Minutes
for the 429th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, May 1, 2013
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I.   Call to Order 4:06

II.   Roll Call
Excused: Senator Hix, Senator Prosper and Senator Welch

III.   Secretary's Report

         Motion: To accept the minutes of the 428th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.
Discussion - Senator Sapeta - If there is a chance to correct my name on page 9 at the bottom.

Senator Stanish - Thank you, any other changes or discussion?
         Vote: Motion carries

IV.   Courtesy Period
Senator Lucey – I just have a quick question, do we have any graduating seniors?
Senator Stanish - Good question, thank you and good luck.

VI.   Subcommittee Reports

•   **Executive Committee**

Senator Stanish - The meeting notes are [SD 12/13-40] which is on page 22 in your packet. We will begin with a motion dealing with our Parliamentarian. Thank you to Senator Robinson who has agreed to serve as our Parliamentarian for this meeting in addition to role as Senator.

         Motion: The SEC moves that Andy Robinson as Parliamentarian for the remainder of the spring
         2013 semester
         Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish - We will now move on to By-law revision that we had brought forward at the last meeting and did a slight edit to about Senate Courtesy, as you can see in the next senate document on page 24 [SD 12/13-41]. We are talking about senate discourse in the first piece and Senator Martin had a few suggestions for an edit last time and I think we incorporated those.

         Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate By-laws Article VI Parliamentary Rules, C. Floor
         Procedure, 2. Courtesy be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-41] be approved by the Senate.
         Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish - We just wanted to give you an update on December Senate meeting that we have been talking about. Thank you to the Senate Secretary for putting together a survey about when people think it would be best to hold the December Senate meeting. Thank you to all that filled out that survey. I believe it is still open and if you would like the chance to fill that out please do so. I did it and it took me 5 minutes. It doesn't take very long at all to fill that out. We have taken a preliminary look at the results and it does not seem to be a uniform consensus but we will try to piece through this and make a decision

about when the December Senate meeting will be. Our next piece we talked quite a bit about the ISP Facilitation and Discussion Team. Senator Jean, would you like to talk a little about this?

Senator Jean - Sure, basically what has happened in our ISP meetings is there has really been no consensus in our group. We had proposed that there be a Director for the ISP program and this particular Director would be the Director of an ISP council. The council would consist of various members, the II Coordinator, the IQL Coordinator and the ITW Coordinator. There would be a faculty member from each of the different schools. There would be a Library Liaison and there would be the Assessment Coordinator. It would basically be a representation from the campus for this particular council. We weren't quite ready to make that recommendation to the Senate and so when I brought this up to the SEC basically a compromise was reached and you can sort of read that in here. What they had suggested instead of a Director because this has been going on for a long time as you all know so we really want to start pulling the ISP Program together so the compromise was that there would be two Co-Chairs and not a Director beginning in the fall including an administrator and again a faculty member. The rest of the committee would pretty much be what our ISP Facilitation and Discussion group had agreed on. The ISP Facilitation and Group Discussion Committee will be meeting with the SEC on the 7th of May to talk about these proposed changes and definitely this will go out. The Provost has agreed to put this out to the entire faculty. It will go to faculty again the transparency because we really need it for this particular group. I think that was one of our main concerns in our committee was the communication piece. There needs to much better communication regarding ISP and the transparency. Before I sign off here I would like to thank Mike Welsh and Mike Antonucci for speaking for me as I was not able to be here last week. Mike is there anything else that you would like to say about that?

Senator Welsh - I apologize I have taken the Senate Agenda package and read it quickly the day of and a little bit the day before. There is a piece of the report that I think I would like to ask about and that is in the report it says the support for the creation of a Senate ISP Committee among our group is mixed. My impression was that we all feel that ISP or that ISP Gen Ed Senate committee is a decent idea and where the difficulty was was the composition and the charge. The charge did overlap with the charge of the existing committees and those kinds of things. Where we were having difficulty was those details and it is in that that we were not ready to make a proposal to the Senate at this point. The idea of the Senate having a committee, a committee responsible for the ISP which I understood our group was comfortable with that.

Senator Jean - Could you repeat the last part?

Senator Welsh - The idea of the Senate having a committee that is responsible for ISP.

Senator Jean - I think there was some dissension.

Senator Stanish - I will say this was my take on the report that Senator Jean gave, and I will take the credit for what is written here. This is why I think it would be very, very helpful to meet with the group on the 7th. This is exactly why the SEC isn't rushing I think to institute an ISP Senate Committee. Personally, I like the idea and in support of the idea, but I don't want to go on my personal feeling. I want to make sure we do this thoughtfully and carefully and the best way forward. Absolutely there are ideas still on the table but we just didn't want to rush through it right now.

Senator Jean - I felt that every single member of the group is totally committed to the ISP program. I think there were issues which is why we really were not, I felt, able to come up with something absolute. We had seven charges that were put to this group and we barely got to do the first one and were able to come up with some type of governance that we thought would work for this ISP Council. When I say

disagreements, it wasn't so much arguing it's just that there were different opinions on the committee that did not allow us to come up with a definite plan.

Senator Welsh - I would go along with that.

Provost Treadwell - I think I would just add that as we discussed this at the SEC, and we really wanted a chance to hear from the full committee, to work over the course of the summer on a charge statement, on membership as recommended by the committee, and to bring before the Senate next year a proposal for the council, a proposal for the recommendation and then guidance with the Senate around what those steps may be. Let's not rush in to solve during the last two weeks of the semester but in fact ensuring deliberate discussion and then making sure that there is transparency and clear communication back to the Senate at our first meeting in the fall. So that we continue to move it forward and I think that the report as Senator Jean presented to us was quite compelling to say that there were fantastic ideas on the table and what that broad agreement with regard to the council and how that work can continue. I think the goal here is to have a deliberate conversation and come back to the full faculty before the summer begins with what the next steps would be and then to the full Senate with regard to the charge that we'll develop over time this summer. It's not ended, it's just beginning and this is the bridge.

Senator Stanish - I would reiterate another piece that I didn't put explicitly in the notes. Any reconfigured structure of the Integrative Studies Program Council would come to the Senate for vote. We have voted on that structure several times. That will continue, as well as the charge. What I would really like to see is an explicit statement in the charge of how other pieces of the ISP come to the Senate, even within the existing structure that we already have now. Some of the debate that we have had this year, new outcomes what is our models for teaching. Those things could come to the Senate next year. Even without an ISP committee next year it would come to the existing structure so I would really like to see that as part of the resolve.

Senator Gianno - The reason for not having the ISP Committee on the Senate or at least make a space for it? The reasons for exactly why it might not be on the Senate?

Senator Jean - There was a lot of discussion in our group. The issues are policies that might come up to this ISP Council. They were concerned that it would overlap with the SCC and the AOC. In other words what would this subcommittee do if many of the issues are really curricular or standards based decisions? It was just a discussion. We weren't ready to answer those questions.

Senator Welsh - That is precisely my memory too. It wasn't a discussion about whether it is good to have an ISP committee but it was a discussion of what is the charge and how can that charge be structured in such that it doesn't overlap with existing standing committees and their current responsibilities.

Senator Stanish - Other discussion? I think that was the lack of a clear charge even in the minds of the SEC was part of our hesitation with moving forward quickly with a committee that wouldn't have a very clear charge right away. It may be confusing for that committee, it may be confusing for the Senate, it may be confusing for the entire campus body and so we didn't want to add to that confusion and rush to something that maybe wouldn't work as well as it could. We would rather have it work well. Are there any other questions or discussion on that?

That brings us to the next point of what do we do with our committee structure? We have already voted in last year's Senate that the AOC will no longer exist as of July 1st so we have seven Senators who would normally have sat on that committee. There are many many options, and an option that we had talked about throughout the year in SEC, although maybe not exactly in this way, is this idea that there are academic policies on the campus, some of which come to the Senate sometimes through the ASC

sometimes through the SEC and some which don't really come to the Senate. There is confusion about what the Senate should consider and what it shouldn't. So an idea that we had was to create an Academic Policy Committee that would be distinct from the Standards Committee. That is the next item in [SD 13/14-41]. At the moment I would just like to bring that forward for discussion and hear what people think about that as an idea of itself and also in conjunction with the idea of moving forward with an ISP committee eventually how would that play in. All those pieces are welcome. So any discussion.

Senator Martin - I think there are three considerations that we are dealing with simultaneously and I think we need to keep them as distinct as possible. From least important to most important having seven unassigned Senators seems to be weighing on this more than it need to. We don't need to try to construct a committee to give these Senators a place to land administratively. The first and second concerns in terms of priority have to do the fact that I can't actually understand what the distinction between academic policy and academic standards would be in practice. Very often policy is standard, policy is regulation and the substance of policy takes its meaning from the way that implementation of policy is specified in some kind of written regulations and practiced in some kind of body of experience. My concern is that this Senate this year, and next year if we are contemplating an Academic Policy Committee, clarify what the distinctions would be between curricular matters, standards and policy. The final consideration we are simultaneously thinking about Integrative Studies and the review of the review. We do not have yet have in our hands the report of the committee that has spent a year engaged in this analysis the seven plus charges, and I think it would be important for us before we make a brand new committee on the Senate that might take over some of the tasks of Integrative Studies to have the full report in our hands with time to digest it, discuss it before we construct a new committee in the Senate. I will be responding to the SEC's motion that we adopt a standing committee. I make the motion moving to table until fall semester 2013.

Senator Stanish - We are discussing at the moment.

Provost Treadwell - Just to offer a few thoughts in response to Senator Martin. The distinction between the policy and the standards committee are outlined on page 25 in the packet. Part of the genesis behind this idea is that there are some very timely issues the travel policy, the building access policy and some other issues that genuinely I have deep concern that the Senate is not engaged in some of those deliberations. This was a process by which policies that are created by the institution that have impact on the academic life of the campus would have a process by which it would have a committee to review and approve any changes to those or improvements to them. I will charge a committee this summer to try to look at more pragmatic policy with regard to travel and building access but I would like whatever that recommendation to be to come before the Senate before approved. So part of the genesis behind this proposal was to create a committee for next year that would attend to issues related to campus policy that impact the academic experience on campus in similar ways. What we discussed at the SEC is that these committees that we create could also be changed over the course of next year. We could attend to some of the critical issues, such as the issues of academic honesty, travel and building access. Those would fill the early work of this new committee. But as we were to meet with the task force and charge the ISPC for next year, work would be done to pick up where the discussion group has left off, work to advance the seven charges that were offered, and then report back to the Senate for deliberation during the next academic year to determine structure with a full charge. That was really the stage and the concept behind it. So the timeliness of attention to some of these important issues certainly are given the time necessary, but that the Senate is consulted at all steps when we finalize committee structure. The Policy committee was really to help attend to some issues, but I think that timely necessary engagement with faculty, and we haven't had that voice, so that was the genesis behind it. I hope that helps. It really wasn't rushed to assign 7 unassigned senators because I think there is a critical need for the Senate to have a voice on a few things and there will be policy revisions and I would like the Senate to weigh in on those next year. Thank you.

Senator Hanrahan - Because it is possible that this might be a temporary committee would it make more sense to make it an Ad Hoc committee just for next year until the ISP decision has been brought forth for a vote?

Senator Stanish - I think that is definitely a possibility.

Senator Welsh - If I may that would increase my comfort level enormously. A one year Ad Hoc Committee whose permanent charge is yet to be determined per discussions that we would be having during the year among other things. One other area of concern and this is just a note the new Policy Committee is most like is the Standards Committee and the Committee's whose turf or whose tasks this committee would be taking. Many of them are currently delegated to the Standards Committee by the Executive Committee when they come. It strikes me that I have been on the Standards Committee this year and it has been a wonderful experience, we have never met. I wonder if we necessarily need to list an array of tasks for the new Policy Committee. Or do we just leave these and give the Ad Hoc one year Policy Committee charges that the SEC chooses as it meets and sees things.

Senator Stanish - I am writing that down.

Senator Lucey - Chair of the not so busy ASC which has been quite wonderful. Since nothing was really handed down there were no pressing issues. I have always thought, and I think I have mentioned this maybe in an email toward the end, we need bylaws of some type. We are very impressed with what the SCC drew up here, but that doesn't exist for the ASC. What exactly does the ASC do? Maybe this is that moment to begin to have that conversation. It always seemed like a jumble with a lot of varied different things and sort of pulling apart of well this really belongs to all those frantic emails from Tom Richard versus those things that potentially reside in the Provost's Office. I do see there is a sense of separation. It made sense to me in the first read. I don't know if it is going to stick that way, but I think the dividing up of that potential work and defining it within bylaws would be a really great task for the future.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Part of our discussion about these committees and workload was that one of the things we still need to do from the time to graduation strategies is that we still need to take a look at all the programs and gateways and those sorts of things and we have never done that systematically. I think part of the idea of separating this was because that task is a daunting task. To look through every program and compile entry and exit and all of the other gateways that exist and try to make sense of it all in some way and I don't even know what that means. I do know that it is something that we committed to the Board of Trustees that we would do and we haven't yet. So I think that was part of the idea behind this. We also need to review the Academic Honesty Policy; maybe it's a big task, maybe it's not. There's probably a couple of calendar things that need to be looked at. The travel policy, the room access policy that seemed like that was a fairly significant amount of workload in and of itself amongst other things that might come up as we look at curriculum. Yes, this was a quiet year, but we were thinking next year would be quite busy.

Senator Stanish - Other discussion or thoughts? I am thinking about how to go forward and I am wondering if I could ask our new Parliamentarian. I am thinking back to Senator Martin's first point that was the least important point and I do agree with that, do we need to assign these seven Senators? I am wondering if we did nothing and left the Senator's unassigned at the moment, would we be violating our bylaws. Moving forward we could make the motion as it stands, but I am hearing there are other suggestions that we could attempt to amend the motion, or we could do nothing and send it back to the SEC and ask them to continue to think about this.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Just to look at this the way we wrote the motion for the next Senate meeting, which is where we would actually vote on it. We left it so we could edit the motion or the text of the committees here, and approve whatever we leave this meeting with in the next meeting, the 430th meeting.

Senator Lucey - Can we vote to violate?

Senator Stanish - We can vote to suspend our bylaws.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - We can, we can do that.

Senator Stanish - Yes, if we need to.

Provost Treadwell - The one thing that I would offer is that if there is the ability to conceptualize the idea of an Ad Hoc Committee and give the authority to the SEC to develop a charge that would come forward with a narrow purpose, then we could easily as we go through next year. We can then move and create an ISP Senate Committee, if that is the will of the Senate and the Facilitation team and the ISPC, as we work through next year. This buys us space and the ability to review entry and exit criteria. Just to put a fine point on that, we have a number of variable admissions criteria and it has created difficulties with regard to student admission and student registration. So it is creating an impact, and I think the discussion of the Standards Committee next year focused on that issue as well. This will consume a tremendous amount of discussion, so this would give space for that.

Senator Welsh - I entirely endorse that and I am a terrible motion imaginary on the fly but let me offer something up. Where it says D under proposed revision on page 25 the one year interim academic policy committee and the description could remain the same basically the description of the committee is charged by the SEC which is what we are looking for. That would specify this item D is in existence for one year and shall be replaced by something more permanent to be determined.

Senator Stanish - We could do that. That would certainly work for me. Any other thoughts on that?

Senator Blatchly - You would probably want to make sense about next year's Chair.

Senator Stanish - Yes. Can I ask a different question on the proposal just to get some feedback? In addition to creating the committee, we also attempted, as Senator Lucey pointed out, to clarify the charges although I think there are many things that are still being worked on and I agree. But in addition to that we attempted to think about the membership. We did add an ex-officio member who isn't currently in the current structure. A representative from the Registrars' office would serve as ex-officio on the Academic Standards Committee. That's a change and I wanted to hear feedback from folks on that. In my experience in the Academic Standards Committee, Senator Brendan Denehy served for a long time and he sort of served that function just because he happened to be a Senator assigned to that committee but it wasn't written in the bylaws. I wanted to get some feedback on a potential Academic Policy Committee ex-officio member. The idea is for a Provost appointee as ex-officio since so many of these policies are coming out of Academic Affairs.

Senator Darby - Just a real quick look at the Senate By-laws. I don't see anything that necessarily states that every Senator has to be assigned to a standing committee so an Ad Hoc Committee might be a consideration.

Senator Stanish - Thank you

Senator Darby - The question came up and I don't think there would be a need to suspend the By-laws at all.

Parliamentarian Robinson - As Parliamentarian I agree that there is nothing in the By-laws that I can see that states that every Senator needs to be assigned.

Senator Stanish - Thank you

Senator Martin - I would just like to say that if there were an Ad Hoc Committee and if it were sunsetted with a one year term of existence, I would support that as an amendment to the proposal. My concern was from my inability to distinguish standards from policy practice. I strongly suspect that a year from now we will be talking about an Academic Standards and Policy Committee and then a standalone Integrative Studies Policy Committee or something like that. I didn't want the Policy Committee to become a repository of all things ISP.

Senator Blatchly - Can I just ask a question about why things didn't get to the committee? There are a number of reasons that matters are not picked up by a committee, say as the Senate for example, there is no such committee. That's what this seems to address. Or people are kind of standing around waiting for someone to give them something. So I was trying to look through the charge of the committee to see if there was some clarity about how proactive the committee could be. In other words, are they supposed to go looking for work? Are they supposed to wait for the SEC to give them something? What is the sense from your expectations out of your conversations and then we can take a look and see if that matches the language.

Senator Stanish - That is an excellent question and that is a question that is continues to be asked through the Academic Standards Committee as well. I agree we need to answer that for either of the committees.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Some work of the Academic Standards Committee comes from the curriculum proposals as they come in. The rest yes, should be charged to them. I think when we started looking at the number of credits to graduation that was something that the SEC charged to the Standards Committee two years ago. That is what we need to do and I think that is where at our last meeting was sort of about. What things do we see in the future that need to be addressed and how will we go about charging committees. Unfortunately both of these two committees already seem to have a long list of things that we could charge them with tonight to address over the course of next year.

Senator Stanish - I think too that the bylaws do mention that all of the work of the Senate technically comes from the SEC and then the SEC gives it to the Program Committee. I think with the Curriculum Committee and the Overview Committee that work was so obvious that we maybe didn't do that process always so deliberately because there was no need. Whereas with the Standards Committee it's not so obvious and that is where the deliberation is. I continue to agree that there is a fine line between waiting to be charged and going out to look for work and then bringing that back through the SEC as a heads up that this is something that we want to look at. That is a question that we continue to ask.

Provost Treadwell - I would just add that frankly this year was a slow year because there were curriculum proposals that had very limited academic standards issues in them and we have had such a feverish pitch with regard to standards and the high credit majors and all of the work in the past few years this was really a year of reflection and a chance for departments. We talked about this and we didn't see any emerging issues other than those in the curriculum proposal. Next year I do think the withdrawal deadline, the declaration of major, obviously some of those issues that had been circulated by email rather than through the Senate or through the Provost's office really should be charged to the Standards Committee to review. Those are very critical issues and things that are happening around, rather than through, our

established processes that we need to attend to. I think that these are the focuses that we are seeing for next year.

Senator Lucey - I just wanted to say looking for work, I didn't want to look at the grading policy again. So I wasn't going to ask about the policy, and I don't think anyone else really wanted to either. We need the guidance; we need to have a frame work for understanding. Well this is what the Administration wants, this is what the faculty wants us to look at, and them come together and sort of make a decision around that. Therefore, if we do get it handed down to us by the SEC without a particular charge, it's hard to know what to do. We might know there's this work to do, but someone has to say it needs to be done. In our department for instance the building access is enormous, it's a huge issue and it's touching everyone, and that's much bigger than the ASC. Something has to have some kind of form for the work to come here; we are just sort of an oversight body with that regard. Maybe not the generator necessarily for the work so to speak. As the Provost was saying it would pass through the Senate and we have got to get that opinion from this body but as an oversight with potentially some changes but not the main player in all this.

Senator Stanish - There are a couple of options we can go with. I am hearing at least a comfort level with the idea of having a one year Academic Policy Committee.

Senator Welsh- I have come up with a better name. How about the Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee for year 2013 - 2014?

Senator Stanish - That would work - so we can give it the title of the Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee for 2013 - 2014.

Senator Welsh - The only other remnant is Senator Blatchly's recommendation of the Chair for the following academic year.

Senator Stanish - We can do that. We will delete that.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Should we just change it or do we care about the Chair at all. Do you want a sentence that says the Chair will be selected in any way, shape or form?

Senator Stanish - We still have a Chair for that committee just not the following sentence. Senator Lucey?

Senator Lucey - The last sentence as well.

Senator Stanish - Yes, we will also leave out the last sentence as well. We shall delete annual because it's only one year anyway for Ad Hoc changes.

Senator Sapeta - I just wanted to ask if the Standards committee for next year will actually have work to do.

Senator Stanish - Yes

Senator Sapeta - We are not creating a committee that will do work and then have a committee that will not do work?

Senator Stanish - No, we already know that we will be charging the ASC at least with this gateway exit/entry/retention review for sure, and I am sure there are other things on the list that I have written down somewhere, but that is an excellent question. Other discussion?

Senator Welsh - Are we moving now? We would not be voting.

Senator Stanish - We could do it a couple of ways. That was the next thing I was going to say since this By-law change, it is just being presented right now. We could make a revised motion and vote on it. If the vote is unanimous then that By-law change would go into effect. We would need a unanimous vote excluding abstentions. If the vote is not unanimous then it doesn't move forward and we would need to vote on it at the next meeting and the next meeting is in a few minutes tonight. So we would vote again at the next meeting in which case we would need 2/3 majority vote.

Senator Sapeta - Is there release time that would come with that committee? Is there release time that would come with the Standards committee?

Senator Stanish - No and no, there is not release time for either of them.

Senator Martin - I would like to urge that the sitting Senate that contemplates the issue should be the body that decides the issue and that a change in membership should I think require, compel, aid in the way in acting upon legislation because new members I am not sure have the background that 18 years worth of Senatetorial experience would provide to the issues that we are speaking to right now. I strongly urge Senators as you contemplate voting on this motion in this Senate that we try to decide the issue if at all possible tonight.

Senator Stanish - And if we don't, we don't actually have to bring it to the next meeting tonight. We could wait until the fall to bring it forward, so that's another consideration.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - If the votes happens in the next meeting, there is a discussion period after the motion so there could be time to try to catch folks up.

Senator Stanish - I will officially make the motion.

> **Motion:** The SEC moves to revise Article 7 The Standing Committees of the Senate as revised in [SD 12/13-41].

I can repeat what the revisions are if anyone would like that. The revisions would be in D. the title would be The Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee for 2013-2014. We would delete the sentence that begins with "The Chair for be following academic year…" and the last sentence "It shall receive annual or ad hoc charges from the Executive Committee." will be deleted. That's the motion.

Senator Darby - This would be under Standing Committees of the Senate so technically this, we are talking about this Ad Hoc Committee is a standing committee anyway.

Senator Hanrahan - Can we change Article VII to say "Standing and Ad Hoc Committees of the Senate '?

Senator Stanish - We could, not sure we want to but we could.

Senator Welsh - Can we just not make this a By-law change and just suggest that this is a motion from this Senate and the following Senate will follow this motion and at the end of their year term they will change the structure of the standing committee?

Senator Stanish - Yes, we could do that. So what we have to do is split this so that we would have a motion to change C. as written because we didn't try to attempt to clarify the ASC as one motion and a

separate motion as Senator Welsh is suggesting just to create this Ad Hoc Committee which is not necessarily part of the By-laws. I will withdraw the motion I just made.

Motion withdrawn.

Motion: The SEC moves to revise Article 7 Part C (Academic Standards Committee) only as written in [SD 12/13-41] be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Lucey - Just briefly, have we articulated everything we think is going to come to the ASC in the future? In other words were there things indeed creating an Ad Hoc Committee that might fall back to the ASC.

Senator Stanish - I think the only piece may be the Academic Honesty Policy. That was the piece that was originally thinking would go into the Standards and then moved it to Policy. However, the way C is written in the proposed change it does say that it shall receive annual Ad Hoc charges so we could lump that into the Ad Hoc charge if we didn't have a Policy Committee but it is a good point.

Senator Hanrahan - It does say "also but not be limited to."

Senator Stanish - That's right.

Senator Lucey - Or "as such matters as."

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion? Again, this needs to be a unanimous vote and no abstentions in order for it to pass this evening.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - The second motion I will make will not be a By-law amendment.

Motion: The SEC moves to charge an Ad Hoc Academic Policy Committee 2013-2014 with the charge as listed in part D. be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stanish - This is not a By-law change so we would not need a majority vote.

Senator Blatchly - I am thinking about Senator Martin's suggestion that if this is a committee for the next Senate then it should be considered by the next Senate.

Senator Stanish - I think he said the reverse. Senator Martin did you say the next Senate should consider?

Senator Blatchly - The question is if it makes sense to table this until the next group gets to vote. I was thinking a procedural way to ask the next group of people to weigh in on this would be to table till the next meeting. I would like to ask Senator Martin if that matches what he was trying to say.

Senator Martin - I think that if we are going to try to respond to this year's business by creating a fix for next year, then this year's Senate has to make that choice. My intention was to identify this body as the competent body and the next body is the charged body.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - The last item on the SEC report is the program review process update. The Provost continues to work on that and we were trying to connect with the Academic Overview Committee and just realized that actually didn't happen so we continue to make sure that that connection happens. We did confirm, thank you to both Senator Blatchly and Provost Treadwell for confirming that the programs that are scheduled to go up for program review next year have already been notified of that and that they should be working on their self-studies. The process of self-study has not changed at all. It would be the process of where that self-study goes and who looks at reports and resources afterwards that will change. That is the process we continue to work out for both accredited and non accredited programs and what that would look like. We will continue to make sure those guidelines are implemented for the fall 2013 and we will make sure we bring them to the Senate as well in the fall. Any questions or discussion on that? That concludes the SEC report.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly - We have nothing to report.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Lucey - We have nothing to report.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Darby - Yes, we have something to report. April 17th was our final meeting of the year and we discussed the revisions to the Curriculum Guidelines. First, I apologize to the body that we haven't elected a Chair for the beginning of next year. I believe the SEC may assist us with that. We have, however, completed work on the 2013/14 Curriculum Guidelines, and we are pleased to report the document as information only and that is [SD 12/13-43]. We do urge the SEC to place the Curriculum Guidelines on the Senate Agenda next academic year for purposes of a rigorous review and debate. As reported earlier, we did not overhaul the curriculum guidelines but we did undertake other revisions that provide clarity and guidance on curriculum development, the approval process for all curriculum proposals, and better communication among academic programs at the college. As the Curriculum Committee Chair, I have already scheduled a meeting with Provost Treadwell and Senator Stanish, and we are going to discuss the guidelines. Based on current guidelines, it is my duty to report that the deadlines for next year's curriculum cycle is June 1, 2013 is the deadline for intent of curriculum changes notifications to be received by school deans. October 2, 2013 is the deadline for proposals to be received by school or II curriculum committees. October 30, 2013 - deadline for proposals to be received by the SCC and February 12, 2014 is the deadline for Senate approval. Very briefly the end of year report, we did have an active and sound curriculum process this year. Our committee had 11 meetings and we reviewed 135 curriculum proposals of which 95 were approved by consensus and passed onto the college Senate as information, 15 course proposals that we approved by committee vote and were subsequently approved by the college Senate, 22 Program proposals were approved by committee vote and also the college Senate, 3 course proposals were not approved by the committee vote but 2 were approved by the college Senate after debate and vote. In addition to reviewing the proposals, we revised the curricular guidelines for the next academic year. There are many people to thank for this robust curriculum process, the different curriculum committees and their Chairs, the Deans and Provost Treadwell, the proposal sponsors and the academic programs. Thank you.

Senator Lucey - Jumping the gun just a little bit here, but I know we have been receiving these emails about the demise of Blackboard so I was thinking of where our curriculum proposal forms will exist in the fall? Do we use public folders? Are we going to switch to Canvas?

Senator Stanish - As far as I know whether or not we are leaving Blackboard and going to Canvas is still yet to be determined. I agree that it is important that at some point in time that we need to think about a potential move from Blackboard, even if it's not next semester or next year. I do think that using

Blackboard is wonderful, but it is not meant to be a permanent archive, and we need to think about that. If that change does come quickly we need to think about that quickly.

Senator Lucey - Just to add to that it's not so much the switching. I know a number of faculty who do not use Blackboard, who do not understand it, and so therefore are unable to get the curriculum forms that they need to get. It just happens, so where else are they going to be?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - They are also on the Senate website. All of the Curriculum Committee documents are on the Senate website. You can access them but if you do not use Blackboard where do you submit them to is a different question. Seems to me that they could easily be emailed to someone else who could submit them, but they are on the Senate website.

Senator Stanish - To get the form you get them on the Senate website and then just email them or bring paper copies to the Dean and the School Curriculum Committee as we currently do. I think the piece that would be missing is if people wanted to look at the existing curriculum proposals that they did not. That's when Blackboard is crucial and those proposals don't exist anywhere else. I do think there is some confusion. It's just very counterintuitive to not log into Blackboard as yourself, even if you use Blackboard. To log onto it as SCC is very counterintuitive for lots of people. Senator Schmidl-Gagne probably gets calls for that on a daily basis, and I'm sure Senator Darby does too.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Just to clarify the entire curriculum that gets approved, I do archive it so it is someplace else as well. I think that is where most folks know to look for it.

Provost Treadwell - Just to offer two points of clarification with regard to Blackboard to dispel any rumors or concerns that have you. Any decision to change our learning management system will be phased over time with clear transparent communication to the faculty and would be coupled with aggressive professional development and a phased approach because it would be such a big change for the campus. We would only want to make the change because the tool is remarkable in its ability to offer us things that we can't get through Blackboard such as semester to semester continuation and the portfolio for those departments that wish it. We don't have a proposal to report but I expect it by June with the business case as well as the cost and benefit analysis and feedback from the pilot. There will be a discussion from campus pilot faculty during our Professional Development weeks. So any decision will be phased over time, it will probably be 2-3 years out before we make that move, so it is not imminent. The second thing I would offer, however, is because of the criticality of that dialog space in the learning management system we have now, we would have to recreate it. So even if we moved from Blackboard, we would recreate that same type of structure in a flexible system that the campus is comfortable with. Lastly we talked a lot about the archive and the importance of an accurate archive for curriculum work as well as the Senate work, and our website must be the place where that is clear and that it becomes a repository of approved documents, documents under consideration. We have discussed in the Provost's Office and with Marketing and Communications a way to ensure that our website is a clear and accurate and consistent record and then to pair that whether it's with Blackboard or whatever the other systems emerge in the next few months, there will be clarity, there will be a phase, and we will not lose that ability for continuity. Thank you for your concerns and I am sorry that there are mixed messages that are out there because I have seen some of them as well, and we are not going to move from blackboard until we have had a long and careful phase in.

Senator Lucey - I am just showing that a member of the ASC can be proactive. Where are those forms, they come up to me at a department meeting saying 2009 form where did you get that? How did you find that form? Just being able to say it's there it's on the Senate website there is no question, it's there. They don't even to touch blackboard.

Senator Stanish - So bring all that message back to everyone you see. It's on the site

Senator Lucey - And it's updated.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I just saved the new curriculum guidelines and I usually do end of May update the By-laws. So that timeline works with the curriculum guidelines too. I usually just set aside a day to become friends with the Senate website again. I just checked and they are dated on there. The guidelines actually have 12-13 so I will continue that model.

Senator Stanish - I suspect often people pull up an old curriculum proposal that they themselves created and saved on their own personal computer and just modified it.

Provost Treadwell - This is not a question but I beg permission of the Chair to speak for moment. I just wanted to offer my thanks to Joe for his leadership and for the members of the SCC for the careful stewardship you offered this year. The clarity of the archive that you maintained it made the work of the Provost's Office much easier to communicate with our Registrar and I just want to thank you because I know this is a thankless job and it feels like it many times during the year and I deeply appreciate the effort not only in our Senate committee but our school committees and the college in general to maintain what is the lifeblood of our college, the curriculum. So thank you.

Senator Stanish - I second that thanks. So thank you and well said.

Senator Darby - We had a great committee this year.

VI.   New Business
Nothing to report

VII.   Adjournment 5:09