think can be done. I would be hesitant to vote for recording of the vote and reading of the motions because I do think there is discussion that comes before a vote that includes things like one is for one is against and being this is the record of the college Senate's actions on particular things. It is useful for the official record to display some evidence of the depth of the conversation that transpired to get to that vote. I would think a preferred option for me would be some paraphrase of the discussion and if I were to characterize the paraphrase when people talk there should be an indication of the essential points of what those people said. You're not recording everything that was said but if a Senator finds it worth their while to speak at a meeting then there should be a record of what they said at the meeting in the minutes.

Senator Darby – The archiving of voice recordings, I am curious what the quality is of the current recording. This is a very difficult room to record voices in. It is a wonderful room but a disaster of a room to hold a meeting. If we move forward with the motion we might investigate having a better recording system if we are going to archive those recordings. Again, this is a very challenging room to have a meeting in and I assume it is a challenge to record voices in this room – acoustically, this room is a disaster.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think Cheryl could speak best to this but even though we use this to make the transcripts I think the problems that you see in the minutes which are minimal – usually it is a word that could be similar are the problems that we have. I don't think they are excessive the kind of flip floppy words don't change a lot of the substance of it. Cheryl could probably speak better to that. It is key that people say their names, speak up as best you can and there will be very very minimal issues. These have worked effectively for us. It could be better of course and the quality as I listen to it is as good as speaking. If people could speak up a little louder it would solve a lot of the problem. It is usually because somebody is a little bit softer.

Senator Daly – I have to agree with Senator Welsh on this. I think if we were able to accurately narrow down all of the minutes and Cheryl you may be able to attest to this, do you feel as though you would be able to accurately do that if someone is talking that you

would be able to do that and anyone reading the minutes could still have an accurate interpretation of the minutes? Would that be easy enough for you to do?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I think the question would be is it possible to have thirty people agreeing on what essence of the meeting will get into the minutes. If I start to pick and choose the essence of the meetings I believe this would pose another problem.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That is exactly why we went to the transcript of the minutes because we were spending a great deal of time in the Senate with people disagreeing with what the spirit of the conversation was. Cheryl and I have worked together on both extremes, the extreme we are doing now and the middle ground which is just a summary and defaulted too because it actually saved time in Senate to have a transcript and just fixing semantic kinds of things but if we recorded the motions and we already do keep these and are already being archived, we felt that that would save time in the Senate and also save time transcribing.

Senator Martin – I think there are a variety of intermediate steps that should be considered so that we can ascertain in a printed record what the legislative intent is of this legislative body and what the deliberations were prior to a piece of legislation and prior to a non decision. That is important information that we do not want to disappear into a sound archive that would be very difficult to search. We need the capacity to research our own actions especially since the institutional memory of this body tends to be fairly short. If fact there is a motion before the Senate to ensure that there be turnover among at least in faculty members. They are making sure that many members of the Senate don't know what a prior Senate did do and would have no recourse or way in which verbal research legislative intent and deliberations. Here is a proposal, instead of summarizing the gist of a conversation that the recorder engages actively to paraphrase closely everything that is said. I said paraphrase rather than capture verbatim of the speaker.

Provost Netzhammer – I just have to say that capturing verbatim will be a less time consuming process than paraphrasing. That requires basically listening to the whole thing and then writing an acceptable summary. In the same way with our students sitting down and copying out of a textbook is a much easier thing to do than reading what's in the text, making sense of that in a different form. If this is about workload reduction I don't think that solves the issue that the SEC was trying to solve.

Senator Martin – I think the information that we might lose is too important to lose in a verbal archive so I would suggest with the false economy to save on one person's time and then have other Senators have to engage in an extensive search of a two hour meeting in order to ascertain what did get said at said prior meeting that they did not even attend.

Senator Blatchly – Could you speak to how the recordings would be archived? Is it by a meeting block or would it be broken up by motions somehow? The problem I see is searching back for the conversation and having to kind of guess where in the recording the conversation would be or may even have to travel over to someone's office to pull a tape or CD out. I am a little concerned we are going to lose the information that is in here and is the information searchable?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is stored on the Q-drive. It would be accessible anywhere you can get to the Q-drive. It is not the most convenient thing but it would be open to you when you were on campus. It is a folder that is accessible to everyone.

Senator Blatchly – So it is accessible to everyone on campus?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I believe it is but I would have to double check. At least it is the Senate. Everyone on the Senate, at one point it might have been open but that might have been for NEASC. It is just a block so if it is a 2 hour meeting then it is a 2 hour recording. I don't think we have looked into different ways to record it so that it could be marked in different ways but is something we could explore.

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – It is blocked and timed so that it shows hours/minutes/seconds on the recording so let's say a discussion becomes more detailed before or after the motion there could be a spot where you could post the timestamp from the tape, so you could fast forward to say 19 min and 23 sec and that would bring you to that motion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – They are digital files so there is not a CD or something.

Senator Shalit - There is a number of automated recorders with software, Have you looked into any of them?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I researched extensively about halfway through my first year doing this verbatim and came across Dragon. The problem was it will only recognize one person's voice which means I would actually have to repeat everything that was said on the tape so that it could at least take it from my voice. I just don't know how much time that would save and after a number of programs they all seem to work the same way in that regard.

Senator Shalit – Recently?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I believe it was two years ago.

Senator Shalit – Technology has improved

Senator Darby – Maybe the addition of time codes in the minutes as proposed here. The time code posted would help with a search of the files such as when the SEC starts their part of the meeting you could put the time stamp next to their report. A Senator wishing to review would know where to go on the tape.

Senator Martin – Hypothetical question, so somebody has spent several hours searching in an audio archive how does that information get communicated back to the Senate in an informative manner. Let's say I would like to repeat this conversation but there is only an audio archive. It would be nice to be able to cut and paste a text with this and share it with my colleagues. How would I communicate the audio archive?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – If we mark it then you should be able to mark the paragraph even more efficiently. Like Cheryl said, if the discussion of a certain motion occurred at 5.05 in the tape and you went there and it was off by a little bit you could find the exact time and share that with the Senators who could also access the audio file and they wouldn't have to do the search that you did if they could move the little scroll bar right to the exact time and begin listening there. What we are saying in the motion is that the audio files become a record of the meeting and that they are the same thing as paper.

Senator Doreski – I don't know the solution to this but we had a recent discussion here in which Senator Welsh raised serious issues about the nature of interdisciplinary courses and the ensuing discussion I think several people touched on really important points. Other people who are not in the Senate read the transcript of this and are really interested in and pursuing these issues. This is the kind of thing that will get lost because it doesn't show up in a motion.

Senator Denehy – Clarification question – The packet that comes out for each meeting, does that get archived? Does that include the ASC report and the SEC report and so on? So we have some record of this meeting.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – Yes. What you will find on the Senate website is for the last 7 years for every years worth of Senate meetings are uploaded as one document. It is the entire Senate packet and I believe I also started uploading, since I have been the Secretary, a separate document that is compiled motions of the year. I believe I have put both up there and if I haven't I meant to and I will get to it.

Senator Stevenson - I guess if the audio tape does become the official record of this body I would like to see some provision in there that any Senator at any time can request a written transcription of a particular section should it become necessary and given some reasonable timeframe. You can't request it 4 minutes before a meeting but there should be some way to request a written transcript of sections they want to discuss.

Senator Welsh – This reflects back on several issues that we have discussed in the Senate over the past couple of months and that is certainly good college policy is often at odds with the resources available. To enact that college policy especially in a constrained environment and I think you find yourselves anticipating resource issues as we are thinking about the policy we should follow and there are times when I think that the resource issues are that its necessary to reconsider available resources and if there are not resources available then find the resources to enact the policy. I think with good written records and I am talking about verbal transcription but good written records the colleges Senate meetings are important and if resources are an issue than we should find the resources to make this possible.

Senator Coleman – I believe Ann Atkinson has some papers in her book marked so I was wondering if she could let us know what her take is from Robert's Rules about this whole idea. I know that has been a lot of different options but I would like to see what Robert's Rules suggest.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Robert's Rules indicate that the Senate runs on action and so it is the actions that the Senate takes so motions and votes are the most critical.

Senator Fleeger – I was wondering if you could share some information on how much time is involved.

Senate Clerk – Cheryl Martin – I can give you a rough estimate. It really depends on the speed of the speaker, the volume of the speaker, the clarity of the speaker, what's discussed and if there are breaks between the discussions. What I find is a one hour meeting averages ten hours of transcription. The reason for this is because I transcribe from the tape into the shorthand that I take during the meetings. Where there is so much discussion, I want to make sure that what I typed is what I heard so I listen to the tape again. After that I proofread and align text and then send it to Kim for proof reading. Before it actually gets into the minutes it has been touched five or more times.

Senator Fleegeer – So ten hours for every hour of meeting?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – Yes, estimating, obviously at the beginning of the meeting where there is the roll call or the Secretary's report it's much quicker it's when it gets into in depth a discussion that's where it takes a lot of time. Again, it depends on the volume of the speaker it depends on the speed of the speaker. There are some people that when they speak I actually have to download their voice into another program all together to slow it down because I can't listen and type verbatim that fast. That is where it is time consuming.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – After Cheryl is done with it I usually spend another 2-4 hours with it and then it goes back to Cheryl to track the changes on and she double checks what I have checked before it gets into your hands and there are still errors.

Senator Fleegeer – Thank you, it is important to know what type of time issues are involved here.

Senator McDonald – We are at the end of our 15min discussion, is there a motion to continue with this discussion?

Motion: The SEC moves that discussion continue on Senate Minutes format on the above motion.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish – There does seem to be a feeling that a written record or at least some sort of written record is important. I was going to say that it seems we ought to stick with the verbatim record until the Senate Clerk let us know what is involved. I had no idea the amount of time that is involved in this. I am thinking about some of the middle ground that have been proposed, in theory I think having a summary is a good one except that puts a burden on someone to come up with that summary and then we end up debating that summary. I don't think anyone in the room would ever fall into this but it does give someone power to put their own interpretation in the summary that and I don't think we want to open that door at all. I actually like Senator Stevenson's compromise that any Senator or maybe open it to any campus community member that requests a transcript of a particular motion that way as an example that Senator Doeski gave in the interdisciplinary discussion we could have requested that transcript. The Senate Clerk could only do the pieces that are requested and therefore put a compromise on this.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If the Senators want to make what I think is a friendly amendment that is fine however we pull it off.

Senator Stevenson –

Motion: Senator Stevenson moves to include the ability for any member of the Keene State community to request a written transcript of any particular motion to the above motion be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – This transcript, would that then become a more detailed version of the minutes?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It would be what you currently get for that motion.

Senator Welsh - A current practice at each following meeting is the opportunity to review and correct the minutes. It strikes me that before this written transcript became a document and distributed and considered an official record as the minutes are that I think they would require the review of and approval of as we do the minutes.

Senator Blatchly – If I heard the amendment correctly it extends the privilege to the campus community which I support. I think that gives us an obligation then to make those recordings available to the campus community so that technical problem is a foul line. I don't think we need to add that to the motion but it does have that implication that we should recognize and move towards a technical solution.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That is not a problem. The Q-drive folder can be assessable to the GAL if we like to use that term.

Provost Netzhammer – I think with the overhaul of the Web site happening over the next several months the opportunity to even post the audio files on the Senate Web site will be available. I think the spirit of this whole discussion is that if we are going to go to an audio recording as the record of the meetings we want the widely available to people. I think taking them out of the Q-drive and putting them into a place where people can access them without needing permission makes a lot of sense.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think I can do that now because it can accept media. I would have to play with it a little bit.

Senator Stanish – I was going to ask if Senator Welsh's point of approval of any written transcript would be a friendly amendment to the amendment for or is it already in the amendment.

Provost Netzhammer – Point of order, I don't think there is anything necessarily done. He is right in his observation that a transcript would need to be approved.

Senator Martin – I really hesitate to add reservations but I have taken minutes for a variety of different meeting over several years and Cheryl's experience as summarized here is comparable my personal experience as well. I am speaking with sympathy of the real difficulty of this. Is it possible for us to consider that the very specific skill of creating a transcript isn't a skill that exist on this campus and that would be contracted out for the very limited purpose of the 2 hour meetings that we have for this body and have the transcriptionist which would be fast and at less cost to the institution than the existing application. Could we study that?

Provost Netzhammer – Point of order, we are talking to the amendment and not the motion.

Senator McDonald – On the amendment is there any other conversation?

Senator Shalit – What are we talking about if we just record the actions?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – If we just record the motions, votes and roll call I could probably get most of it done during the meeting and then it would be just cleaned up after.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – I actually currently do that so Cheryl would not need to do it at all. As we vote on the motions by the time the meeting finishes up I forward the motions and the attendance to both the Provost and Cheryl, so it's done.

Senator McDonald – I would ask that we return to our amendment. After the amendment we can go back to the discussion on the motion.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We are now back to the discussion on the motion.

Senator Denehy – To Senator Martin – I am not sure that is necessary I listen to the NH Legislative State House and there are times when I look at the journal of how the House is done and I want to listen to something I just start jumping through the audio. I don't think it is necessary for us to do a transcription when the ability is possible under the audio.

Senator McDonald – Any other questions or comments?

Vote: Motion carries as amended

Senator McDonald – We now move forward with the SEC report.

Motion: The SEC moves to eliminate the Academic Overview Committee (AOC) from the Senate, effective July 1, 2013. Furthermore, all references to the AOC are to be stricken from the By-Laws on or about July 1, 2013, including the following passage.

D. The Academic Overview Committee (AOC) shall be responsible for establishing the process for, and the reviewing of, all curricular programs (those that offer majors, minors, certificates, graduate programs or other academic courses) on a periodic (not more than 10 years) basis. The committee shall be comprised of 13 members of the Keene State College community drawn from the following constituencies:

- Seven members of the Senate (one of the seven must be a student)
- Three non-Senate faculty members (one from each school)
- One non-Senate PAT member (as selected/appointed by that group)
- One non-Senate Student (as selected/appointed by that group)
- One non-Senate member of the campus community designated by the Provost

All members of the AOC shall have full voting rights within the AOC; however, only the seven Senators shall vote in the Senate. The AOC should appoint a Chair and a Vice Chair who serve staggered, two year terms. The Chair and Vice Chair must be members of the Senate. The Chair will oversee the program review process, lead the committee and report to the Senate. The Vice Chair shall assist the Chair and serve as Chair as necessary. If a senator wishes for the Senate to discuss and/or amend a document (such as the review calendar or guidelines) created by the AOC, a motion and second are required.

All programs on the calendar for review during 2012-2013, with the exception of ISP shall go forward with the standard review process.

The SEC requests that the Provost provide the 2012-2013 SEC with an outline for an administrative program review process no later than June 1, 2012.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – Under review of non credit programs the Dean will work with the department to begin the process but there doesn't seem to be a role in getting the Dean in the process of accredited programs, is that correct?

Provost Netzhammer – You are referring to the document that Senator Blatchly commented on? That is correct, for accredited programs generally that process starts as a relationship between the accrediting agency and the department.

Senator Doreski – What on earth is netted data, literally it would be data about data.

Senator Blatchly – That is what it is. Netted data is just a little bit further detail on data so it is kind of like tags that are put on things that are sort of they are faster defined in a specific format so they go into a data base in particular place and are easier to find. So they would have descriptions on the report, the author the kinds of things you would find in a card catalog.

Senator Stanish – I appreciate that the Provost put together the sort of draft of what may happen for this administrative function and we are not actually voting on the draft. We are just voting on the proposal to eliminate the AOC. I think it is important that the Dean is very involved in self study. My suggestion is with having the Dean being in the process in the department, on one hand that makes a lot of sense the Dean's are very in touch with departments but one of the benefits of having the AOC is that it is a committee across campus so that departments in different schools are all sort of given the same time limit to work on it, all processes work in the same way and everyone plays with the same ground rules. If you leave it up to the Dean's it will be different depending on how they interpret it. Will they all start a timeline in the same way? I would love to see something involving the Provost's office where it crosses all schools and the Dean's taking it from there. It is just a suggestion.

Senator Blatchly – I think it is pretty remarkable that we were able to ask the Provost last week for a draft of some procedural material and we got it essentially by Sunday in my hands to take a look at and further the conversation. I think that is very responsive and applaud the effort. It is pretty clear that he spent some time thinking about this and I have tried to spend some time over a few hours thinking as deeply as I could about how to put together a process or procedure. I am little concerned that we are going too fast even still. One thing that occurred to me just in the last day or so is that have got nothing in the revised proposal for any sent review with discussion of the procedures by which were produced would be handled. If you look at the AOC procedures you will realize they are fairly detailed and anyone who has been on that committee in the last couple of years there is a lot of stuff in there. What needs to be part of the review, how the reviews are handled, how the external reviewers are chosen? There is a lot of stuff that could potentially affect the outcome of the review and that is not really part of the revision that we have. It seems like we are jumping ahead a little bit. I am not sure why we need to jump into this as quickly as it is purposed. I notice there a couple of people who are worried that it is not going to happen and I can understand that concern. Given some of the valid points about comparative institutions that function this way, I think it is a very reasonable thing to consider replacing the Senate roll in the AOC with something that is a little bit smaller but this is a time in which we have control over the procedures by which this review is done. It seems to me that until we have the ability to see what the replacement is it is a little bit premature and really doesn't treat the AOC in the context of the whole Senate Curriculum Committee structure. I would urge that we look at the whole package.

Provost Netzhammer – Thank you for your comments. I think that as we have thought about this that this isn't supposed to be the perfect plan and would not be the ultimate version of what we would use. I think as Senator Blatchly and I were talking about one thing that does concern us both is what is the faculty and staff voice in this process. It is clearly not described in the draft and I think if you take a number of different formats, for example, in some institutions a faculty member at our institution could be a faculty member on the Senate would be an internal member of the site team that visits the departments. This means that someone on the Senate would have access to the self study right at the beginning and serve as an evaluator of the program and could really participate in those deliberations. In some way it would provide a richness that we might not even get today in the way that we do this process. My sense and you know I never vote and the fact that we came together as the SEC around this issue is that the idea behind this proposal is a strong one that every member of the SEC supported and that the details of what this new process would look like would involve consultation with the Senate.

Senator Darby – I have a question about Senator Blatchly's response under external review under column 3. An additional quote to accreditors make necessary that outside this review process can a response to the accreditors still be entered into the record or would that still be submitted as part of this process even though it is not necessary. The program response to the accreditors report is a very important document and I would assume that would be entered into consideration.

Provost Netzhammer – Yes, from my perspective the intent of what we are talking about absolutely. If I could just elaborate, the reason you see Senator Blatchly’s comments in blue is because there is other language in this document in which he and I agree. I don’t think we were Seeing Eye to eye on what happens with accredited programs and it might be helpful for us to articulate that in this forum. My own sense was that the accrediting process for our accredited programs is as rigorous as our internal programs and the need for saying this is not particularly there we go to an administrative process rather than the AOC process. My own sense in writing this was that it is already rigorous enough for our accredited programs to go through that process. To then create another step for them to draft a self study based on that seemed, in my view, to be superfluous and unnecessary. As you can tell from the material in blue Senator Blatchly has a very different perspective on that.

Senator Denehy – Is this a special document that I received?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I sent it last night to the full Senate. It was separate from the minutes.

Senator Blatchly – First of all it is important to realize that these are not yet official procedures. We are still talking about a draft so that may cut the tension down a bit. I think when I have a conversation about the accreditation standards it is important to note that no one is arguing about the rigor of an accreditation process. They are very rigorous; the argument is more about the fit between the program review process and the accreditation material. I can talk about it from a Chemistry point of view and I am hoping we will be accredited in the next 6 months or so. The accreditation process does not look at all of the courses that we provide support for example the Professional and Graduate Studies. They do not look at the qualifications of the faculty; they do not look at the way the courses are treated or what the assessment process is. It is just outside the purview so any college wide support submission is typically not part of an accreditation process. As we talked about this that was the reason why we lean very much towards asking the accredited programs at the very least provide us with some of the accreditation documents. We also have had to deal with accreditation documents that have 600 files in them and it was difficult to navigate so we are hoping to find some sort of middle ground. It is not an extreme process but that it would be pretty typically handcrafted for an accredited program and people would sit down and try to find some way to make the most efficient path of getting a reasonable package.

Senator McDonald – Any other questions or comments? Keep in mind that this is a bylaw change and will take a majority vote to pass.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – Continuing with the SEC report;

Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate adopt the “Time to Graduation Waiver” form

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves to eliminate all term limits from the By-Laws effective immediately

Senator McDonald –I must point out that this was not presented in written form at last week’s meeting. It can be presented today but the only way this can pass is by unanimous vote of the Senate. I do want to point out that this does not benefit me because even though I am at the end of my term limit I am not running for any open seats on the Senate for next year. I just feel that if we have people that want to volunteer on the Senate then they should be able to and not have term limits. If you do not want that person on the Senate then you would not vote them in.

Senator Stanish – If we do approve this bylaw change by eliminating term limits then would we no longer need to vote on separate bylaw changes in article 3 section G where we were changing “no elective member of the Senate shall serve more than 6 consecutive years of an elected faculty member of the Senate.

Senator McDonald – That would supersede that. By the way the Article 3 was given in writing last week and I kept this separate because it was not given in writing.

Senator Blatchly – Does anyone know why the term limits were imposed?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – My understanding is that there used to be a great deal of competition for seats on the Senate. It was also a way to make sure that there was turnover and people had opportunity.

Senator McDonald – When I first ran for the Senate about 21 years ago we actually had to campaign in front of an assembly of faculty.

Senator Denehy – Since this has to be a unanimous vote my understanding is abstention is not a unanimous vote. So if someone abstains it is not unanimous.

Senator McDonald – Correct.

Senator Martin – I would like to speak in favor of the motion because my study of governance since 1969 strongly suggest and I think there is a literature and people could disagree with me says exist that it is antidemocratic to have term limits. If people want to be represented by somebody an arbitrary limit on their capacity to be represented by that person places an obstacle that prevents them from having the person they want. I will be voting in favor of this because I would like to ensure that people are being represented by the representatives that they choose rather than the ones that they are forced to accept as a result of an arbitrary term limit. The antidemocratic piece is also complimented nicely by the development of institutional memory. I think with a great deal of turnover on a body it becomes very difficult to develop expertise and knowledge of both the business and the history of that body. I believe the development of institutional memory will be served by this amendment.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – The SEC did discuss the grading policy and was tabled until next year. Some people did ask that this be moved forward and we discuss that and we determined that we did not want undercut the motion of the Standards committee and bring that to the table. This will return to the Senate next year for discussion. We now move to all of the other bylaw changes that we have. Senator Schmidl-Gagne sent out a request last week to see if any of these needed to be brought up for discussion. It turns out someone wanted every one of these brought up for discussion. We are going to go through each of these and bring them up one by one to discuss except the ones that by previous votes have already been passed.

Motion: The SEC moves to remove any remaining "gendered" language from the bylaws to be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Denehy – I support the idea of the motion however I don't believe we can put an open change to the bylaws. My understanding is that we would have to have a list of each item that would be changed.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – When Parliamentarian Atkinson and I spoke, this was actually something that we voted on last year as well and in my review of the bylaws I missed one section at the very end when I updated it. A similar motion came forward last year and it wasn't a list of all the places that the language needed to be changed it was intent to. Because these are all administrative changes and not substantive Parliamentarian Atkinson said that was an ok way to do it. I did not want to change more language in the bylaws without having the Senate know that that was happening but I did find a section that I missed in my original review of the bylaws. That's why it appears the way it is and in a very technical sense I suppose I could just change them because we already have the approval from last year to do that but that wasn't what I had wanted to do. I wanted to make sure that people knew more words needed to be changed.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves to Article IV, B: Remove "and shall (with the assistance of the Secretary) submit a year-end report to the President of the College. This year-end report shall include a chronological list of Senate legislation for the past academic year and is due no later than one week after Commencement."

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just for clarity this is in the Vice Chairs job description and since the Secretary already does what the Vice Chair has been charged to do in the job description, you will see that the Secretary job description would more accurately reflect that I do that anyways and that the Vice Chair doesn't do it so it is just a swap of who does what because it is already happening in a certain way. For example, I did it all and forwarded it to Pete and that just seems to be an extra step in the process.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article IV, C: Add "The Secretary shall submit a year-end report to the President of the College. This year-end report shall include a chronological list of Senate legislation for the past academic year and is due no later than one week after Commencement" be accepted by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article V, A: Add "If a Senate agenda does not include motions to be voted on, it is the purview of the Senate Chair to determine, after consultation with the members of the SEC and other Committee Chairs, to propose an online motion and vote to cancel a meeting" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – It sounds wonderful to me but I just want clarification. The online motion and vote, would that be among the entire Senate?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – Last year's bylaws included in it how to do an online vote and it is the entire Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article V, A: Remove "Three (3) such absences from any one of the above groups of the Senate shall." Replace with "Three (3) such unexcused absences from any one of the above groups of the Senate or Senate Meetings shall" be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Sapeta – Is this for 3 absences per year?

Senator McDonald – Per year.

Senator Stanish – I am wondering if we have or do we need a definition of unexcused. Who does the excusing? Is it the Senate Chair? What does excused mean?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – They are in the Senate bylaws.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Article V, A: Remove "upon notification by its chair, require an appearance by the senator before a regularly scheduled meeting of the Executive Committee." Replace with "upon notification by its chair and/or the Secretary of the Senate, be removed from the Senate and/or committee" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – Let me explain, in the bylaws there currently exists a statement that if the Chair of the SEC is informed that a person has missed 3 meetings it says they come before the SEC. It doesn't say what the SEC does; it doesn't say there is any sort of review process so it wasn't clear. It seemed that as opposed to something in there that we could say that there are just 3 unexcused absences and it is very easy to get excused absences that someone would no longer serve on the Senate.

Senator Blatchly – Could you remind me what the *it's* refers to. Is that the SEC or the actual committee where the absences are taking place?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – It refers to actually the motion above; any 3 meetings of the Senate or their standing committee.

Senator Blatchly – It says *it's* chair. What is the *it*?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – It is the standing committee's Chair.

Senator Stevenson – Are they called before the committee and they say see ya?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – There is no clarification of when you get called before the SEC what would happen. It just said you would get called before the SEC.

Senator Stevenson – So now it is just see ya.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – Now it is just see ya

Senator Stevenson – This now expands the power of the role of the Chair of the Senate and to the Secretary?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – The notification.

Senator Stevenson – I am not entirely sure of the Chair saying see ya.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – It doesn't need to be. If there are 3 absences you are done.

Senator McDonald – 3 unexcused absences.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – 3 unexcused absences you are done.

Senator Stevenson – There is no due process?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If we do what say and say what we do – we can change this, the thing that was there that sort of bothered me was that if you got called before the SEC and there was nothing that said what happened. I don't know do we go into some sort of room that the lights are off? I tried to create something that was clear and unambiguous. We can do whatever folks want but I don't think we can just call folks to the SEC.

Senator Welsh – Is this because of this year's Senate and someone was removed from the Senate because of a string of absences?

Senator Menees – Yes, a string of absences did occur this year.

Senator Welsh – Was that Senator removed?

Senator Menees – Yes

Senator Welsh – It seems like that part of the system worked.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Nobody came before the SEC.

Senator Menees – I don't know if they went before the SEC but I never saw them.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – So they just never ever appeared. There was no official action taken they just never were here.

Senator Menees – They were momentarily heard from in an email, after that never heard from them.

Senator Welsh – You keep using the pronoun they, were they asked to come before the Chair of the Senate?

Senator McDonald – Nobody reported to the SEC that I am aware of.

Senator Menees – Yes you did. You said it was ok to remove them and we already had a new Senator that was on the floor.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It could be that some of the students took care of that problem on their own.

Senator Blatchly – I love the irony of requiring someone who can't show up for meetings to show up before the SEC but I think I share Senator Stevenson's concern for due process and not have a Chair just decide on someone who is absent. It seems from this bylaw that there is no recourse for the Senator to show up and say look I really did show up, this person that disagrees with me is trying to remove me from the committee. If we are going to change the bylaws it is not unreasonable to specify the expected outcome but also to add a little bit of due process, give them the opportunity to petition to the SEC. That is not in here so I am a little concerned about it. It seems like the process was working.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I don't think there was a process. Maybe we should leave this one and move onto a different one so we can work on something. We can vote this down and revisit it in the fall.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: Article VI, F: Remove "In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals." Replace with "It is within the purview of the chair of the SCC to bundle courses and curriculum packages into motions as they feel is appropriate. In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – Which should be that?

Senator Welsh – A technical question, *may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies*, which implies that the Curriculum committee will be presenting Standards motions and I am not sure what the presentation of standards policy would be appropriate from the Curriculum committee. This implies that Standards passed these and then they are presented as one. I am not sure I understand that sequence. A general concern, I think this is a motion in which is likely to lead to the bundling of proposals in a more expedited way. It puts the burden on an individual Senator to get a majority vote of the

rest of the Senate to vote to discuss specific issues if they are bundled. I think that is less appropriate than a delivered body such as ours than an opposite attachment would need for a motion to be made to bundle an array of classes within the proposals. That motion is a deliberate choice by the body of the Senate to not have discussion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There is language that allows a Senator to unbundle it once it comes to the Senate.

Senator Welsh – My concern is that it comes bundled and becomes the responsibility of a Senator or a small group of Senators to convince the rest who may not approve the entirety of the packet. The opposite way is more conducive to make available for discussion.

Provost Netzhammer – To your first point, I think that was the idea. We have had so many conversations at the Senate where either the ASC saying, well we are getting ahead of Curriculum Committee or we will be later. We wanted to create an opportunity where the SCC and the ASC could come forward so that those issues of Standards and Curriculum could be considered at one time rather than at very different parts of a Senate meeting.

Senator Welsh – I do understand the desire to do this but it strikes me that the language here looks as if the SCC is making the proposal, a motion for the ASC. I am not sure if that is appropriate or how we authorize the SCC to unblend one of our motions. It is not clear in this language.

Senator Stanish – I share Senator Welsh's concern about sequencing of when the standards policies are looked at versus the curriculum, proposals. The way this motion is written currently it does seem to put the responsibility on the SCC Chair to sort out what are Standards motions and what are not. I think this year that people from the ASC were saying that it doesn't have to be the SCC Chair's job. It seems the two Chairs working together is a better process and then if the Chairs agree to unbundle the proposals then that makes some sense. It seems to me that we need slightly different wording here that might make more sense.

Senator Denehy – We have the same issue in a later motion where those of the ASC being allowed to bundle SCC items. I understand the intent but it seems we should at least look for language that is clearer that says the idea that when there are proposals that have gone to different committees that come to the Senate at the same time. The intent is good but this language does not achieve that intent and could create confusion between committees.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VI, J, 2: Remove "Section J, 6." Replace with "Section J, 8" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is another administrative change that I didn't catch but again didn't want to alter anything in the bylaws without folks realizing I was doing it.

Senator Welsh – When I download the bylaws I see it already says J8.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I don't know what happened then. The fact of the matter is we are moving the AOC and all of that probably scrambled everything. It is quite possible that other things will change so we can leave that one alone. We can vote it down and move on.

Senator Martin – When it says remove section J,6, is the effort to remove the entire section with its code or just the letters.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just the article. I thought it was inaccurately sending you to J6 when it should have sent you to J8. I don't have it open in front of me and I have forgotten my hard copy.

Senator Blatchly – It's already there.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I don't get how that happened but great. It says two informational reports send you to J6 and I believe you want to go to J8 – the 48hour rule. We wanted to change from J6 to J8 to send you to the right section. That's all.

Senator Martin – It says J2.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I meant J2. I suppose you have different versions of the bylaws than I do but it does need to be updated.

Vote: Motion carries.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VI, L: Remove "All policies, resolutions and recommendations formally adopted by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Chair of the Senate to the President of the College." Replace with "All policies, resolutions and recommendations formally adopted by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the President of the College or designee" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – Currently as I said earlier I forward all motions voted on to the Provost who talks with the President I am sure so that is why it changes to Secretary and changed to President or designee.

Senator Stanish – I am fine with this but just had a question if it made sense to replace President with the Provost because that is our practice.

Provost Netzhammer – I think it is President or designee. I think there are some issues that the Senate has dealt with that the President has wanted to keep as her own but when they are curriculum she has designated me to handle it. I think this policy that we have used though has been much more efficient. Approvals are coming out to a wider distribution lists and a more responsive way and I think this reflects what we are doing and the practice over the last 2 years that we have been doing it this way has really been beneficial to the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries.

Senator McDonald – On the next item change I am speaking for members of certain committees and it does in fact effect people or more likely a person on that committee and that person was not notified in advance of this change. Generally I catch anything but I didn't catch that. It was not intentional.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII, B: Remove "The Registrar shall serve as an ex-officio member." The SEC requests that the SCC review their guidelines and revise to include an "administrative review" of proposals. This review would be designed to ensure that all prerequisites and policies are accurately reflected in the curriculum and course proposals be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Denehy – It doesn't make sense to me that the Registrar who is the person responsible for overseeing the college curricular policy implementation would be removed from this committee. What I am proposing is to get an explanation as to why this Senate suggested it.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – This is interesting it was on the list of bylaw revisions from the fall that we started collecting. I can't point out who suggested it so to answer that part of the question, I do not know. It came and I have been keeping a log and I apologize but I do not have that information. My understanding was the suggestion was that it focuses the SCC on curriculum and not on policy.

Senator Denehy – This is a curriculum committee on curriculum is a bad thing?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – No if we remove the Registrar it will cause the SCC to concentrate on curriculum. That was the rationale that was provided.

Senator Darby – I have a problem with this particular proposal in changing the bylaws and not quite sure what the problem is. I am not sure with the administrative review which is in quotation marks within quotation marks what that entails. I am also a little bit of agreement with Senator Denehy about the role of the Registrar at the point of the SCC's deliberations. In short it's helpful because there is turnover in that committee and the Registrar does provide an institutional memory which does help in my opinion guide the members of that committee toward better decisions. I am also a little bit concerned that an administrative review, where does this review happen? Does it happen at a point prior to the SCC? Does it happen afterwards? The answer is afterwards. I think this change would have the opposite effect of a transparent process that I do feel that we have. I am also a little concerned about the inefficiencies of this change. In effect if the SCC reviews something and keep it in mind that the SCC is populated with faculty and students who are specialists in their area but they may not be specialists in adhering to complex curricular policy. The Registrar in my opinion has provided that guidance. As a faculty member unless someone can produce evidence to me I don't see the Registrar's place at that table as an imposition on faculty control of the curriculum. The Registrar is Ex-Officio and in my observation the Registrar does provide guidance to the faculty and students who are on that committee. I am a little miffed at the inefficiencies if the point of review is post SCC. I imagine a flurry of emails and repeated visits by sponsors of programs even greater than what it is now.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – The SEC added the SCC the request for administrative review. I think our thought was that it would happen before the SCC received a curriculum packet but we are going to leave it up to the SCC to write the guidelines that worked for the SCC around what that review process would be and what the timing of it would be. In my own mind that is before that they got it but I don't think we wanted to legislate to the SCC how that would happen. I would guess that that makes more sense. So it would go through its process then hit the Registrar to identify any issues but again we wanted to leave it to the SCC to help identify guidelines.

Senator Stanish – Without really serving on the SCC but in the current guidelines for the SCC it shows the Registrar as serving as the Ex-Officio and I have served on different committees where Ex-Officio means different things and I don't know if I know what the definition for Ex-Officio means here. Does the Registrar have a vote in the SCC? What is the role of the Registrar?

Senator McDonald – No vote

Senator Doreski – I have served on the SCC for many years and Chaired the SCC for a while and I have some institutional memory and remember a previous version of the controversy over the Registrar's role. For a while the Registrar did not sit on the SCC and it created a lot of problems. No faculty member has the overview of the curriculum that the Registrar has. That is just a fact of life. We ended up having to go to the Registrar and lot of back and forth that delayed some curriculum proposals. It just created more problems than what it was worth. I think having the Registrar there at the SCC meetings saves a lot of time and trouble and does not interfere in my opinion in open and frank discussion. I don't see this as a problem at all and I am really opposed to the notion of putting an administrative review in the middle of a curricular review process. I think that could act as a negative filter and I think the SCC should be as much of a faculty process as possible. Certainly it is an administrative review prior to the process and the Dean is involved at the beginning of the process so I don't see the need to mess with something that seems to be working rather well.

Senator Peters - I am part of the SCC and I think it is important to have the Registrar there not only because he knows about the curricular and says a lot concerning the students that even though I am a student I don't know. I would also be against it.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII, B: Remove "This includes working with the School Curriculum Committees and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools." Replace with "This includes working with the School Curriculum Committees, the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools" be approved by the Senate.

Provost Netzhammer – Please make the editorial change of Integrative Studies.

Senator Stevenson – It appears this would legitimize the Interdisciplinary Studies committee in the bylaws. I would like to know where and when Interdisciplinary Studies committee was created and how they got the power they did because there is no reference to such a committee in the original ISP.

Senator Stanish – I do not recall but going to make a guess and see if it triggers someone's memory. I was on the Senate when the original Integrative Studies program was here and I agree with Senator Stevenson that there was no mention of any subcommittees that we currently deal with at that time. However the Integrative Studies Program Committee also looked very different at that time. I seem to recall during the time I was off the Senate there was a proposal made by the Integrative Studies Committee to divide into the Integrative Studies Council and the Integrative Studies Advisory Board and I am wondering if in that proposal there was something with definitions of subcommittees.

Provost Netzhammer – Your recollection is correct but I do not know the document well enough with accuracy about the subcommittees.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I have them pulled aside because you so often need them. If you give me a minute I can look because I moved them all into a folder so I know where they are. Is that helpful?

Senator Welsh – What are we looking for, Senate approval for the reconfiguration of committees?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It sounds like Senator Stevenson was asking how this got created. Is that accurate?

Senator Stevenson – Correct, my concern is legitimate existence of the subcommittees.

Senator Darby – Is the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee the committee responsible for the approval of II courses?

Senator Stanish – My point was I am wondering if when that restructure was approved by the Senate of the Integrative Studies Program Committee, part of that approval was the creation of these other subcommittees.

Senator Darby – Senator Stevenson's point is well taken however as I read this, this was in effect to bring into line in essence the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee because I think with my experience in the SCC we have had some challenges around some of the II

proposals and some confusion about those proposals that may have been alleviated with better communication of that committee. This is how I interpreted this was to help charge the SCC with maybe to facilitate better communication with that committee.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – In the motion of the 386th meeting of the Senate, Professor Nielson advised on the correction in the chart of the proposed composition column are as follows; sixth row down and eight row down in a mention of the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee so I need to go back to 2008-2009.

Senator Blatchly – I guess this raises the question of what we are referring to in this motion. Do we know for certain whom the Chair of this Subcommittee is? What the membership is? We are referring to something in a motion and it would be good to know who this committee is.

Senator Doreski – I wonder if this is the committee or if this is still a subcommittee of the ISP, the one that is chaired by Mike Antonucci. If so, this seems elevated from being part of the ISP and a separate entity.

Senator Welsh – I wonder if this raises significant issues that we are having trouble answer right now at this meeting and there for it might be worthwhile to table this motion.

Provost Netzhammer – I would support that. I think this whole discussion could take place in the context of the ISP task force report or the organizational structure that we put in place for the ISP and try to pick off this piece when we are all struggling and trying to figure out what we are talking about doesn't make a lot of sense.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC move that Article VII, B: Add "In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – What is different with this?

Senator Schmid-Gagne – This is language in a different part of the bylaws. If we approve one, we could approve the other. That is all with this one. I think the next one is a little bit different.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC move that Article VII, C: Add "If a standards package includes curricular changes, these changes shall be forwarded to the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee. In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – If we do not want to approve this, this is two things in here. There was the SCC in the bylaws already has the ability to bundle a curriculum package however they like, so part of this was meant so that the ASC could do something similar. Maybe it just all needs to wait.

Senator Welsh – I was considering that this seems similar to the other motion again.

Senator Schmid-Gagne – It is but there is a subtle difference about the SCC can bundle anything they want and the ASC can't. The SCC can put together a curriculum package together as one motion, if there were policies that you wanted to put forward as one motion that is part of this. If we vote this whole thing down at some point we might want to revisit the ASC allowed to bring forward policies that go together, together. Does that make sense?

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII D: Delete, motion to include the timeline of the end of the spring 2013 semester be accepted by the Senate.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VIII, B: Remove "All of these constituencies must notify the Senate Vice Chair and Senate Clerk of the results immediately upon conclusion of the election. Replace with "All of these

constituencies must notify the Senate Vice Chair and Senate Secretary of the results immediately upon conclusion of the election" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Martin - I cannot find this in my copy of bylaws. I am looking at the ones that are currently available on the website and they say revised 1/20/10, is there a version of our bylaws on the website that more recently.....

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Yes, there is. Somehow or another there is still an active link to an old Senate website. If you can find that link and email it to me I would appreciate it. We need to get rid of that link. There is a new Senate website and I can't figure out what that link is that people sometimes find so if you can I would like that. There were approved bylaw changes made May 1st of last year in 2011. I apologize

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – That concludes the report of the SEC and we have reached 6:00pm and we still have the AOC report.

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that the Senate extended past the 6:00pm meeting deadline be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Parliamentarian Atkinson – That is supposed to be a ballot vote

Motion: Senator Denehy moves that the Senate suspend the rules and take a hand vote to extend the Senate meeting be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that the Senate extended past the 6:00pm meeting deadline be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion to extend the meeting carries

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly – We have only one order of business here and would like to present for you the review of the Mathematics Program and I will make a motion and ask Senator Harfenist to give a very brief summary of the material.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Math Program and the response from the department be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Harfenist - Keene State College (KSC) has offered courses in mathematics since its inception as the Keene Normal School in 1909 for the training of prospective teachers. Mathematics grew to become a major area of concentration by the time that the newly named Keene Teachers College began offering the Bachelor of Education degree in 1939. Mathematics became a major and minor concentration option for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees soon after 1963, when the school adopted its present name. The Mathematics Department grew along with the College as it began to expand its mission beyond educating teachers and presently offers two major concentrations, Mathematics and Mathematics Education for Elementary Teachers. The latter concentration offers three potential options; mathematics, secondary teaching and middle/junior high teaching. It additionally offers minors in Mathematics and Statistics. In conjunction with the Computer Science Department, a Computer Mathematics Major is offered as well as a Mathematics-Physics Major in conjunction with the Physics Department. At present, the Mathematics Department makes a fundamental contribution to the Integrative Studies Program by offering a college-wide foundational quantitative experience, IQL 101 (Quantitative Literacy), an interdisciplinary, theme-based course. The Department has one of its tenure-track and many of its adjunct faculty develop and teach sections of the course, with several tenure-track faculty involved in the assessment of IQL 101 sections. Two new full-time tenure-track (FTTT) faculty have been hired since the last program review in 2000-2001 and none have left since then, but two positions were lost in 1999 and 2000, so that has left the Department with eight FTTT positions.

Recommendations:

Curriculum

18. The external reviewers addressed the issue of breadth vs. depth in terms of the courses offered to students. They suggested that picking topics that deliberately build on previous courses would produce the effect of having a yearlong sequence. It should be

acknowledged that this is a difficult issue given limitations on the number of courses that students can realistically take and given that such a move would limit, to some extent, the breadth of the students' knowledge.

19. The external reviewers recommend that the department needs to better coordinate its 100-level multi-section statistic and pre-calculus courses in terms of the technology and textbook that students are expected to use. This consistency would create a more unified experience for the students and instructors and would more effectively support those students who work in the Math center and are currently expected to deal with multiple technologies and multiple texts for the same course.
20. Both the self-study and the external reviewers recommended that the department needs to work with Computer Science and Physics in assessing and possibly revising the joint programs so that they remain current. More generally, through increased collaboration across campus, the Math Department can be more proactive in making other departments aware of the benefits to some of their students in taking certain Math courses.
21. The external reviewers recommend that the 3+2 program would perhaps do well to replace 4 credits of physics elective with 4 credits of a Math elective such as MATH 361: Differential Equations. Since the department expressed a willingness and desire to be an active part of the engineering preparation program, they should consider pursuing this sort of idea.

Faculty

22. Both the self-study and the external reviewers recommend making the addition of a statistician to the Math department a priority in any upcoming planning. The self-study provided a well-conceived rationale for this important recommendation though neither the department nor external reviewers listed this as an urgent priority
23. As reflected in the self-study, at the time of the last program review the Mathematics Department had no consensus on standards for promotion and tenure. In particular, the department was deeply divided on standards in the area of scholarship and related professional activity. Recently, however, agreement on departmental P&T was reached. The self study goes on to say that the varied professional interests and activities, teaching styles, and areas of expertise of Department faculty are strengths that greatly enhance the ability of the Math department to deliver a quality curriculum to a wide range of students. The faculty hope to do a better job of recognizing the value of each others' contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service, even though they may be different from their own.

Adjuncts

24. The external reviewers recommended that the adjuncts should be reviewed and given professional feedback on a regular basis.

Student Experience

25. The external reviewers found some indication in the self study that there is a lower expectation for Math minors, as evidenced by the statement "Students completing the Math Minor are expected to achieve these same competencies, though not at the same level as students completing the major." Their recommendation was that as a general rule it is important for all students to be judged equally and action should be taken if this statement suggests that major and non-major students are judged by different standards.
26. While student advising is generally a Department strength, the self study recommends developing an advising checklist for faculty that would assist advisors in better monitoring advisee progress, help students do better long-range planning, and provide intervention strategies for students who are not meeting program expectations.

ISP

27. The self-study shows that while responsibility for the delivery and coordination of IQL 101 exists outside the Mathematics department through the ISP structure – a configuration the department agrees with -- the department still has more to offer IQL 101 than it can currently make available. The recommendation is for the Department to consult with, among others, the IQL 101 Coordinator to determine what would be helpful and feasible (especially as determined from IQL 101 pre/post test data and feedback from IQL 101 faculty), articulate a plan, and then follow through on implementing the plan. For example, the external reviewers recommended that the department work with the IQL director to create a course format that involves a semester-long project. This would mirror the ITW courses and would help alleviate concerns about there not being enough "Q" in the IQL courses.

Assessment

28. The department has developed a clear assessment plan to which they seem committed. The external reviewers recommended that they need to continue to maintain that commitment and make adjustments to their programs as indicated by the assessment.
29. The external reviewers recommended that the College as a whole should work with the Math department to assess senior and junior quantitative literacy to see if there is a need for students to take additional Math. Then, if there is, the College should work with the department to help address this issue. In particular, the Math department in that instance should work with other departments to find ways to help the other departments' students improve the quantitative literacy in a way that is meaningful for their students' goals.

30. The external reviewers recommended that the NCATE assessment process should be more transparent for the certification students. When these students are being assessed, they should be given the assessment rubric ahead of time, so they know what is expected of them. It should be clarified that how an instructor grades an assessment for class purposes may be different from how that instructor grades an assessment for NCATE purposes.

Facilities

31. The external reviewers found that the teaching space for education classes and the office space for adjuncts are "adequate though less than ideal". It's recommended that the department solicit better space for both cases.
32. The external reviewers recommended that the Math Center should have some additional computers in it, especially if technology is to play a bigger role in the department's courses. The same is true of the computer lab on the first floor and the computer classroom on the second floor.

General

33. Both the self-study and the external reviewers addressed the limited departmental budget. For the Department to maintain programs that incorporate best practices relative to student learning, the Department budget must include funds to support the specialized Math software and Math education "manipulatives" that help students learn concepts from visual, numerical, and hands-on perspectives. The department should look to alleviate some of the economic burden of procuring software by collaborating on the purchase with other departments at KSC and other state schools.

The Department looks forward to the wider implementation across the campus of a student portfolio management system such as TK-20, as this will permit students to better maintain more of the work produced in their classes and more easily draw from it, and reflect on it, for the purposes of individual and programmatic assessment. The Department urges the KSC Administration to provide monetary support for this initiative.

34. The Math certification programs have received National Recognition from NCATE and the external reviewers recommend that this achievement be publicized on their website and on the "planning sheets" for the Math certification programs.

Vote: Motion carries

VI. New Business

Senator Denehy – Last week the Provost talked about the 20 credit change and moving to the 18 credit model and I was stunned that something the Senate had dealt with three years ago was just sort of sitting on the Provost's table for three years. My recommendation to the new Senate is to come up with a process for tracking recommendations so we don't have another situation like that where a recommendation whether is it accepted or not accepted sits for three years.

VII. Adjournment 6:07pm

Minutes
for the 421st Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 18th, 2012
Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order** 6:40
- II. Roll Call**
- III. Election of 2011-2012 Senate Officers**
 - a. Chair – Karen Stanish
 - b. Vice Chair - Sally Jean
 - c. Secretary – Kim Schmidl-Gagne
 - d. Faculty-at-large – Debra White-Stanley

- IV. Adjournment** 6:55