

Complied Minutes of the Keene State College Senate
2010-2011

Minutes
For the 401st Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010
4:00pm, Mountain View Room, Young Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:00pm

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Timney, Senator Warder, and Senator Rust

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 400th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as written

IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Cerilli announced the following:

- An Evening of Dance will be on Wednesday through Saturday, April 22 to 25, at 7:30 p.m. in the Main Theatre of the Redfern Arts Center

Senator Stroup announced the following:

- Dr. Michael Ferber, professor of English and Humanities at the University of New Hampshire, will present "On Poetic Fame," Keene State College's 2010 Janet Grayson Lecture in Literary Studies, on Monday, April 19, at 4 p.m. in the Mabel Brown Room, Student Center.

President Giles-Gee announced the following:

- The Board of Trustees will hold its full board meeting at Keene State College on April 29, 2010 and all are invited to participate in the audience

Senator Clemmenson announced the following:

- The 3rd Keene State College Carnival will be next Friday from 4:00pm – 10:00pm
- Annual Chalk Talk event will be held April 29, 2010

Provost Netzhammer announced the following:

- USA Today has an article about Keene State College in the life section of their newspaper. The article is about the film restoration project that the film program has undertaken for the film, *When Lincoln Paid*. The story has gone around the world in over 500 media outlets about the restoration of this historically significant film. Larry Benaquist was interviewed on NHPR. Alumni from across the country are pouring in with praise about the story. The first viewing will be April 20th. It is one of nine silent films that Francis Ford did in which he starred as Abraham Lincoln and it is the only surviving film.

Senator Swiger announced the following:

- The KSC Athletic Trainee Society is hosting on May 1st, and there will be multiple sports events. The Pepsi Grant Spring event will also hold multiple activities and all proceeds will support ovarian cancer.

V. Subcommittee Reports

• **Executive Committee**

Senator Stroup reported the following:

- The SCC's request for an "ad hoc" committee to study proposal related to ISP suffixes: The SEC supports further conversation regarding issues related to the suffixes in the SCC; however, with the newly available lists and Datatel limitations the SEC believes that at this point the proposal will not go forward and a separate Ad Hoc Committee will not be established.
- After a discussion within the SEC Senator Stroup made the following motion regarding adjournment of the Senate

Motion: The SEC made the motion that all meetings of the Senate shall adjourn by 6pm. Any vote to keep the Senate in session beyond this time must be by ballot, requiring two-thirds majority of senators present.

Vote: 23-0-0 Motion carries

- The Ad Hoc committee for high credit majors is a challenging committee to put together and overlaps with other campus work. This will continue into next year with discussions among department Chairs.

☐ **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator O'Brien reported the following:

- As addressed last December, the reviews of the Geology and Physics Departments have been postponed from AY 10-11 to AY 11-12. The departments have been combined and a single review will be done in AY 11-12. This change has crowded the review schedule for AY 12-13. To alleviate this crowding the AOC has recommended the movement of the review of the Individualized Major program from AY 11-12 to AY 10-11. The committee approached Dr. Ann Rancourt about the move and she agreed on December 7, 2009 to move the program review up one year.

Motion: The AOC made the motion to move the program review of the Individualized Major from AY 11-12 to AY 10-11 be approved by the Senate

Vote: 23-0-0 Motion Carries

- As discussed in the AOC meeting notes from December, Larry MacDonald has requested the Technology, Design and Safety Program be split into three separate designations with three separate reviews. These would be Architecture, Safety Studies and Sustainable Product Design and Innovation. The AOC believes a tenth year is needed in the review cycle to accommodate two additional reviews.

Motion: The AOC made the motion that the insertion of a tenth year and changes to the Program Review Schedule be approved by the Senate

Discussion:

- Honors is not included on the chart, Senator O'Brien will research this
- If we add a year 10, this will put programs on a 10 year cycle which means there will be no flexibility for putting anything off a year
- It would make sense to have newly created programs added to year 7 or 8 of the cycle so there is flexibility
- We may want to expand the AOC membership to accommodate looking at 5 or 6 large programs going for review in any given year
- Editorially [SD 09/10-34]: Year 6 - # 37 Technology, Design and Safety (TDS) and Year 7 - #15 Safety Studies are both Safety Studies
- #37 TDS should be removed, and there should be a separate one for Safety Studies. Even though they are separated they will both happen in the same year under Sustainable Product Design & Architecture
- Year 8 - #2 should be Holocaust and Genocide Studies
- Concerning placing the Honors Program review on this document, when we revised the policies, it was to take out those things that we do not have to report to the University System. All of the programs that are reviewed here go through the review process and then reported to the University System but that would not be the case for Honors.
- Process question related to the timing of when some of our accredited programs come up. Programs like Athletic Training, which went through its accreditation review this year, if should we connect it to this review so they are not repeating something and bringing in new people beyond that. This could be a great cost savings.
- The Music review is scheduled for 2012-2013, but in October of this year, they will have a site team on campus. They have done their self-study and have all of their work completed. It seems a little odd to put them off for two years only to have them go through a similar parallel process.
- We could contact departments to see when they are going to have their accrediting teams here for their own disciplines and rework the timing into this review schedule
- This is a document we could review every year
- The Dietetic Association has standards and the report would not be similar to the AOC report that is asked for and would not show the same type of format
- The focus was programs that have curriculum, not necessarily programs that go to the board
- It may be helpful to have reviews at the half way mark prior to National Accreditation this would allow for time to make

necessary changes

- We could leave it to the departments to determine whether they want to do this as a one or two part process
- The General Science program is an interdisciplinary program that goes through the AOC process and it is not listed on the schedule
- This will be revisited on a regular basis

Vote: 23-0-0 Motion Carries

Senator Lucey read the following statement:

The AOC subcommittee would like to thank Dr. Mark Long, the author of the Self Study, as well as and the entire English department for providing a document that was exemplary in its thoroughness and thoughtful in its ability to convey the dedication the English Department demonstrates in forwarding the Mission of the College.

The subcommittee members would also like to draw attention to our increased muscle mass that was an unforeseen, yet welcome, byproduct of examining this "weighty" document.

In general, the External Reviewer's Report acknowledged the strengths of the program as outlined in the Self-Study, including, but not limited to:

- an impressive faculty composed of serious and active scholars who are devoted to teaching and student learning
- a series of faculty hires since the last review period that added a highly desirable diversity of material coverage and methodology to program offerings
- a recent curriculum overhaul that was meant to address issues of course sequencing and multicultural breadth, in compliance with national trends, to better prepare students for post-baccalaureate study and/or careers
- corporate and individual leadership roles which the English Department and faculty members modeled such as spearheading the transition to the four-credit system or winning campus-wide awards for excellence in both teaching and scholarship
- a commitment to interdisciplinarity seen in the Department's connections with American, Women, and Holocaust Studies
- an active program of cultural events that enrich our campus and community

Challenges that the English Department face in fact stem from a number of the strengths listed above, and the AOC subcommittee recognized that many of these challenges were shared by other departments:

- air conditioning in Parker and Morrison was an issue in the 2001-2002 report, and it continues to compromise the classroom experience of faculty and students
- The exponential increase in the number of writing minors should open a discussion of the benefits of creating a Writing Option in the major. However, this would likely require the hiring of an additional faculty member and consensus within the department in terms of its long-term program goals.
- the need to review program goals and learning outcomes that reflect recent curricular changes including the adoption of the 9-credit core was a concern for the external reviewers, though Dr. Stroup, in his response to our report, noted that discussions are in fact underway
- The shift to a four-credit system and major changes to the curriculum have made imperative the need for results-oriented and varied methods of program assessment. One of the external reviewers was in fact chosen for her experience with assessment practices and implementation. The AOC subcommittee's reading of the Self-Study assured us that the English Department was in fact committed to assessment, especially in the recent creation of a department committee to oversee future assessment activities. The external reviewer's concern - if not obsession - with assessment focused on a need for documentation in the form of hard data and/or narratives. The AOC subcommittee recommends that such information be available to reviewers for the next review period ten years hence.
- The English Department and external reviewer's were equally concerned with the scheduling conflicts that arise from English majors with a second major in Education. The subcommittee was in fact misinformed as to the extent of this issue, and Dr. Stroup's response offers a corrective in stating that this affects only those students who must balance a second major in Elementary Education and Early Childhood Development. The AOC concurs with Dr. Stroup's hope for a "college-wide discussion of scheduling coordination"
- Finally, the external reviewers and AOC subcommittee hope that the English and Education departments continue to work together to obtain accreditation from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Motion: The AOC made the motion that its report on the review of the English Department along with the report of the external reviewers and all comments be approved by the Senate

Discussion:

- Air conditioning in Parker and Morrison will be researched
- The adjunct teaching ratio has gone down in English from 128% to 43%. This is due to the freshman English course now separated from the English program.
- 80% of ITW courses are taught by adjuncts
- English Education in the senior year is tricky because 45% of English majors are also Education majors
- As we increase our academic standards in departments like English, the bottle neck becomes more intense for students
- Education has talked about structuring the methods courses so they are at a particular time so others know to schedule around it, but this created more anxiety because it has to happen while school is in session. That means other programs had to schedule outside of the prime time. The Teacher Education Council has taken this up for ongoing discussion.

Vote: 23-0-0 Motion Carries

☐ **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Jean reported the following:

- March 24th and March 31st were open meetings to discuss minimum of 40 upper level credits per degree. Those 40 credits would include courses for the major, ISP and electives
- The main points that came out of the discussions:
 - i. Problem in not mandating #UL credits in a major
 - ii. Already a need for UL ISP, puts added burden on ISP program
 - iii. Cross-disciplinary prerequisites to allow students to take another major's UL courses
 - iv. This brings the issue of philosophically, what is an UL course
 - v. Relieves registration pressure of upper-class students taking LL courses and limits them to take UL courses to increase breadth of knowledge, but LLs can act as buffers for a semester with lots of intense/time courses
 - vi. Could be a staffing problem in trying to provide more UL classes in a major. KSC has committed itself to get more tenure track faculty
- 46% of last year's graduating class had taken 40 or more UL credits

Motion: The ASC made the motion the Keene State College require a minimum of forty upper level credits (300 or 400 level) for successful completion of any baccalaureate degree. As part of this motion, we recommend that this policy take effect for students who matriculate in the fall of 2012

Discussion:

- Very few degrees or programs would require any curricular change
- This is for first year students coming in 2012
- Departments would have 22 months to complete this, nothing would be implemented that could not be followed through on
- The 46% of students were still in the transitional General Education program that did not have any UL requirements
- The degree would require 40 UL, not the program itself
- There is concern about prerequisites, the understanding with curriculum development is that you build upon earlier courses to get into a higher course
- What constitutes an upper/lower level course has been a big discussion
- There may be a abundance of upper level courses offered but the number of seats available are low
- Who is going to teach these upper level courses
- This becomes a labor allocation issue – how are we going to staff these courses

Motion: Senator Stroup made the motion to close debate

Vote: Motion does not carry

- Do we offer enough courses and seats to handle this without prerequisites or changing programs?
- The courses are already there, this would not be a huge influx of students that need to take ISP courses
- Some of the flexibility from the UL courses would come from within the majors itself

- There may be a problem with programs that have a high number of lower level credits required
- In reality, 40 credits means students taking two semesters of UL courses
- We are already doing this – we just need to state that we are doing this
- Many majors have prerequisites before you can get into any UL courses
- Departments have two years to look at this

Vote: 20-1-1 Motion carries

Senator Jean explained the following motion was brought to their attention because when a student is involved with an academic dishonesty problem there is nothing in the policy stating if the student withdraws from the class, the sanctions can be carried out.

Motion: The ASC made the motion to recommend the following clarification to the Academic Honesty Policy be implemented for Fall 2010:

The due date of any assignment/project/lab or the administration date of a quiz/exam is deemed to be the start date for alleged policy violations and a case remains pending until the matter is fully resolved. If found responsible for a Academic Honesty policy violation the sanctions (i.e., grade of F, suspension, etc.) will be applied and enforced regardless of the student's enrollment status.

Discussion:

- There is a program that a student must partake if found responsible for academic dishonesty
- This language states if you are found responsible, then what you did subsequent to that such as dropping a class, is no longer applicable
- What about the date of infraction?

Friendly Amendment:

The due date of any assignment/project/lab or the administration date of a quiz/exam/*lab or the date on which the violation is alleged to have occurred* is deemed to be the start date for alleged policy violations and a case remains pending until the matter is fully resolved. If found responsible for a Academic Honesty policy violation the sanctions (i.e., grade of F, suspension, etc.) will be applied and enforced regardless of the student's enrollment status.

Vote: 21-0-0 Motion carries as amended

- Changes in the Time Blocks are on hold for discussion. Once Senator Jean receives the different variation from Scott Strong, she will post on blackboard for everyone to see.
- Senator Swiger is the new Chair of the ASC

Curriculum Committee

Senator Gianno reported the following:

- Curriculum guidelines are included in the packet

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the BA in Earth/Space Science be approved by the Senate

- There is no need for additional Tenure Track lines because there are no new courses

Vote: 20-0-1 Motion carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision to the BA in English be approved by the Senate

Vote: 21-0-0 Motion carries

- The committee continued its revisions of the Curriculum guidelines and they approved the final document.
- There were a lot of new courses coming through this year and information provided was minimal. Courses that are

interdisciplinary go into fields that have no advisory opinions, they felt if they had a syllabus there is more information about what the course is covering

- The syllabus is provided with the proposal as information because proposals do not have a lot of information on them. The following information must be appended to the course:

1. Course title, prefix and number
2. Catalog description
3. Course goals and learning outcomes
4. Course methodology, briefly describe your approach to the course (e.g., lecture, discussion, demonstrations, etc.)
5. Sample readings and instructional materials, and a list of reserve readings where appropriate
6. Course topic outlines

Motion: The SCC made the motion on the following Senate By-law:

Current language

Article VI

Parliamentary Rules

1. Effective Date

Senate legislation passed during an academic year takes effect on the first day of classes of the following fall semester. Curriculum changes to academic programs and associated courses will take effect the beginning of the fall semester following and end of the catalog revision cycle (February to February) in which they are approved. Course changes that do not require program revisions will have a more flexible schedule (see Curriculum Guidelines). Immediate implementation of a motion may be achieved and shall require a separate vote passed by a two-thirds majority of those present at the next Senate meeting. The above provisions shall not apply to amendments of the Senate Bylaws under the provision of Article XI.

Proposed Revision

Effective Date

Senate legislation passed during an academic year takes effect on the first day of classes of the following fall semester. Curriculum changes to academic programs and associated courses will take effect the beginning of the fall semester following the end of the catalog revision cycle (February to February) in which they are approved. Course changes that do not require program revisions will be implemented immediately. Immediate implementation of a motion may be achieved and shall require a separate vote passed by a two-thirds majority of those present at the next Senate meeting. The above provisions shall not apply to amendments of the Senate Bylaws under the provision of Article XI.

Vote: 21-0-0 Motion carries

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment 6:15pm

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 5/12/10

**Minutes
For the 402nd Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 14th, 2010
Following the 401st Senate Meeting
Mountain View Room, Young Student Center**

I. Call to Order 6:20pm

II. Roll Call

Absent: Senator Menees, Senator Blatchly, Senator Darby, Senator Stemp, Senator Warder, Senator Doreski, Senator Ditzkoff, Senator Rust, Senator McCarthy, Senator Clemmenson, Senator Robinson and Senator Netzhammer

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Chair: Larry McDonald

Vice Chair: Pete Stevenson

Secretary: Kim Schmidl-Gagne

Faculty-at-Large: Pat Dolence

Provost: Mel Netzhammer

Student: Donnie Clemmenson (running unopposed for Student Body President)

III. Secretary's Report

IV. Courtesy Period

V. Subcommittee Reports

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment 6:35pm

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 5/12/10

**Minutes
For the 403rd Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, September 15th, 2010
4:00pm, Mountain View Room, Young Student Center**

II. Call to Order 4:00pm

III. Roll Call

Absent: Senator Stemp

IV. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 401st meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as written

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 402nd meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as written

V. Courtesy Period

Senator Donnie Clemmenson announced the following:

- Student elections will take place next Monday and student Senators will be at the next Senate Meeting.

Senator McDonald reminded Senators of following:

- Try to keep your comments to 2 minutes and to the topic on the floor. Please state your name prior to speaking and those who want to but have not yet spoken on the topic will get preference.

VIII.Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald reported the following:

- The first issue for the Executive Committee is bringing a Parliamentarian to the Senate. The Parliamentarian is chosen by the Chair with the advice and consent of the Senate Executive Committee, and confirmed by the vote of the Senate. The Parliamentarian shall, at the request of the presiding officer, offer advice upon Senate rules, matters of procedure, and points of order and privilege. The Parliamentarian may, upon request of any member, rule that the gavel pass to the Vice Chair because of the trend of the debate. The Parliamentarian may be a member of the Senate or may be a non-Senate member. Senator McDonald invited Ann Atkinson to be the Parliamentarian for the Senate because she has served prior and did a wonderful job.

Motion: The SEC made the motion that Ann Atkinson serve as Parliamentarian of the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

- The SEC invited Melinda Treadwell and Mary Ellen Fleeger to speak to the Senate about the Nursing program, timeline, and bringing the nursing curriculum through the curriculum process.

Melinda Treadwell gave an introduction of Mary Ellen Fleeger.

Mary Ellen Fleeger is not only a practicing nurse but has served as Dean of Nursing in a number of capacities and most recently working with the Chancellors office at the University System of New Hampshire in support for Chancellor Steve Reno and of our current Chancellor with respect to academic programming and curriculum development. Mary Ellen brings a vast array of experience not only in nursing but also, in curriculum development within the University System. She is here to assist us with the development of the nursing program and the curriculum itself here at Keene State College.

Discussion:

- Melinda Treadwell requested that detailed discussions on the curriculum itself wait to receive the package that goes out in a few weeks

Mary Ellen Fleeger explained that 3 years ago the Presidents and Provosts of USNH spoke with UNH about having UNH deliver a nursing program at Keene and Plymouth. After a couple of years of discussions, the Dean of Nursing at UNH advised that UNH could not do this because of resource issues. At that time, the President and Provost of UNH advised that Keene and Plymouth were free to go ahead and develop their own nursing program.

- There will be a severe shortage of nurses in the next five years because in the past ten years young people were not getting into nursing programs largely because of lack of faculty. Due to this, there are not allot of nurses in the pipeline and many of the nurses today will be retiring whether from practice or education.
- There are eight different nursing programs in the State of New Hampshire and there is not enough demand to meet that need.
- There are two ways to become an RN and take the same nursing boards.
 - Through an associate degree program where you go to the Technical College in Concord for two years
 - Start as a bachelors, which is what we are proposing, that has a liberal arts focus and you add your nursing to that.
- Part of the interest here is we have a wonderful medical facility, good supply of Baccalaureate and graduate prepared nurses and as part of Keene's mission a commitment to serve the region. This is important because the students have to work in a health care facility within the region.
- Numbers from UNH – this past fall they had a thousand qualified applicants for nursing and only 48 open slots. For transfers, they had no openings and for the direct entry Masters', they had 40 qualified and 24 accepted.
- A direct entry Masters is where you have a Baccalaureate degree in History or Business or Art etc. then goes for 2 years and gets an RN after one year and a Master's in clinical nurse specialist after two. It is a way to meet the demand for graduate level nurses that practice.
- We have an oversupply of Associate degree nurses in this state and an undersupply of Baccalaureate and above.
- The Governor has put pressure on Schools of Nursing in this state to produce more nurses because we cannot meet the demand. The Chancellor and Presidents really wanted Keene and Plymouth to meet the regional nursing need.
- They have met with the medical centers in both Keene and the Lakes Region and they are very interested in helping with this program.

Melinda Treadwell explained the following:

- We are beyond the consideration of a nursing program and challenged by the Governor and Chancellor to develop a nursing program at both Keene State College and Plymouth State University. The work that Mary Ellen has been doing and now embarked upon is developing a Keene State Nursing program and not a program that simply has been imposed upon us but one that grows within which is consistent with our mission.
- One of the disciplines considered that both Mary Ellen and Melinda have been discussing and working on with a number of programs across campus is developing a pre-med option through biology and chemistry.
- We have a very robust and recently fully accredited athletic training education program that draws from the health science disciplines. We have very talented students who enter seeking environments where they can expend and truly immerse themselves in allied health disciplines or in the sciences in very rigorous ways. The nursing program will not only attract student but also, retain those students that we might be losing because we do not provide some of those challenging avenues or we do not have the programs that meet their needs.
- This is consistent with our liberal arts mission when we look at studies like Liberal Education - America's Promise, National Association of Nursing and Councils at the State and National levels. What we know is that nursing graduates are being asked to have much broader skill sets in critical thinking, creative thinking and working in teams to problem solve in a rapidly changing workplace.
- What we are realizing with the Nursing program at Keene State College, is we have a unique opportunity to create a curriculum as a public liberal arts college. One of eight (now nine) other COPLAC institutions that would develop a Baccalaureate of Science Degree in Nursing that would be rooted in liberal arts principles to create those broad habits of mind and couple that as we do now with our robust Professional Women's Studies program to prepare people for careers. This would mean that students would have the liberal arts foundation, strong science and professional preparation as well.
- We are looking very carefully at the curriculum proposals that you will see coming forward and are developing agreements with local partners. Many of our academic programs strive to have community partnerships. We are looking to share simulation and laboratory facilities with River Valley College.
- We have agreements in place with Cheshire Medical Center to share simulation laboratory facilities and library resources in addition to those that Keene State has already brought online several years ago when we made a commitment to support River Valley College Associates degree level program. We created new library resources specifically as a community service. We will now leverage those without additional resource investment.
- We are looking to work very carefully with River Valley College regarding structure delivery. How might we collaborate, and deliver curriculum for Baccalaureate and Masters Level qualified nurses in true partnership. We are not looking to do this alone but leveraging our community resources.
- As we have gone into the building planning of Adams and Butterfield Technology Center, we will be creating a new facility directly across from the Science Center that will house Architecture, Safety Studies and Sustainable Product Design and Innovation. We have worked closely with the Dean of Sciences to discuss the Allied Science Course work that we have physical constraint to deliver in Chemistry, Micro Biology, Anatomy and Physiology. We are creating two laboratories in the Adams/Butterfield facility to deliver and provide additional physical resources to support not only nursing but also our other Professional Studies programs and help lessen the burden with respect to physical planning within our science components. A number of things are falling into place to help support the infrastructure, resource and personnel perspective.
- The majority of the costs for nursing programs are in the physical infrastructure. You have to be able to deliver the simulation laboratory experiences and clinical experience practice. Simulation facilities cost millions of dollars, and we have secured these off our campus, which is a dramatic cost savings. We are not looking to create a standalone nursing program at Keene State College but relying on local partners to bear some of the largest costs.
- The budget models we have built are looking at tuition and fee revenue brought in by 48 cohorts. Those dollars would self sustain the program. The program and models that will be forthcoming are self-sustaining and not drawing resources. The one resource complication is Prerequisite courses and addressing that is going to be a major challenge. We are working to that and have agreement largely due to the contract negotiations and the work we are doing to support Sciences and Social Sciences.
- Melinda Treadwell has had many conversations with Dean Gordon Leversee and will be reaching out to Department Chairs and faculty in Sciences and Social Sciences to discuss the linkages and prerequisite course work for nursing candidates so they can enter into the nursing program.
- The revenue profile shifts from an 8-credit tuition model to a full tuition model and that is a dramatic difference in the revenue brought in. You will see the shift in a 2 to 3 year window.
- They also have close connections and have had many discussions in the school of Professional Studies around Nutrition, Dietetics, Athletic Training, Health Science, Biology, Chemistry and Psychology that have course work that can play into the needs for these majors. They are working closely to make sure the departments and resources are clear to support this going into future.

- Mary Ellen Fleeger has worked to meet the State Board of Nursing requirements and keep the nursing major within the 50 credits Keene State College requested.
- The Nursing content along with the hiring of faculty is highly regulated.
- The faculty and director of the Keene State College Nursing program will be Tenure-track technical faculty and part of the community.
- The partnerships explicitly address articulation for 2-year degree recipients from River Valley College and a few other programs into the Keene State Program, 2 + 2 articulation. Students find a gateway to us. They also draw connection with us to use their simulation laboratories at both Cheshire Medical Center and River Valley. The control of content delivery will always be under the supervision of a tenure-track faculty member at Keene State College in the nursing program. Just as it would be for student teaching, or any other program that we have off site experience. The integrity and rigor of the academic program is fully in the hands of the faculty and Keene State College. The partnerships are leverage based and the resources are cost effective to them. The benefit to them is a gateway for students and instructional model. They will have students enrolled in our programs.
- In the forthcoming proposal, you will see budget predictions, course curriculum, enrollment plans, staffing and resource plans that face this program over time and clearly identify revenue over costs consistent with our other programs on campus.
- Nursing timeline:
 - September – working on budget predictions
 - First week of October – Goal is to have full proposal package along with courses and learning outcomes to Departments for advisory votes
 - October 15th – to School Curriculum Committees
 - October 29th – Senate Curriculum Committee
 - November 10th – Senate
 - The reason for this timeline, which is consistent with our current curriculum proposal windows, is that we have a timeline of November 30 to get it to the System Academic Planning Council (SAPC). If we approve here, we still need the University Systems approval. We have a pre-approval to propose which was granted this summer following the Chancellors challenge for all of us to develop this program. We need the proposal to make it to the Board of Trustees by that meeting or we will be delayed by one year because we will have missed our ability to submit that package to the State Board of Nursing. We cannot enroll students into the program without the State Board of Nursing's approval. If we slip from this timeline, we will have dramatic negative consequences.
- The goal would be to have approval from the full Board of Trustees by February 17. We would then begin working toward enrollment targets of our initial cohort by the spring of 2012.
- Recognizing the timeline, Melinda Treadwell will work to make revisions live to the proposal based on advisory votes as it moves forward.

The status of the UNH nursing program:

They are currently focusing more on their graduate programs and increasing the number in their Master's students. They have a nurse practitioner program at the Master's level and plan on taking fewer students at the undergraduate level.

In part of we see in the Keene State College nursing program level, we are trying to reflect our goals around rural nursing community skill wellness and a lot of the work that we do is focused on our communities overall wellness and the nursing program is a direct contribution to that. Secondary to that, our safety faculty proposed that there are only 2 other programs in the country that offer Occupational Health Nurse Preparation track. To do that, nurses who were going through baccalaureate degree program would need to complete a selected group of course work in Occupational Health Hazard Identification and Wellness in the Work Environment. Those courses are currently within our curriculum in Occupation Safety Health Care and our Applied Baccalaureate degree programs. We would join through this proposal and have a track in Occupational Health Nurse development, another unique component to Keene State's platform, joining John Hopkins and the University of Washington State to deliver Occupational Health Nursing preparation, which has been a real regional need. We are really trying to leverage our strengths on this campus and not just create a nursing program.

- Senator McDonald went over the Senate vacancies and advised they are waiting for the elections of the freshmen representatives. Student Senators will be at our next meeting.
- The SEC asked for a special 1-year nomination for the ASC due to two senators out on Sabbatical, one in the fall and the other in the spring. Senator Pete Stevenson has put out the call for nominations and at this time, he reported the deadline for self-nominations is tomorrow and he has not received any.
- We are also short two non-senators for the AOC. Senator McDonald has contacted the Dean of Sciences and Social Sciences and Professional Graduate Studies for nominations.

- The SEC appointed Graham Warder to serve as Senate Representative to the College Planning Council.
- Senator McDonald was appointed to serve as Senate Representative to the Budget and Resource Council.

📋 **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder went over the review of the calendar:

- The tentative schedule for program reviews will be sent out prior to the next Senate meeting.
- Pending approval by the AOC and the Senate itself, the big changes this year would be to delay Physics and Geology for one year because those programs merged.
- Physical Education and Athletic Training this year to save on resources and faculty time because they are going through accreditation processes now.
- This year would be Theatre & Dance, Athletic Training, Physical Education and the Individualized Interdisciplinary Major.
- Social Sciences to next year's schedule
- Concern with having enough people on the AOC.

📋 **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Swiger reported the following:

- There has been one proposal submitted.
- Tasks of charges from last year are completed.

📋 **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees stated there was nothing to report at this time:

IX. New Business

Senator Netzhhammer advised the NEASC meeting is scheduled for October 31. A full schedule has been finalized and the Senate as a whole has the opportunity to meet with the NEASC team. This will be a lunch meeting at noon on Tuesday November 2 please RSVP so they can order appropriately. The hard copy of the document and schedule are at the printer and anyone interested in reading the printed document can do so at the library. The link will be up shortly He is requesting that Senator's look at Standard 4, which is the Academic Program Standard, and the Standard that has to do with Governance.

X. Adjournment 5:05pm

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 9/20/10

**Minutes
For the 404th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, October 13th, 2010
4:00pm, Mountain View Room, Young Student Center**

III. Call to Order 4:05pm

IV. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Lucey

V. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 403rd meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion: Senator Doeski stated the minutes do not reflect actual discussions because there is no reference to the questions asked concerning the nursing program.

Minutes were tabled for revisions and will be brought back to the Senate for vote at the next meeting

VI. Courtesy Period

Senator McDonald welcomed student Senator's Kristy Carlson, Anna Cerilli and Chelsea Clouse. He also welcomed Senator Fleegeer who will be serving a one-year term to replace people for the fall and spring.

Provost Netzhhammer reported the following:

- NEASC visit will begin 10/31/10 and asked Senators to review the self-study.
 - Meeting for Senator's will be held on Tuesday, November 2 at 12:00 in the MVR. Lunch will be served so please remember to RSVP to Senator Schmidl-Gagne if you intend on attending.
 - Open forum for faculty on Monday November 1 at 3:00pm - MVR.
 - Open forum for staff on Tuesday November 2nd at 1:00pm - Madison
 - Open meeting for students on Monday, November 1st at 3:00pm - Madison
 - Exit report will be on Wednesday November 3rd at 11:00 - MBR

These meetings are subject to change so please check your email for any updates

Senator Clemmenson reported the following:

Deferred Maintenance fee is a fee students pay every year that goes into a fund, which will total \$35,000,000.00 over the next five years from all USNH campuses. This allows for renovations and upkeep of buildings across all UNSH campuses. UNH and Plymouth State students are boycotting the fee and refusing to pay it because there really is no student input. The Deferred Maintenance fee does not go through student fees but shows up as a subcategory of the tuition factored in on the bill. At this point, Keene State College students continue to endorse a certain 5 year schedule; however, if administration decides to change it, students believe that it should be brought to the student body for re-evaluation with the administration.

XI. Subcommittee Reports

• Executive Committee

Senator McDonald reported the following:

- The SEC discussed changes of the By-Laws to Article VI. a and b concerning the list of members who have courtesy of floor during Senate meetings. This is difficult because of changes every year with titles and/or additions to positions. The discussion in the SEC was that the future change to this was to give standing courtesy to the floor to anyone recognized by the Senate Chair. The exception to this would be a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote from the Senate that would prevent that person from having courtesy of the floor. They will wait to bring it before the Senate while requests for other By-Law changes are solicited and considered.
- Provost Netzhhammer explained many discussions have been taking place about the ISP program. The SEC discussed how they would put together a process for engaging in these conversations then having broad based conversation across campus. The SEC will constitute an Ad Hoc Committee with representatives from KSCEA, KSCAA, Operating Staff Council, Professional/Administrative and Technical Staff Council, Administration, Students and the ISPC to determine the charge for and composition of a Task Force to discuss ISP. The intention is that the group will come together over the next couple of months to talk about what kind of Ad Hoc committee be put together and what the charge would be to that group to lead the campus in discussions of the ISP. The Ad Hoc Committee will make recommendations to the SEC by the Monday, November 29 meeting of the SEC and the Task Force will begin work in the spring.
- Balance in the Majors: The SEC will constitute a Task Force to review balance in the major, the Vice Chair of the Senate, Pete Stevenson and six members of the faculty (one each from Arts, Humanities, Sciences, Social Sciences, Education and Professional Studies) and one support staff member, will lead this Task Force. The Task Force will consider balance between ISP courses, major courses and electives and compare to national standards. Senator Pete Stevenson is hoping work will be done and recommendation made by the end of the academic year.
- Provost Netzhhammer explained beyond the specific interest of the Senate in the summer academic program, there will be three groups looking at how we might redo the summer program in ways that deal with revenue issues. The first group is looking at academic programs and full time residential experiences for 200 students and a summer start program for 25 incoming students. The second is considering what support programs and services we will need to provide to support these students, and the third is looking at the business practices needed to support the program including registration and financial aid.
- The summer calendar will also be reviewed to determine flexibility in scheduling academic programs. Their work will be looking at this during this semester. One issue that the committees have raised is what the impact will be on the calendar

for the current academic year. They are looking to see if we should have a summer session II because attendance has been poor. The committees were wondering if they could move their actions forward with the assumption that they would address the calendar issue. There is no vote for the Senate at this time just the potential that they may bring the calendar with regard to summer 2011 back to this group for some deliberation and recommendation.

It was recommended that a student and adjunct sit on the committees.

📋 **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder reported the following:

- AOC Membership - since they met, they now have a student representative (Kristy Carlson) and a non-Senate faculty member from Sciences and Social Sciences (Nora Traviss). Senator James Stemp is on sabbatical this semester and will be joining them in the spring. The AOC thus currently consists of ten members. One concern Senator Warder voiced is they still need a non-Senate faculty member from Professional Studies.

Senator McDonald stated he has sent two requests to Professional Graduate Studies to get a non-Senate representative to serve but so far, it has not been successful but will press the issue.

Senator Warder explained it would be helpful to consider suggesting someone from one of the programs that is about to be reviewed because they could advise on the process and would understand how it works.

- The vice chair automatically becomes the AOC chair for 2011-2012. Rich Blatchly tentatively agreed to serve, pending scheduling issues. The matter was tabled until the next meeting.
- The following subcommittees were formed, each responsible for one review:
 - Theater and Dance - Stephen Lucey will serve as chair of the subcommittee.
 - Individualized Major - Michael Antonucci was volunteered to be chair. He later graciously accepted the position.
 - Physical Education - Steven Harfenist will serve as chair of the subcommittee.
 - Athletic Training - Rich Blatchly will serve as chair of the subcommittee.

Senator Warder wanted to add that they have tentative external reviewers visits scheduled for the self-study from Theatre and Dance on November 18 and 19th, and the Individualized Major on October 28 and 29th.

- Revisions in the program review calendar:

Discussion: Senator Hartz questioned why Physical Education Athletic Training was in the rotation for review again when they just had one in 2006-2007.

Senator Warder explained they are up for accreditation and if the program review were scheduled at the same time, it would reduce workload.

Senator Doeski asked if Holocaust & Genocide Studies should come up again in 2026-2027

Motion: The AOC made the motion that the revised program review calendar be approved by the Senate as corrected.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald explained the Vice-Chair pointed out prior to the meeting that from the Roberts Rules of Order, you do not ask for abstentions in general. However, in our own By-Laws it does have a point for abstentions but only in the case where question of the majority vote needs to be recorded.

📋 **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Swiger reported on the minutes of ASC

Motion: The ASC made the motion that the new application procedure to establish Admission Standards for the Social Studies Secondary Education Program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

📋 **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees reported the following:

The following approved course proposal was presented as information - Comm. 378
Two other course proposals from TAD were sent back to the department for revision.

XII. New Business

There was no new business to report.

XIII. Adjournment 4:40pm

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 10/28/10

Revised Minutes
for the 405th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, November 17th, 2010
4 p.m., Madison Street Lounge, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:08

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Stemp, Senator Stevenson and Senator Doreski

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the revised minutes from the 403rd meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as revised.

Motion: To accept the minutes from the 404th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Friendly Amendment: Senator Darby advised that on page 12 under *Revisions in the program review calendar*, Senator Darby questioned - not Senator Hartz.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as corrected

IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Cerilli announced the following:

- "Turning the Tide" opens tonight at the Redfern Arts Center Main Theatre and starts at 7:30pm. It is collaboration between PeggyRae Johnson and Dr. Francis Nii-Yartey, visiting professor from Ghana.

V. Subcommittee Reports

• Executive Committee

Senator McDonald reported the following:

- The SEC discussed several Senate By-laws changes that had been suggested:
 - Courtesy of the Floor
 - Would like to change to something more generalized which would alleviate editing every year to positions and/or titles
 - Voting packages from the Senate Curriculum Committee
 - Removal of references to the "Interim Committee"

These will all come up later for discussion.

- Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained they found a reference in the By-Laws concerning an elected Senator who is a faculty observer to the Trustees that is not taking place now. This came up as a question from one of the other campuses in the University System as to why it was in our By-Laws. The SEC will look into this.
- Senator Schmidl-Gagne will explore options with Marketing and Communications concerning the Senate Website to retain greater control of the posting of content to improve the timeliness of postings.
- Senator Clemmenson proposed the creation of an Annual Alumni Speakers Day each fall. This will be brought up later for discussion.
- Senator McDonald asked that the Chairs of each of the subcommittees have their minutes with any motions highlighted reported to the Senate Clerk by the end of the business day on the Friday before Senate meetings.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees reported the following:

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision and name change to the Women's Studies Minor be approved by the Senate.

Discussion:

Senator Welsh – explained he had several questions that apply to the Minor but aimed more toward the Major. This array of classes is what students would draw from. He wanted to raise some questions about the nature of the II category that is going to be used as the ISP contributions from Women's Studies in both the Major and the Minor. It was his recollection that the II category was to be for classes that were team designed by professors from two different disciplines with the assistance of resource allocations from the college. These would be taught by both members of the faculty that had designed the course. This would be a resource issue because both of them would be involved in the teaching of one course. Those courses would be available for the teaching of professors in either of the professor's disciplines and in particular, by professors who designed these courses. He noticed that in the proposal from the Women's Studies in both the Major and the Minor, there are an array of classes that are IIWGS and WGS. Are the II classes in this array of classes II because they have been designed in the manner that was originally proposed in the ISP proposal?

Dr. Sara Hottinger explained that the II courses were an option within II. It was never specified that II courses needed to be team-taught. If faculty was interested in team teaching and it was within that II designation, those resources would be available and there have been some courses developed in that way. The vast Majority of II courses are in fact proposed by single faculty and taught by single faculty.

Senator Welsh advised he understood that they have historically evolved that way and that the teaching of them is often something that has not been done in teams but wasn't the design suppose to be in teams?

Dr. Anne-Marie Mallon explained that the original design was not exclusively a team design. The request came from the Committee and from the campus, that faculty who have never taught in an Interdisciplinary program or had never even entertained the possibility of teaching an Interdisciplinary course have the opportunity to think more about the changes that that would mean in their own Interdisciplinary perspectives and identity. The idea of team teaching was a very strong incentive for them to take on that challenge but there were multiple Interdisciplinary programs that were already moving forward as II programs and there were multiple Interdisciplinary courses already moving forward. Therefore, the team-taught option was one of several as Dr. Hottinger said which invited people who had never thought of doing a course in an Interdisciplinary fashion.

Senator Welsh stated that his recollection of the ISP being a team designed and the II category of ISP being only one feature of/or one possibility of the original design of the program.

Dr. Mallon advised that was correct.

Senator McCarthy asked if any men were teaching in the Women Studies Program?

Professor Hottinger replied no.

Dr. Mallon added that one of the reasons why this program is moving forward into a Gender Studies program is to invite greater participation among the faculty in multiple disciplines in that program whether it is by an individual course, joining the council or by other contributions. This is a way to open a door.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the addition of the Women's and Gender Studies BA Major be approved by the Senate. *Note: this also needs approval by SAPC

Discussion:

Student Steven Gonzalez commented the Women's and Gender Studies Major is very important, many students have sought out individualized programs under the current individualized Bachelors of Arts or Bachelors of Science with Women's Studies being part of the focus. If the option were available to them, many would have chosen Women's and Gender Studies as their Major. It is very important for this campus to offer this kind of Major given that Women Studies is committed to social activism, engaged learning and also purges disciplines and interdisciplinary which seems like a very important part of our education and our education philosophy here at Keene State.

Senator Swiger questioned the number of students pursuing an Individualized Major. What is the number of students that this particular Major would be drawing in?

Dr. Hottinger replied that the current Minor graduates about fifteen students per year and anywhere from three to five students graduate in the Individualized Major that has Women's Studies as one of their components when they survey the Senior Capstone course. Again, the vast Majority indicate that they would have chosen a Women's Study Major had it had been available.

Senator Swiger asked if we have proved this then would the Minor still exist.

Dr. Hottinger replied that yes, the Minor would still exist in the redesigned format of the Women's and Gender Studies Minor.

Senator Swiger - Is there a need for both?

Dr. Hottinger sensed most students that are now currently in the Minor would opt to major so she is not sure if enrollment in the Minor would decrease. She does believe it is important to have that Interdisciplinary Minor available for students who would prefer a Disciplinary Major but still want that Women's and Gender Studies component. In terms of numbers, she is just not sure at this point.

Senator Swiger - The classes that overlap, in terms of faculty load, would all of the courses that are within the Minor require an increase load for faculty on top of what they are already teaching or what they would be teaching to provide the Major?

Dr. Hottinger – At this point with the faculty resources that they have and staffing plan projected they can handle about thirty students graduating a year. That is with a Major and a Minor combined so anticipating 15-20 students will graduate a year with a Major that still leaves some room for there to be between 10 – 15 Minors that they can handle with current resources.

Senator Swiger – worst-case scenario - What happens if the Minor goes several years without anyone graduating? What if everyone moves to the Major and then the Minor is non-existence?

Dr. Hottinger stated they would have to look at what other programs do with their Minors.

Provost Netzhammer explained that all of the courses for the Minor are subsumed into the courses for the Major so they do not have to offer additional courses to support the Minor. In terms of the resource issue, there are not additional resources to support the Minor that are already being directed toward the Major.

Senator McCarthy gave antidotal support for the Major and the Minor, stating he often sees in his Public Speaking classes the effects of what they are teaching students. Some of the very best speeches he gets in his classes are from students that have taken these courses. They are so well motivated.

Senator Dolenc stated that when they added the Political Science Major a few years ago, they saw a kind of student enthusiasm that wouldn't have necessarily been able to predict from Minors prior to that. We came closer to what he thought as a Public Liberal Arts College by restoring that and this has a similar kind of opportunity to give students a way to pursue what they are passionate about and to engage in an academic program that fits with off campus activism and community engagement. This gets us a little further down that COPLAC path.

Student Steven Gonzalez commented that the Minor is necessary to maintain. Given that there are certain programs for example, if a student was pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Biology but had an interest in Women's and Gender Studies just the course load demand of fulfilling the requirements of a Biology Major would lend itself toward pursuing the Minor and bridging connections.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees stated there are six II courses presented to the Senate for approval.

Senator McDonald asked if anyone would object to do this as a package. This is not normal but would be more efficient.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne mentioned that in rereading the By-Laws it does not seem to preclude it. It just has not been our standard practice.

Senator Menees read all proposals for the motion.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IIWGS 101, IIWGS 210, IIWGS 220, IIWGS 230, IIWGS 240 and IIWGS 290 course proposals be approved by the Senate.

Discussion:

Senator Welsh - It struck him that we have approved a Major and a Minor with these courses already blended in. Women's Gender Studies will be situated in the Humanities. When an ISP course is considered and designed within Women Studies, is it naturally an IH class that gets made into an II class with further consideration and modification or is it naturally an II class?

Dr. Hottinger replied it is naturally a WGS class. They ran the WGS classes through the A&H curriculum and the IIWGS classes through the II subcommittee or the ISP. There is no school of Interdisciplinary Studies but that is where the WGS would go if we had one.

Senator Welsh stated it is good for the entire campus to know what the II course is and if a program has a natural avenue in its ISP contributions into the II category. Why that is so and what kind of programs are naturally II contributors if any are naturally II.

Senator Warder - Should the decision be made at the course level or the program level whether it becomes an II, IH or whatever. He believes it needs more discussion.

Senator Welsh stated that he was not raising a blocking point but asking a question that needs discussion and if it has already been discussed, then dissemination of the results of that discussion more broadly so that people understand procedures.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees noted several course proposals presented as information.

The next meeting on November 3rd focused on the Nursing proposal and they met with Dean Treadwell, Gordon Leversee, Nona Fienberg and Irene Herold to discuss the Nursing Program. At that time, they decided to table their discussions.

On November 10th, they did vote on the Nursing Major but had a number of issues that they felt were part of that proposal. Melinda Treadwell did go through tremendous efforts to revise the proposal to a position that they were reasonably satisfied with the presentation to the SCC that they could vote on.

The SCC spent considerable time during its last two meetings discussing and reviewing the Nursing program proposal. The following are the issues that were of primary concern to the Committee.

First, the administration grossly underestimated the actual time needed for the curricular approval process. The process has timelines built into it to insure that the process is not rushed. The curriculum Committees should not have been pressured to meet a deadline external to this process. This undermines the faculty's ability to carefully deliberate on such an important curricular initiative.

Second, the SCC has grave concerns regarding the statements made by the sponsor regarding funding. The Committee was presented with a proposal that could potentially impact the resources of other departments, especially during the first two years of its implementation. While we do appreciate the transparency of the proposed budget, we would like assurances that the USNH Trustees will support the upfront costs and that KSC will not incur added expense. We would also like assurances that projected revenue returns to the college are under the college's control and become part of the general operating budget.

Third, the fact that two courses within the new program, BIO 241 and ISPSYC 312, do not exist and at least one of these does not yet have a proposal submitted into the curriculum is unprecedented. We voted to approve the program without these courses with the understanding that they will be undergoing the curricular approval process this year and be in place by the time the program is implemented.

Fourth, the two upper level INNURS courses (INNURS 309 and INNURS 310) will require approval of the ISPC as well as the SCC. They voted based on the assurance that this will take place.

Normally, we would not pass a proposal with this many unresolved issues. They recognize Dean Treadwell's efforts to revise the proposal to the extent to which she was able. We understand the complexity of the proposal and the attention to detail paid to the requested revisions.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the addition of the Nursing BS Major be approved by the Senate.

Discussion:

Joseph Darby asked about the advisory opinions which the SCC received. Were there any updates to that? There were a couple of Committees that hadn't had at least at time of reporting had time to review the proposal. Have we received any other advisory opinions at either the school level or program level?

Dean Treadwell replied that they had not received any additional advisory opinions.

Senator Menees asked for any input on funding to be explained.

President Giles-Gee explained the system did provide money for the Director's position. Next Monday they will be submitting the proposal to the Board's Finance Committee that outlines the funding required for the Nursing Program separate from the additional funding they are looking for in regard to other programs and issues such as faculty increases etc. We have a long-range finance plan that discusses monies needed for the first couple of years and the funding brought back to the point when this program is expected to actually contribute to the costs of the institution. They are expecting that the Board would be reviewing and hopefully approving those plans. It is a wait and see but the expectations are good that it will be approved. This will also be something that will be discussed with the Legislature with regard to our appropriations. She is hoping it will be seen in a positive light.

In terms of the stability of our enrollment, that is also an issue they are looking into with bringing on a Nursing Program with shortages nationally in the thousands for both its uses in the hospitals and retirement homes. They have also consulted other programs across the State where the number of applicants far exceeds the number of positions in current programs. This program will take it first as a required investment and then give back in terms of dollars. Additionally, she mentioned that they did consider the needs in other areas, which are in Chemistry and Biology, and they are looking at the staffing plans that the Provost submitted to make sure there would be allocations of faculty positions for those areas as well as facilities for additional labs in the newly designed Technology, Design and Safety building.

They have had many more meetings of the Board in Capital Projects and Finance this semester as they are trying to obtain a tuition that is approvable before June of next year. The expectation is and has received tentative approval from the first two Committees for the funding of a Technology Design and Safety building in which would be included in the facilities necessary to augment a Nursing Program. This was a significant part of the dollars that we would get back from the \$25,000,000.00 swap with the System when the Legislature took our repair and renovations cash and gave us back debt service at lower rates. The title was only \$15,000,000.00 available for that debt service and the approval of this building meant that Keene State received \$8,000,000.00 in terms of the recommendation that will go to the full Board. So facilities will be increased and funding has been requested for additional faculty and a funding specifically for Nursing separate to the faculty projections that have been requested. They have also requested that supplies side budgets be increased.

Senator Darby appreciated hearing from the President because there are concerns on this issue in the Sciences. No one voted on the proposal in the Sciences and Social Sciences Curriculum Committee based on resource issues. He wanted to hear from colleagues in this body from Sciences and Social Sciences since this vote was taken and since other votes that were negative taken that are not level particular in Chemistry whether those issues have been resolved.

Senator Blatchly responded specifically on the Chemistry issue. They were surprised by earlier indications and they did not really have time to clarify things. They have had consultations with a number of people on many of the resource issues and believe they have addressed most of them. A couple are still outstanding but there was a real concern on their part that somehow the teaching of the course that they would teach and contribute to the program would somehow be split between the Sciences and Professional and Graduate Studies according to what is in the commentary of the advisory opinions. That was the biggest concern.

There are some smaller issues in dealing with setting up the laboratory program. One concern, having read the budget, is they are not attributed to the Nursing Program because there are broader general issues. In teaching Chemistry 103 for example, they serve not just the Nursing Program when somebody comes in but also the Nutrition Program and Athletic Training. There will be a new lab and they will need a new lab manager set up. If Nursing takes a piece of that, perhaps it will be prorated and certainly, they need to plan for that. They need to plan for the set ups for the labs. They ran a rough estimate and to set up the Chemistry portion will take about \$30,000.00 just to get the equipment because you cannot be swapping equipment between two buildings. We really need to

set up a new lab completely with separate equipment and a person to maintain them. He does not know about Biology, they might be half again or double that. It is going to be two programs and there will be a question whether that is going to fit into that room. He just hopes that can be addressed. This is a proposal that is being done on the fly. Hopefully, we can add the budgetary issues to the request and really give an honest estimate so we do not fall on our face.

Senator Clemmenson added that we have the proposals into the Board of Trustees, which have been submitted. If we approve this, we now have a Nursing program and we do not know if we have the budget coming in until the Board votes on it. If we approve this today what happens if the proposals are rejected?

President Giles-Gee explained that since this proposal would also go to SAPC, The System, and the Programs and Services Committee then the Board itself would need to determine if they could fund the programs that would need to come through it. They would have to give the final authorization for any program. This is a program that they have requested and a program that the State needs. Her expectation is that they would be finding the funds this year but she cannot guarantee that because it would require a vote of the Board.

Senator Blatchly mentioned the other side of a concern while going over and reading the budget, thinking about the processes that we have to go through – do we have a timeline that is a little too ambitious? We have already seen the curricular process delayed. We are talking about 4 or 5 hires to begin and he is not sure exactly when. If the hire is actually during FY 2012, you start that in July and you hire these people in November. Who is hiring? We do not have much expertise with Nursing on campus. Who is actually doing the hiring? Can we support these 5 searches with the care that we need to provide a good faculty? He mentioned the faculty is really the key to getting a quality program. We really need to be careful how we bring the faculty in. Do we have the time and expertise to be careful enough to bring the faculty in under this schedule? If we hire people in November, how do we handle the admissions that are supposed to be handled by the faculty and admissions decisions to be made by October 1st according to the proposal? Should we consider delaying this a semester to give us some time to actually do the hiring? When does the curricular development for the courses which we have not yet installed, when does that happen? If people are hired in November, do they have time to develop 2 or 3 new courses?

Provost Netzhammer explained Nursing is a different program for us in a number of different ways. He explained the constricted timeline and the pressure the Senate has been feeling about this. It is no different than the pressure that we have all been feeling about this.

When the Board of Trustees set our budget in June, which was with the expectations that we would have a Nursing program in January 2012. It was at that point the University System released Dr. Fleeger to work on that program with us to help us to be able to do that. The Board of Trustees released \$50,000.00 for us to be able to begin that process. Our budget this year was set with this very constricted timeline and we have tried to be immediately responsive to every question that has come up sometimes to the point of confusing things instead of helping things. The Senate has asked many questions and we have tried to address those as immediately as possible. In May and June, the Provost and President were having conversations about what was an acceptable timeline and in all honesty, if we had another year to do this it would have been great. The Board was clear that if they were going to invest in us in this year then we needed to meet that deadline. The effect of the Board not investing in us would have meant that we would have had to hire a year in advance a Director of Nursing and come up with the start up funds on our own. He believes it is fiscally prudent for us to meet that deadline and he thinks we can.

As they have visited other Nursing programs and talked about what we need accomplish in the next year this will not be an easy thing. We have to have by July 1st a staff of 4 nursing faculty on board and those searches have to begin quickly. They need to begin once the curriculum is approved and that is an essential element. It is one of those things that begin to constrict the process and will begin once we are approved by SAPC on November 30th assuming we get approval from the Senate today. We do not want to presume approval at any level but we want to be ready to go when we have that approval. We have not advertised a Nursing program but we need to move quickly to begin marketing a Nursing program as soon as we have that approval from the System. He believes the mechanisms are in place for us to be successful to have our faculty on board and the fact that Nursing programs have a mid-year start instead of a November start does buy us the additional time we need to address all of the concerns we are talking about. Finalize the course proposals, the Curriculum Proposal and to tweak things that may need to be tweaked in this process and address the resource needs for the Sciences particularly those suggested. They are moving along but are not finalized yet. He feels confident that we have done the work to make this possible.

President Giles-Gee addressed the additional question raised about quality control. She served as Chair of the Post Secondary Education Commission when nursing programs did go to them. It is that body that regulates all of Higher Education in NH. One of the things with the Nursing program is that requirement for accreditation; they turned at least one down if not two because of the things you mentioned. The expectation is that this curriculum needs to be vetted through that body, in addition to being reviewed

by the Director, and has worked to review those types of programs is essential. Her expectation is that this would not happen unless we get that approval as well. The implication with this program with the Liberal Arts focus that is specific to Keene State should be part of the program - as long as these two things are made whole, they can bear the mark of Keene State and one we can be proud of.

The processes by which curricular comes to this body we are seeing come from outside other than faculty. She went back historically and discussed how this college was created with public dollars coming in to pay for the education to teachers for the region. She has already been asked by others to bring in other programs needed by employers in this region for economic vitality. One was Engineering. So the question is how we address the needs for programs that do not exist in the region that are called for by employers or by the State. If you look at the mission of the System for public institutions, that requirement is in their mission. This is not something we have had to deal with in the past but she expects that in the future this will be something that this Senate will be facing. She is asking that the Senate spend some time in the future talking about how to address those issues.

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to extend discussion for another fifteen minutes be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Provost Netzhhammer added that as a community we have realized this is an issue we need to deal with. One of our projections in our NEASC Self study that we have is precisely the question the President has asked and is raising with us right now. How do we as a community, deal with our Governance Board, with our State and the expectations that they create for us as a poorly funded public campus. We need to address those issues. He thinks Engineering is an interesting one and our relationship with the Community Colleges is another issue that is a major concern to the Board. The Community Colleges are talking about offering 4-year degrees. Our interest in responding to that and the Boards interest is how we locate our programs on the Community Colleges. He thinks these are going to be issues that the Senate will confront over the next few years and developing a process that allows that to happen. We are learning a lot over the experience that we have gone through over the last three months.

Senator Blatchly responded that he did not believe anyone disputes the need for a program like this. Who is going to hire the faculty? How do you hire for a program like this? What is the sense that we will be able to attract reasonably good candidates given the severe shortage of nursing instructors? What is the presumably conglomerate relatively high average salary?

Dr. Fleeger explained that she would be doing the hiring and does have the authority. She stated it is an interesting discipline because she had to be approved by the State Board of Nursing to be the Director. That approval also extends to the faculty. Therefore, if she wants to hire faculty she still has to get approval by the State Board of Nursing. It is a much regulated discipline. She had to be hired 12 months in advance and have the autonomy to develop the program and work with faculty. She has to have them hired by June 1st so they have 6 months to refine the courses and set up the clinical experiences, meet with students and select students before the first student enrolls which would be January 2012.

The interesting thing for her was she has met with 4 people from this region that have contacted her who have PhD's and Masters in Nursing and they have not recruited. Word of mouth is going around and people are supporting Baccalaureate prepared nurses. They want to hire and support them here. There are Masters in nursing that want to live and work here. They do not want to be at a research University. Plymouth, who is also starting a Nursing program – two people have contact her from there to state that they would be interested in teaching in a Baccalaureate program. Dr. Fleeger and Dean Treadwell may select them but the Board of Nursing will still have to approve them. She has to hire in 4 different areas, Master in Med Surgery, Community Health, Obstetrics and Pediatrics and one in Psychology. She does not even have a choice in the disciplines, which is mandated. There is a shortage because most of them are going to be retiring in the next couple of years.

Senator Darby asked where she used the word Director, if she was on the draft budget as the Director of Nursing at the Associate Professor level for 12 months as indicated on the spreadsheet.

Dr. Fleeger stated currently she is and she may stay as that or she may hire a Director of Nursing and move to faculty. She is a full professor.

Provost Netzhhammer clarified that the Director must be on Board at least 12 months before the first student begins. What the system allowed us to do was to use Dr. Fleeger since she has those credentials and is licensed in the State to be able to develop that program. We have not presumed that she will be the permanent Director. We have not had those conversations at this point. Our conversations have been about what are the faculty we need to hire and getting the curriculum done. Once we are past that point, we will begin to look at all of those positions and have that conversation.

Senator Darby mentioned on the documentation shared with the Senate there seems to be an anomaly on the lines with respect to the two collective bargaining units in agreements they have with the University System. What is the Educations Association's role in hiring procedures and with the Adjunct Association?

Senator Dolenc replied that himself, Provost Netzhhammer, President of the Adjunct Association Michael McCarthy, Pete Stevenson who leads in the negotiations and Representative John Lund started meeting in the summer and have been meeting more consistently every couple of weeks. The goal has been for the five of them to clarify what clinical faculty would look like, where they belong and how that works to suit the needs of the stakeholders which include the 2 Associations and the Administration. They are cautiously optimistic that they will resolve most of those details by the end of the semester.

Provost Netzhhammer added that there is another piece to this issue and that is 12-month faculty that they have never really dealt with. It came up in negotiations and that will be something that they will need to figure out in the next few weeks along this same timeline.

Senator Blatchly stated he added up the total number of courses in the program and it looks like there are 22. There are 4 or 5 faculty members, which mean that they can teach 24 sections. It seems like there is a cohort going through each course of about 32. Will the classes be 32 students or will there be matching multi section classes and if so does the number of multi section classes actually allow us to cover this with the staff that we have proposed?

Dr. Fleeger responded that there are 13 Nursing classes.

Dean Treadwell added that they are paired cohorts for a number of those courses. That is where they tried to make the distinction between the generic and the RN Completer. The clinical courses are governed by the State of NH Board of Nursing with the faculty to student ratio. They do believe and will evaluate our staffing plan internally within the guidelines of the Union bodies but also with other Nursing programs of similar size and mission to the scope that we appropriately staff with the cohorts projected. They have been assured at every level with the staff projected and clinical supervision needed there will be support for the program.

Senator Darby - The fees that are articulated on the proposal program include payment for immunizations, differential fees for clinical courses, travel fees back and forth etc. Does the Bursar collect these fees? Is there an expectation that is placed on the students through content on the syllabus? How are the fees accessed and collected by the institution?

Dean Treadwell explained that they have modeled the fee structure parallel to our Athletic Training program and are engaging the process with the Director of Purchasing, Jim Draper to evaluate with the Bursar's Office, the Center for Wellness and Bookstore ways for us to appropriately direct the students and gather reduced costs options leveraging our resources on the campus. Those fee structures are parallel to our Athletic Training program and based them on the same model that is consistent with systems we already have in place.

Senator Swiger clarified what they already do in Athletic Training. Where they are Nationally Accredited, they have to inform students that there are additional fees such as, immunizations and maintaining of professional CPR. If they do not have those things coming in and we do not offer it, then they have to go out and maintain that on their own. We provide different opportunities for them to be able to achieve it on campus. When students go out to their clinical at the hospitals they have to be in professional dress so it is a way for us to notify them that in addition to their tuition, books etc. there are these other things. Sometimes there is a laboratory fee because they have to purchase stethoscopes or whatever. We provide some for the laboratory but students want to have their own so when they go to clinical they have them.

Dean Treadwell explained additional fees with respect to the Nursing Program proposal and fees. They also met with Chris Burke from the Center of Wellness concerning immunizations. They anticipate those will be offered on campus to the students as part of the admission process. The Nursing candidates would receive their immunizations here through the Wellness Center and in addition to that, the fees from the Nursing Program help to cover the cost of consumables. As we described before, there are resources to establish the clinical simulation facilities as we have established relationships with Cheshire Medical and River Valley.

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to extend discussion for another fifteen minutes be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Lucey asked when it says Allied Discipline Requirements - is that ISP. Those 44 credits

Dean Treadwell stated 16 of the 44 credits are also ISP

Senator Lucey questioned if the Nursing students are being held at a standard that all of our students are.

Dean Treadwell stated yes.

Senator Hartz observed that this is the first time a proposal has come through with a projected budget that goes out 3 years. When Dr. Treadwell presented it to them, it sounded like the best efforts had been made to project what that budget will be. He just wanted to point out that with that budget, the college stands to profit from a monetary standpoint as well as producing graduates by \$870,000.00. It is his hope that the President and the Provost would be able to keep those funds within KSC control because it seems as we think about new programs, we can show a profit to the college, and benefit the community it is a win win.

Senator Darby asked again if the fees articulated under the proposed program are collected by the Bursar and does Athletic Training do the same.

Senator Swiger explained that students purchase their laboratory equipment through the bookstore. If they have to maintain a CPR certification they do that on their own and go off campus. If they need additional immunizations they can go to the Health Center. In terms of clothing, they can purchase those through the bookstore. They are working with Jim Draper to institute a mechanism through the Bursar to be able to purchase clothing at a bulk rate.

Provost Netzhammer advised not look at it as fees but as irregular expenses that are the costs of being part of this Major. We want to be very upfront and transparent with students that there are these costs that are not traditionally fees that they would be paying to the institution. They are fees to the provider of the service they are getting. If it is an immunization then it is to the doctor. If it is supplies for a lab class then it is to the bookstore. It is identified as fees but really, its additional expenses that all of the students will incur and we want to be transparent about it.

Senator Blatchly made a comment about the budget. There are some things missing like lights and heat. If you just take the salaries and the local expenses for the program itself, you will also appear to get a huge profit. That profit is what keeps the rest of the people on campus in their jobs and we would like to have the people in Physical Plant be able to keep their jobs. This looks like it is going to be quite reasonable and in line with many other programs on campus.

Senator McCarthy moved to call the question

Senator McDonald explained that the Senate By-Laws do not allow for discussion to be discontinued if a 15 discussion period is in progress.

Senator Darby - what is a differential fee? What does that mean?

Dean Treadwell explained differential fees relates to consumable supplies in the clinical courses.

Senator Clemmenson - In terms of the budget, we have had budget issues before and this is the first time they have gone through step by step the budget and monetary expenses that are going to go along with this. The budget is going to change and salaries are going to change this is what they are projecting over the next three years. The important thing here is the curriculum they are providing.

Senator Darby stated there are concerns. Keene State College is very fortunate to have a number of Nationally Accredited programs such as, Teacher Education, Athletic Training, Health Science, Music and others. We also have programs that have aspirations toward National Accreditation – Chemistry is one, Art is another. National accreditation is something that comes to the college and it is recognition of the investment that is made by the college into a program that seeks National Accreditation. That is expensive for us all. Is it fair to say that the current program will not erode programs that currently exist?

President Giles-Gee advised that the approach that has been taken with the Board as we defined our initiative, as a quality and access initiative and the additional funds we need are to sustain and enhance quality here. One of the primary criteria for the strategic initiatives was in fact the enhancement. The documentation of whatever was proposed would enhance the academic program therefore a number of the accreditations that she noted when she came in had not been reviewed for some time. We spent additional funds to bring those to the standards that they are today. Some had been on probation, a number are aspirational, and she personally sought funds to enhance the possibilities that those certifications and accreditations should and could have.

The expectation is not just the accreditation alone which does not exist for other programs but also we developed a program enhancement dollars for the Provost's Office to be able to provide some support to those areas. True they were minimal but it was a beginning. The expectation is in fact all programs with the recommendations of the faculty have opportunities to enhance. With the program reviews of the Senate that provide recommendations of the needs of the programs, those too can be used as tools to provide enhancements. Her expectation is for excellence all around and the Board has come to understand that that does mean money and we will be requesting the types of funds that will make up for some of the funds that we have lacked at the time. We have been fortunate that the Board heard us last time and she is expecting and hoping that on Monday they will hear us again with the same types of requests that will bring us that same expectation. She did also caution as we go into FY 12-13 we are looking at an economic time that has not really come out of the recession. It may not push us as far or as fast as we would like to.

Senator Darby thanked President Giles-Gee for her advocacy at the State level and the dynamic job she is doing for Keene State College.

Senator McDonald called the question and mentioned there was a request that the vote be done by ballot.

While the ballot vote was taking place Provost Netzhammer explained what SAPC was for new Senators. It is the System Academic Program Committee and it is made up of the Provosts of the 4 USNH institutions. Any curricular activity, new program or commission of a program first goes to that group then the Administrative Council, which is made up of all the Presidents before it goes to the Board of Trustees.

Vote: 24-3-1 Motion carries

Senator Menees continued:

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the INNURS 309 and INNURS 310 course proposals be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Clemmenson asked if we should approve these before we know if the ISP Committee will approve.

Senator Warder asked if we have to approve these or can we wait until it goes through the ISP Committee. Is there a reason it is coming to the Senate now?

Senator Menees explained they are not really courses for the Major but courses outside the Major that are offered as electives and to be offered to any student who wishes to take it. They are not essential to the program.

Senator Lucey stated they are courses that do not have faculty.

Senator Swiger stated normally Integrative Study courses need to go through the ISP Committee before the Senate as a motion to be approved here.

Senator Clemmenson asked if they are not essential to the Major then do they have to be approved tonight. We could table them until the next meeting while the ISPC has the chance to view them.

Senator Welsh offered his opinion to the extent that we would like to keep the breaches of protocol to order that this body engages in to a minimum. It might be beneficial to table this motion provided it is the appropriate sequence in steps until the next meeting.

Motion: The motion was made to table the two course proposals until they have been approved by the ISPC be approved by the Senate.

Senator McDonald asked if this would affect the Nursing Program in anyway if these course proposals were tabled.

Dean Treadwell advised it would not.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained Interdisciplinary courses are reviewed and approved by the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee of the Integrative Studies Program. After review by the subcommittee, the coordinator forwards decisions to the faculty co-chair of the Integrative Studies Program Committee who forwards proposals for approval to the Senate Curriculum Committee. She explained that we do not know when that will happen so it might be a reference to the process.

Vote: Motion carries

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder updated on the overview process:

Physical Education and Athletic Training are reusing accreditation reports for their overview so they are collecting those materials. They met with Professor Smyth and Professor Swiger to receive information about this and what they are finding is they need is a road map to accreditation reports. It seems like all of the information is there, it is just where you find it. He believes using accreditation reports for the AOC process will work well. They will report to the Senate in the spring about how well this works.

Two other programs they are reviewing, one is kind of an unusual program and it is the Individualized Major just because of the nature of it. They had outside reviewers and just received the report from the external reviewers and will start reviewing that. One thing that came up in their meetings was whether the Individualized Major is really a program that should be reviewed because it does not have any standing curriculum. The other program, Theatre and Dance, the external reviewers will be coming on Thursday and Friday. They will receive their reports within 3 weeks. By January, the AOC will begin writing their reports.

Senator Blatchly agreed to be Chair of the AOC next year.

Senator Darby pointed out on page 19, Item #3, Physical Education and Athletic Training. Subcommittee chairs reported on meeting with department chairs.

Senator Warder stated he should have made that clear. They are separate subcommittees, subcommittee for Athletic Training and subcommittee for Theatre and Dance. Each one of those subcommittee chairs met with the head of Physical Education Athletic Training to talk about the review process.

Senator Swiger stated she is not a Department Chair but a Program Coordinator and it should read that way.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Swiger stated they met twice to go over the Nursing Admission Standards.

Motion: The ASC made the motion that the admission standards for the Nursing program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

VI. New Business

Senator Hartz – question concerning the comment about how does the Senate position itself to look at these proposals differently from outside. Is it a task force that is charged within this room to study that or is it a larger process question. How is it from a strategic standpoint? What do we do?

Provost Netzhammer asked if the question was how do we have discussion?

Senator Hartz explained yes. What is the process that we need to use to help examine how our internal process facilitates these questions from the outside? Moreover, when we recognize it is not a normal route of faculty bringing forth or request to change a program.

Provost Netzhammer explained there are 30 projections in the NEASC Self study. On January 11 and 12 the cabinet will be meeting and one of their tasks will be to say that someone has responsibility for each of these 30 projections. One of them will be from Academic Affairs because that is where a majority of the projections are. This will be one of them. He believes that particular question is primarily a Senate question because it is dealing with curriculum. Even as we have seen with Nursing, there are many things that come external that involve the work life of the faculty, which makes it a collective bargaining question as well. He thinks what we need to do is break these down and say who are the groups as we just did with ISP. Who are the groups that need to be represented at the table to have this discussion? Once that is figured out then it is a task force or Blue Ribbon Committee that is asked to look at these issues and bring something first to the Senate for discussion on this particular issue because it is so connected to the curriculum.

VII. Adjournment 5:50

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 12/6/10

of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, December 8th, 2010
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:05

II. Roll Call

Absent: Senator Stemp and Senator Carlson

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of 405th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion:

Senator Blatchly explained he emailed some minor corrections to the Senate Clerk.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne advised grammatical changes would be made to the minutes then posted.

Senator Welsh mentioned on page 3, at the top *"This array of classes is what students would drop from."* He meant to say what students would draw from. Same paragraph, 4th sentence, should say It was his recollection that the II category was to be *for* classes not *four* classes.

Senator Welsh stated that as we evolve, and this is not changing the minutes or anything like that, but would increase his comfort level with the minutes; on the same page further down there is a line that says, *It was noted that at this time only women are teaching Women's Gender Studies but it is being looked into* - that is a true account of the essence of what happened at the meeting. But his memory of the moment that produced that account is that a question was asked by whom he believed to be Senator McCarthy. He asked if any men were teaching in the Women's Study program, by which Professor Hottinger answered no. His feeling about the minutes is that the questions asked by members of the Senate are very important to the record about the votes that we take and he would be most comfortable with the presence of the actual questions and the answer of the respondent.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne replied the person asking the question did not identify himself or herself, but we will go back and make that change.

Senator Darby stated on page 9, where it states *Senator Blatchly asked where she used the word Director....* He believes he asked the question.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne said that we will make the change.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as corrected

IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Cerilli reported that the Choreography Showcase will be in the Mabel Brown Room on Friday and it starts at 7:00pm.

Senator McCarthy reported you may receive notice in Events that one of our Adjunct Faculty in Communications and Journalism Mark Ryan who has no health insurance had a severe break in his arm and had to undergo surgery. Thanks to the efforts from the staff on the Equinox and Julio Del Sesto they organized a benefit for him tomorrow night from 7-9 in the Mabel Brown Room. Donated items from faculty and students will be raffled off and enjoy a dinner. All proceeds will go to benefit Mark's medical costs.

V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald advised there is a full Senate meeting next Wednesday, December 15 at 4:00pm in the Mountain View Room. The main topic for that meeting is the ISP review. The committee that is doing the prep work for that will be meeting tomorrow. He also stated that the Senate might be looking at one issue of the calendar review at that meeting as well.

Senator Lucey asked what ISP report or review.

Senator McCarthy replied a group of constituency leadership was invited to discuss what the charge would be for a committee that would be formed to look at the ISP Program and assess how it is doing. It is not part of the Academic Overview Committee that will come up in a couple of years.

Senator McDonald noted it is just a pre-committee to look at what Senator McCarthy just stated. It is to look at what the charge might be.

Senator Lucy stated that we have an ISPC.

Provost Netzhammer - The ISPC are represented on this group.

Senator Welsh – This discussion that we will have next week will be a discussion of the charge of the committee and the Senate will weigh in on issues that they think ought to be looked into; is that what we are going to discuss next time?

Provost Netzhammer stated yes and the process for undergrad evaluation. Our hope was that in this semester to figure out what this review would look like. There are a lot of interested parties and there are questions about the relationship of Student Affairs to the Integrative Studies Program and to the balance of the Integrative Studies Program taught across the schools. Many things have come up, we have now graduated our last class from the previous general education program, and as we begin this review, we will be graduating our first class that has only been on ISP. We felt five years in this is really an appropriate time to look at those issues and to begin a more thorough review of that program.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained that what they hope to have to present to the Senate is a draft of the charge and a draft of the process. This is something they have talked and worked through but are looking for final input on the Senate.

Senator Welsh asked this because one of the things that came to mind after looking at the II input for the Women and Gender Studies program was there were a number of questions about the II category and what that means. Some concerns in history and existing policy. He has questions but will be happy and it seems most appropriately to hang onto those questions until next time.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder reported that they had the external review team in for Theatre and Dance a couple of weeks ago and they are waiting for their report.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Swinger reported that they are going to table the Exercise Science Proposal until the SCC has a chance to address that. .

Motion: The ASC made the motion that the Admission Standards for the B.S. in Athletic Training be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Senator Swinger asked if she could abstain

Senator McDonald replied on a technicality in a voice vote we do not ask for abstentions as long as long as it is clear. It was pointed out in the Roberts Rules in a previous meeting.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees reported the SCC discussed many proposals.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision of the Journalism major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IHFILM 310 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Discussion:

Senator Swinger questioned if all of these Integrative Studies courses were reviewed by ISPC.

Senator Menees replied they went through the School Curriculum Committee. It states only courses that are II go to the ISPC.

Senator Swinger stated she was just checking for clarification.

Senator Menees advised she did check and they go to the ISPC if they are II. They do go to the School Curriculum committees for anything within the school.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IHFILM 320 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IAFILM 330 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Discussion:

Senator Welsh questioned what the difference was between an IA Film class and an IH Film class.

Senator Darby explained he was not in the Film Department but in a department, that has both an Arts component and a Humanities component in it. He does know that the Film Department has in essence a part of the house is Film Criticism, along the lines of literary criticism except applied to film. Other courses that they deliver are Film Production courses so that you are involved in the artistic process of making a film.

Senator Menees advised that was the understanding on the Curriculum Committee that came up last spring.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IHHGS 355 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Senator Menees advised they would like to withdraw the motion for the IHHGS 356 course proposal because the A&H committee had forwarded an electronic copy and they should not have. The A&H Committee tabled it and the request is from both the department and the A&H Curriculum Committee.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision of the Athletic Training program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the ISGEOG 205 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the INASTR 315 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision of the Criminal Justice Studies minor program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: 24-0 Motion Carries

Senator Menees presented several courses as information only

Senator Menees also reported several proposals they voted to return because they were incomplete, poorly worded, incorrectly numbered, or in some manner do not adhere to curricular policy. The proposals were returned because they felt the changes required were beyond the editorial purview of the SCC and required more consideration by the sponsoring departments. The SCC would like to encourage departments and school curriculum committees to review proposals more carefully and not only look at how the course fits into the program but also whether it meets requirements before forwarding to the SCC.

Senator Welsh stated the forms that one uses to make to curricular proposals are balky, clunky and do funky things to margins and fonts. In trying to be a good citizen and use the forms, it ends up being quite a difficult process to do sometimes. For the record, it might be worth exploring to have an IT person taking another look at the curricular forms that we have and changing it to make it more user friendly.

Senator Gianni advised it was an excellent suggestion in terms of the technical aspect of it because there are many codes embedded in there after many revisions.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne suggested that as they move things to the new site she could clean them up. She could even create the curriculum proposal forms on a Google docs form. A link that dumps into a spreadsheet, she is not sure if that would be helpful to the Curriculum Committee to look at it as a spreadsheet or a document.

Senator Menees thought there are even some things even in the helping Chairs and School Curriculum Committees in the way they do things. It is difficult especially at the end of the semester as to what is where, what is approved and what is coming back for revision. This is where some of the problems are with items going to the SCC and should not.

Senator Lucey mentioned the textbook doc form; the electric form where you just start plugging in the information may work quite well.

Senator McDonald stated it would be nice to look at an electronic form and have that illustrated at Senate meetings so people could see what that would actually look like.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated she would pull something together for next weeks meeting.

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment 4:33

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 12/13/10

Minutes
for the 407th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:05

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Fleeger, Senator Lucey, Senator Stevenson, Senator Ghatak, Senator Welsh, Senator Warder, Senator Doreski, Senator Dolenc, Senator Cerilli and Parliamentarian Atkinson

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 406th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as written

IV. Courtesy Period

V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald reported the following:

The SEC met last Friday to discuss two items. The first item up for discussion is an editorial change to the calendar because the summer session schedule has changed. We no longer have a semester 1 and semester 2 in the summer. The schedule starts at the same time but extended by two weeks. There is now flexibility to schedule summer classes either in the period where the first session would have been or the second session or you can bridge between the two. This brings it down to a 10-week undergraduate academic program.

Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate change the Calendar Guidelines to create a single summer session for 2011

Discussion:

Senator Harfenist questioned if he could formulate an 8-week program within the 10-week period but start two weeks into the 10-week period.

Senator McDonald responded that was his understanding how it was set up.

Provost Netzhammer advised that is correct but that summer schedules are already due. It would be worth having conversations with Bob Baker before the end of this week because Friday they are presenting the first draft of the summer schedule.

Senator Menees stated the classes used to be 2hrs and 40min and now are only 2hrs for 6 weeks, 4 days a week. She was wondering standard wise how that matches up.

Provost Netzhammer explained that should not be a change.

Senator Denehy stated it is 2hrs over 10 weeks. What is missing is a rule that states summer session you have to teach "X" number of hours and he believes it should be in the proposal.

Senator Menees believes there will be major confusion in the first summer session because of the way it is presented on the form as 6, 8 or 10 weeks but 2hrs 4 days a week and they put their schedules in based on that.

Provost Netzhammer believes the Senate Guidelines say that summer courses will meet an equivalent to a certain number of hours. So if it is a 10 week course you would meet for 2 hours, an 8 week course it would be 2 ½, a 6 week course would be 2 ¾. The proposal was not intended to change that but they will look at the draft of the schedule when it comes out on Friday.

Senator Menees explained the way it was presented, was very confusing to her and her department.

Provost Netzhhammer stated in his discussion with Dean Treadwell today she stated overwhelmingly with very few exceptions, all courses offered start May 16 and end 6 weeks later although some are shorter and some longer. There are blended courses that span all semester but the bulk of the courses fit into that traditional 6-week period at 2hrs and 45 min.

Senator Rust asked if the number of credits for that course dictates the number of teaching hours.

Senator McDonald pointed out this is just a calendar change and has nothing to do with the academic requirements for summer school.

Senator Rust mentioned thinking of it in different terms; could we call it a summer semester instead of a summer session? Should we investigate that verbiage further?

Provost Netzhhammer replied yes but he did not believe for this semester. One of the things they have been dealing with is this discussion and pressure from the state in how we use our summer. His own view of moving to a summer semester would get people thinking that we are an institution that uses trimesters instead of semesters and he is a little concerned about that. He believes it is a good discussion to have and is wondering if perhaps the Senate approves this calendar change for this year we then go back to guidelines. The guidelines do talk about 6 week sessions. Even though we have not had 6-week sessions only, for the last couple of years that is how the guidelines are set up. His hope is that we approve a change to the calendar this year and perhaps charge the Academic Standards committee to that semester looking at the calendar guidelines themselves and seeing how we need change that.

Senator McCarthy is in support of this change but offered that because this is such a change and looking at the possibility of 4, 6, 8 and 10 week programs, we give faculty more time. The deadlines for submitting these proposals comes at the most hectic point of this semester, wouldn't it make sense to give faculty a little more time with this new change to consider their course options and development of their courses? Only this one time, this is only a thought.

Provost Netzhhammer believed the schedule will be in flux until the end of January so there are still opportunities to add courses and should not be an issue. If it is something, someone is considering we would like to know so we could begin to plan for that. One of the things they are looking to change this year that is not a Senate matter is to make registration for summer begin in February as opposed to after Spring break. This is moving into the regular processes of the institution. Students will be going through a Datatel registration process as they do for the other two semesters. They wanted to have more time to see how this is working and to give students more time to register for classes so they will be opening registration at a much earlier date. We have well into January to finalize the process.

Senator Gianno questioned why SEC did not include the report from the Summer Review Committee.

Provost Netzhhammer explained everything is coming piece meal to them and the meeting tomorrow is actually pulling some of that together. He is happy to talk more comprehensively about the changes to summer at the Senate February meeting. He does not have that today. What was happening was some of these things require deadlines. They have been doing test runs on Datatel and the budget system for the last few weeks even not knowing what that was going to look like. We really do not have the time. This was one of the recommendations that came out of one of those groups.

Senator Gianno explained that it states it has completed the work on December 5th.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne advised it might have been an editorial on her part. She may have summarized a discussion they were having and she could have misunderstood.

Senator Darby was interested in the Graduate Professional Development programming scheduled throughout the summer. What consideration if any has been given to local teachers that have a demanding schedule up until they are released for the summer? Has work been done to make sure our schedule in effect is fluent to the schedule of local public schools?

Provost Netzhammer replied absolutely. That has been the driving force as they looked at this. Some things that will happen earlier in the summer, but graduate courses and professional development training that we do for local school districts will happen in the latter part of the summer in mid to late July and early August.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Schmidl-Gagne made a motion to send the calendar guidelines to the ASC for review for summer. They could take a complete look at them to make sure we have not missed anything.

Senator McDonald asked if this was coming from the Senate or the SEC.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated she was not sure but it should be done because there is another statement in there that is not accurate.

Senator McDonald replied that generally anything that would go to the subcommittees would be assigned through the SEC and asked that the SEC meet after the meeting to discuss that. If necessary, they will send it to the ASC.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne withdrew the motion.

Senator McDonald continued with the SEC report on the ISP Review Task Force.

There have been several meetings about bringing this task force together for review of the ISP Program at Keene State College. Generally, the SEC puts Ad-Hoc committees together, but in this case, the SEC wanted input from the other groups and then to the Senate floor for advice and consent of the Senate. It involved members from the ISP Committee, SEC, Representatives from the KSCEA and KSCAA, student representation and the PAT Council in forming this. Please note that one of the students would be able to continue this work into the fall semester.

Task Force Elected/Appointed Membership and Meetings

1 Each Full-Time Tenure Track Elected from the Following:	Appointed From/By the following
Sciences	Adjunct Union
Social Sciences	Faculty Union
Arts	ISPC
Humanities	PAT from Academic Affairs
Teacher Ed	PAT from Student Affairs
Professional Studies	Two Students
Library	
2 Elected	Mel can also appoint a liaison to provide information and support
Adjuncts	

Election Process: By December 17th requests for nominations will go out from the Secretary of the Senate to all faculty. Self nominations and nominations of others will be due by January 21st. All nominations will be confirmed. The election will occur online beginning on January 24th. Elections will close on January 28th. ***Faculty may only be nominated and vote within their primary department as of December 17th.***

Motion: The SEC moves that the Task Force as outlined in this proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion:

Please note the highlighted dates below should be changed in the proposal:

The Task Force will provide progress reports to the Senate Executive Committee on May 1, 2011 and October 15, 2011. A final report will be due the Senate Executive Committee by January 31, 2012 and be shared with the full College Senate during the February 2012 meeting. Recommendations from the final report will be distributed to the appropriate Senate committee to follow established processes

Senator McDonald pointed out that while this is a review committee, any recommendations from this committee will be reported back to the SEC and then brought to the Senate floor for consideration.

Senator Darby wanted clarification on the charge to review of the following dimensions on the top of page 8. If there are other dimensions to be explored, is the task force allowed to add those? How fixed are the questions on the top of page 8?

Provost Netzhammer advised that is a good question. From his perspective, the group that they charged came up with these questions. The Senate has the opportunity to change that. One of the things that was discussed and should discuss as a Senate is that this report from the committee will be due right as the AOC review of ISP is about to begin. They were trying to be respectful of that because there are different processes for each.

Senator Denehy stated that Integrative Studies Program should be spelled out somewhere in the document. He also wanted clarification on the statement on the top of page 9 that reads *Once the individual membership of the committee is complete and confirmed, it cannot be changed.*

Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained that as the committee gathered the concern was that changing the people that were there midstream would have to play a lot of catch up. They wanted people that were running and appointed to understand that this is a commitment from this spring through the completion in February. This is a yearlong commitment.

Senator McCarthy replied that he was a part of this group and believes that door will remain open due to the fact they were talking about bringing in other constituencies that may have concerns. Not necessarily part of the committee, but want to express their opinions and concerns. The possibility may be there. As far as Adjuncts are concerned, he will very clear with them that whatever negotiated compensation we can arrange and a certain number of absences you will be replaced because you are not living up to your commitment.

Senator McDonald noted that people have to free at 4:00 on Wednesdays the same as the Senate meets.

Senator Gianno raised the question of the committee that is overseeing this which is a curriculum issue. This has been discussed prior, concerning the SEC overseeing a curriculum issue as opposed to the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee should have a role in this as well.

Senator Clemmenson mentioned when the recommendations the task force make should be forwarded to the SCC as well as the SEC. If forwarded to the SCC as information, the SCC could give feedback to the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gage stated the way this was written is that the recommendations will come into the SEC then go back to the appropriate committee. Therefore, anything that is a curricular recommendation would go back to the SCC. If guidelines needed to be changed, that would go to the ASC. The SEC is the only body charged with creating a task force. None of the other committees can do that. Therefore, the oversight has to come from the SEC then back to the other committees. This review committee is just a recommending body, not a body that is a decision making body.

Provost Netzhammer mentioned one of the things they did not do given how all this planning included a Senate representative is in the final iteration, we did not actually have a Senate appointment to this committee. One solution to this issue is as one of

appointed members we include either a member from the Curriculum Committee or the Chair of the Curriculum Committee. Part of what we are discussing today is the membership and he believes the Senate should be represented.

Senator Menees stated if he was suggesting a Wednesday at 4:00 meeting time they use that for curriculum.

Senator Clemenson pointed out that if we tie this to Wednesday at 4:00 he cannot get anyone with experience with the ISP program and the knowledge of the political structure of the college to be able to sit on this committee and be productive. If we schedule this for Wednesday at 4:00 people on the Senate would not be able to sit on that committee.

Senator McDonald explained the design was not schedule the meetings during Senate or the week before the Senate. He does understand some committees meet more often than those two Wednesday's.

Senator Hartz believes there will short term or simple things that are going to be fixed like policy change but there will be longer term changes that will be necessary and effect the program as a whole. What is the Senate's role in revisiting the report results either at the end of the year or beginning of a year to know what was accomplished and what remains open? Who ultimately owns the results? This is a long time, a year and half there should an output, results. Who owns this?

Senator Schmidl-Gage advised the way this is set up is there will be a report given to the SEC in February 2012, which includes recommendations. Those come to the Senate for discussion through the committees and back to the Senate during the February and March meetings. Who knows how long that will take?

Senator Hartz – Then what? How do we make changes?

Senator Menees followed up with the ISP coming up for review in a couple of years. Would this be tied into their review of the program then also allow that committee to make recommendations for changes?

Provost Netzhhammer advised that is correct. Some things will come forward that can be easily changed once it goes to the appropriate committee of the Senate. It comes back and there is a GPA change or there is a recommendation that it is 40 credits or that we change the membership of the ISPC. There will be structural or curricular things that come out of it. His sense is that as a Senate we need to decide what recommendations we act on at that point that we can change immediately. They realized this was a lot of work in a semester and moved it to a December deadline then realized that even December was too late to make any curricular changes for the following year. That is why they extended it to the February meeting. In moving to the February meeting if there are small or structural changes there is nothing that binds us to a catalog so we have the spring semester to work those out and make those changes over the summer and be implemented by the fall of 2012. If they are curricular or larger then there is the self-study process that begins in the summer of 2012 that we can feed these into and they become a part of that particular process.

Senator Gianni questioned what if the Senate makes a series of recommendations and the ISPC does not agree? They are in charge of making the curricular changes for the ISP program.

Provost Netzhhammer advised he would check with the Curriculum Committee Chair but those recommendations come through the Curriculum committee. The Senate voted on those guidelines.

Senator Gianni state the proposal comes from the program itself.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne asked if she was concerned that a recommendation might be given to the ISPC that they choose not to act on which means it never comes back to the Senate.

Senator Gianni stated yes, this is a what if kind of question.

Provost Netzhhammer stated his guess would be that we create a process in this review that does not allow that to happen on any level. Everything would be reviewed by the appropriate committees then back to the Senate Floor for deliberation.

Senator Blatchly questioned if the governance of ISP is something that the task force is required to take on. It sounds like many of the questions we have surround this. Who owns the guidelines? Who will be writing this report? Is the governance imperatively in this charge? It sounds like the task force is allowed to add to the charge. It does seem like we want to set some minimum criteria to this.

Provost Netzhammer replied his sense was that governance was one of the key things that we expected the committee to deal with.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated we could name that as a bullet point that says something specific about that.

Senator Blatchly questioned if you were to find that issue where would it be in here.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated the structure of the ISP. The communication reflects some of what Senator Menees was talking about with who knows what about how the process is supposed to work.

Senator Clemmenson stated two years ago, the ISP made changes to their guidelines and the whole controversy started over the ISP changing their guidelines and skipped the SCC because the SEC was the one that approved the changes to their guidelines. Would the governance piece of that end up back on the SEC because that is how we have done it in the past? Are we going to be looking to changing that as well?

Provost Netzhammer stated it gets to Senator Gianni's point and he thinks it is a good thing to discuss. We clearly have never resolved it. This is still new to us after 5 years. Is the governance of ISP a Curriculum, Standard or Executive issue? Maybe one of the results of this work is to define some of those issues. The whole idea as we came together as a group was that there are still things people are not clear about, concerned about and reasons people are not buying into the program. There are great things being accomplished in the program. There is a lot going on and after 5 years, it is time to bring, a group together that represents all the constituencies that have been invested in ISP to talk through what these issues are and bring those recommendations back. Ultimately, this body here has that responsibility for the Integrative Studies Program.

Senator Gianni - How much timing the ISPC has or should have?

Friendly Amendment from Senator Schmidl-Gagne:

Under Structure of ISP - New Bullet:

The governance/decision making of the ISP including the role of the Integrative Studies Program Council

Senator Menees wanted to add Advisory Board

Provost Netzhammer advised this is not a friendly amendment but a change to the document and should be voted on as a motion.

Senator Denehy – Point of order - the motion on the floor was for the membership list.

Senator Hartz stated this is a 17-18 membership task force. Would the Registrar's Office or Dr. Rancourt role be tapped into for these issues? Due the breadth of questions, he wanted to make sure everyone involved is included.

Senator McDonald explained this was part of the discussion to seek the advice of others for their expertise.

Point of Order:

Provost Netzhammer stated that if the motion on the floor is the membership then we need to confine our discussion to that and vote on that then move on to the charge or just agree we are voting on the whole package at once and continue the discussion.

Friendly Amendment from Senator Darby:

Add representative from the College Senate to the task force

Senator Swiger agreed to the amendment because she had 2nd the motion

Senator McCarthy questioned if Senator Schmidl-Gagne's amendment was withdrawn

Senator McDonald stated we are on the membership first

Senator Hartz called the question on the membership

Senator McCarthy – point of information would it be a mute point if someone from the Senate is on this group. You would be increasing membership by one and there may be someone already on the Senate that is serving on the group.

Senator Darby stated Senator Gianno and Senator Menees spoke to the interest to have someone from the Curriculum Committee

Senator Clemmenson is concerned we keep adding people to this task force. How efficient is this task force going to be?

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to stop discussion

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Darby questioned if the vote coming to floor was on membership or the friendly amendment.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated the friendly amendment.

Senator Darby replied we are voting to add a Senate member to the membership list

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to vote on the friendly amendment to add Senate representation to the committee

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to vote on membership of the committee as amended

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion for the Senate to accept the recommendation of the charge to the new committee

Friendly Amendment: Senator Schmidl-Gagne made the motion to add a bullet point under the Structure of the ISP; The governance/decision making structure of the ISP including the role of the Integrative Studies Program Council and Advisory Board.

Discussion:

Senator Clemmenson believed Adjunct vs. Tenure Track faculty teaching ISP courses should be revisited. What is the compensation for an Adjunct teaching vs. the compensation of a faculty member teaching an ISP course? How does that affect the course load? What are the percentages of Adjunct/Tenure teaching?

Senator Gianno brought up the Academic Freedom issue in terms of how they teach the class and the evaluation.

Senator McCarthy stated they are the only uncompensated groups that would serve on the committee.

Point of Order: Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated there is a friendly amendment on the table about the first bullet point. She suggested that if there are other additions/deletions we take them one at a time discuss then vote.

Friendly Amendment: Senator Gianni made the motion to change the description from Structure of the ISP to Governance and Structure of the ISP.

Vote: Motion carries

Discussion went back to open discussion of the charge with those changes:

Senator Darby and Senator Denehy asked if the acceptance on the floor is for the overall charge.

Senator McDonald replied yes

Senator Blatchly asked about the integration of this process with the review processes. In departments, there are well-established departments with well-established long-standing governance systems. This is relatively new. Does it make sense to do a longer pre-review process? Was there a thought about amending the review process? Would the review by the academic overview be a report in standard format by whoever is in place at the end of this process?

Provost Netzhammer replied it is something that will be discussed with the AOC. They talked about that as a timing thing but in none of the discussions he was a part of, was it mentioned how they would inform that next level of the processes.

Senator Blatchly stated there was no consideration that this report would somehow just be passed on. You are not thinking at least now, of non-standard review process.

Provost Netzhammer advised there was only that awareness that it came. There was no discussion one way or the other of how the two would connect.

Senator McCarthy stated we knew it was coming 2012-2013. Provost Netzhammer should get credit of putting this group together so that they could brainstorm how to create this group. This group should benefit the ISP program in its efforts to develop its own self study that will pass on to ISP for oversight.

Senator Hartz – Are the two check-in points enough for this process? Is everyone going to be satisfied with the time that we have to understand what the results are and how that process evolved?

Senator Clemmenson stated he believes the report should go out to Senator's earlier than a week before the meeting. They should get it in January so they have time to review it before the February meeting.

Provost Netzhammer advised the SEC did not speak about this being discussed at the February meeting. The reason for February was that it gave 3 more meetings in the semester to be able to deal with it. What the SEC needed was time to be able to take these recommendations and by the time of the February meeting decide which committees of the Senate these recommendations would go to. Discussion would occur as those committees came back to the full Senate with their recommendations based on what they had gotten from the committee.

Senator Clemmenson – so the final recommendations will be a process through the entire spring semester rather than final recommendations coming at that February meeting.

Senator Menees wanted to clarify the proposal is for May 2011/Jan 2012

Senator Blatchly pointed out what is in front of them is the minimum reporting requirement and certainly does not prevent people from providing additional information. The Senate member on the committee has the Senate, as a constituency at some level status updates could be available. He strongly urged adequate time for reflection.

Senator McDonald explained they also requested public hearings that would provide information.

Provost Netzhammer stated in part of the charge it talks about providing of variety of mechanisms such as public hearings and surveys. They want people to have different opportunities to provide their feedback.

Senator McDonald stated there is also a mechanism in place that in the future, if we come up with other questions or a change that is possible.

Senator Clemmenson – Now that we have appointed a Senate member to the committee the meeting times should be revisited. That member is sitting on a subcommittee and Senate and feels that a concrete meeting time is needed.

Provost Netzhammer explained their consideration was before people run for this committee the Senate should decide when the committee will meet so that people can run knowing that they have this time free. If there is an inclination on the part of the Senate to move the meeting time then maybe we should make a motion and put it into the document.

Friendly Amendment: Senator Clemmenson made the motion to move the meeting time to Mondays at 4:00pm

Senator Darby asked why we are changing from Wednesday to Monday.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated that at that time there was not a Senator on the committee. The conflict with another Senate committee or the Senate itself was not a concern. If the committee had to come before the Senate, we would know they were available at 4:00. We do not want the committee to come together and then figure out if there is a common time to meet particularly a committee of this size.

Vote: Motion carries

Discussion of charge:

Senator Schmidl-Gagne asked Senator Clemmenson about a friendly amendment he made earlier.

Senator Clemmenson stated it was concerning Adjunct representation on the committee but Senator McCarthy explained there would be representation.

Senator McCarthy asked if we should consider what Monday of the month the committee will meet. Who is going to make that decision?

Provost Netzhammer explained he did not think we should do that because it really needs to be people that are free on Monday's at 4:00. The committee may choose to use subcommittees or meet weekly or biweekly. If we say the first Monday, they will not get their work done.

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to vote on the charge as amended

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated there is the charge piece of this and the election piece. Does the motion include both? She then answered yes.

Vote: Motion carries

VI. New Business

Senator Denehy requested since edits were done to the document can the whole document be included in the minutes?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated yes

VII. Adjournment 5:15

Minutes
for the 408th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, February 16th, 2010
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:05

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Sapeta and Senator Clemmenson

Absent: Senator Lucey

Senator McDonald mentioned two items before the Secretary's report:

1. There are no table tent name signs today so please identify yourself when you speak
2. When the Agenda was sent out on Monday, an amended agenda was sent out after and technically, it did not meet our 48-hour rule. It was a matter of minutes and asked if anyone objected to continue the meeting with the amended agenda.

No objection and the meeting continued with the amended agenda

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 407th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion:

Senator Gianni stated in the middle of page 8 – Senator Gianni – *How much timing the ISPC has or should have?* It should read *How much autonomy the ISPC has or should have?*

Senator Swiger mentioned incorrect spelling of her name on page 4

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as corrected

IV. Courtesy Period

President Giles-Gee brought three issues to everyone's attention:

1. Governor's budget discussion:

Within the Governors discussion, a number of people heard the Governor say that the system would be receiving from his budget 95% of our current budget. If you go to page 25 in the operating budget document distributed by the Governor, the general funds support for the system would be at 76 million instead at that 100 million. Why that would be is that some of the dollars would be supported through the Unique funds. That is an Endowment fund that we usually use for our financial aid and now would be used to make up some of the difference. The abolition of the Post Secondary Finance Education Commission also provides the system and institution with about 3 million dollars a year in financial aid funding. That reduction will also come from that. The total dollar amount that the system would get if this were to go through would be 92 million with other funds contributed from funds we would normally use for financial aid. As this proceeds the reconciliation between the Governor's proposed budget and that coming from the house in the Senate, with the house having one subcommittee offering a proposal of cutting the system budget by 25%, it puts it at 75 million. It will not be until June that we will know what the system's appropriation will be. We are where we were last year except we do have our tuition for FY12. I will testify from the Legislature next week regarding the college, the system, and its value to the state.

2. Capital projects and our discussions with students:

There have been a number of articles in the Union Leader about the University of New Hampshire looking at tuition to finance its building and comments within it said that UNH “has not spoken with students about raising tuition to help finance the new business college”. “We have not discussed it with students”. That is not our process. We meet with the Student Assembly each year and discuss any issues dealing with the finance of the buildings. Within our operating budget, we have 4% that is allocated toward repair and renovation. Additional dollars, the DMA (deferred maintenance assessment) we discussed fully with our Student Assembly and they voted to approve it. It is at a lower end compared to other institutions. Additionally, as we looked at the future with our Civic Center, we asked the Student Assembly if they were willing to contribute additional dollars to support it. We did that twice last year and received a vote from the Student Assembly, which they agreed to. We went back to the Student Assembly and they agreed again but they also recommended and we accepted a process that annually we go back to the Student Assembly if there are any changes in the dollar amount that they agreed to. We would go back for another vote and approval. Any discussions about increasing fees associated with capital projects outside we discuss fully with our Student Assembly. This will come up tomorrow at the Board Meeting and wanted the Senate to know what our process is with regard to fees, tuition and capital projects.

3. Total Rewards:

As you know this has been a difficult process for all of us. Those of you who have been following some other States such as Wisconsin, know that in those States there has not been the level of discussion even that has been afforded to us by our Board. With the Governor taking drastic steps alone to support a bill that would levy benefits cuts across the State and Faculty and Staff without their input as well as looking at the cessation of some of the Unions. That is not happening in this State. The Board did move more swiftly than is usual within the shared governance process that we support here. When they were informed of the shared governance process and the role of SPPC and HR, they did take steps to meet with them along with the OS and PAT Councils. Again, it was not the process we would have liked but it was a better process than what they began with. The tough situation we are in right now is whether or not the Board and Chancellor of the Board are armed with some cuts to be able to discuss with the Governor and the Legislature versus not having anything in our arsenal at all. Where we would look with the Governor proposing layoffs that are huge across all State agencies to occur as immediately as of July 1, this year? It is very difficult as I recognized that I would need to vote on this recommendation tomorrow and how I would appear before the Governor and Legislature not supporting something that did go forward. It is a political agenda. I am laying this right out there as this is not an easy decision that I have to make but will make for the benefit of this institution as we move forward. I continue to work with the Chancellor and the Board on some of the recommendations if they are approved and to get the input of the councils here and HR. This is to assure where we were afforded that opportunity to bring the voices of employees to the table and address those as best we can. It will not be an easy meeting tomorrow.

Senator Cerilli reported on the following:

There is a bill going through the NH legislation that would stop out of State students from voting in NH. For instance, if you are from Massachusetts and registered to vote in Massachusetts, when elections come around you can go the same day as an election and register to vote in the Keene elections. There has been talk about eliminating students that right and military personnel that are stationed in NH that may have a permanent address somewhere else. Some students caught wind of this and started “The Right 2”. Tonight in the Lantern Room of the Student Center, they want to get as many people as they can from all aspects of the Keene State Community to write letters and sign petitions. Some students will be attending a meeting in Concord next week to voice their opinions.

Senator McCarthy asked if the University System of NH employees are considered State employees.

President Giles-Gee replied no. Not State Agencies and there is a difference.

V. Subcommittee Reports

- Executive Committee

Senator McDonald reported the following three items:

1. The SEC discussed election of the ISP Review Task Force that is now completed and the membership list is in the minutes. The student membership is blank because Donnie Clemmenson will graduate at the end of this semester and another student will move into that role in the fall. He wanted to thank everyone who ran for that committee. The first meeting for that committee will be the first week of March.

2. Each year in the spring, Senate By Laws are reviewed for corrections and/or improvements and asked Senate members for suggestions. You can email those to any member of the SEC. They will consider all suggestions and bring back to the Senate floor at the end of the semester.

3. They also discussed graduation rates, credits in the majors and the viability of the programs. The report for improvements is due by June 6. As they looked to form an Ad Hoc Committee for this, they faced the reality that in the past whenever the Senate created an Ad Hoc Committee during the spring semester that was supposed to report out in the spring semester it almost never happened. By the time the committee could get together, it would be almost impossible to have meeting times for that to be effective. In addition to that, most of the Ad Hoc committees formed have failed to have a resolve on some of the tough issues. This is going to be a tough issue to look at so the Ad Hoc committee is actually consisting of the SEC plus the Chairs of the other Senate Sub Committees. This is a broad representation of our Senate and the campus. This process will be a very open process. We intend to have public forums on this and do that for input. This is an important issue and while some people feel this is something being forced, it is better that we look at this internally and make our suggestions rather than let the deadline run out on June 6 and have the suggestions waiting for us as we return in the fall. The committee will start to meet in the next couple of weeks and update the full Senate on the progress that they will be putting forward.

Senator Swiger requested that all members on the committee receive a copy of the Chancellor's letter.

Senator McDonald stated it is in the packet after the SEC's notes.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder reported that Sub Committees are still working on program reviews. The program review report for the Individualized Major will be ready for the March 9 Senate meeting. Program review reports for Physical Education, Athletic Training and Theatre & Dance will be ready for the April 13 Senate meeting.

He wanted to thank Mike Antonucci and Ann Miller for doing double duty in writing the reports and serving on two sub-committees.

- **Academic Standard Committee**

Senator Swiger reported that the Nursing program went before the State Board and they recommended that the standards for admission be increased from 2.5 to 3.0.

Motion: The ASC made the motion to accept the Board of Nursing's requirement to increase the standards for admission to a 3.0 for current students and a 3.2 for incoming students be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Senator Swiger stated the ASC discussed and reviewed the calendar guidelines. They now include the date of the last editing.

Motion: The ASC made the motion to accept the Calendar guidelines as edited be approved by the Senate

Discussion:

Senator Blatchly stated there are a number of instructional days as a requirement but there is nothing about the distribution of those days. Is this accurate? Is there any requirement about having an equal number of days in a week represented?

Senator Rust explained there is a requirement for the number of hours per credit for the course.

Senator Blatchly explained that sometimes semesters fall where you have more Monday's than Friday's especially with holidays.

Senator Rust stated the only two holidays in the summer are Fourth of July and Memorial Day.

Senator Blatchly advised the Calendar guidelines are for the whole year.

Senator Rust explained the changes made were primarily for the summer because we no longer have Summer 1 and Summer 2.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne noted that the Calendar guidelines never included a statement about the distribution of days so what they changed did not affect that because it never existed.

Senator McCarthy noted the guidelines state that spring and fall semesters will include a minimum of 69 instructional days unlike public schools that allow for snow days. Do we make any provision? This year on certain days, we lost a whole week of classes depending on the days classes fell on. There is no provision for makeup and we have to make that up in our own way.

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Senator McDonald stated that he and Senator Swiger had another item on the table but asked if it would be appropriate to come back to that after the SCC report.

Senator Swiger advised yes because it had to do specifically with the Physical Education Exercise Science admission statement.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees reported they met 3 times since the start of the semester and had a number of things to review. She went through all of the programs they had approved.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that revision of the Health Science major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the Substance Abuse/Addiction minor proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Senator Menees explained the Math program redesigned their major and added several new courses. One of which is Data Analysis for Teachers which would also be offered as an alternative IQL. This had to do with the changes after the 4-credit model. They took away some courses and replaced with new ones. In order to better fit their curriculum they had to restructure their major.

Senator McDonald asked if anyone objected to handling the next 4 motions in one discussion.

No objections.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the Mathematics Education for Elementary Teachers BA proposal be approved by the Senate.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the Mathematics BA: Mathematics option proposal be approved by the Senate.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the Mathematics BA: Secondary option proposal be approved by the Senate.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the Mathematics BA: Middle School option proposal be approved by the Senate.

Senator Hanrahan questioned if the IQL had to go through the IQL Committee before it went to the SCC.

Senator Menees responded yes, simultaneous the ISP Board reviewed and indentified it as an IQL alternative.

Senator Cerilli – Clarification – is that a course anyone can take or take in their major and counts as their IQL?

Senator Menees advised this issue came up. They were going to say that 175, 141 and 251 Psyc could not be taken for credit but they removed that. You can take 175 but if you changed your major...it is designed for teachers.

Senator Stemp questioned if there are other courses on the books that are IQL replacements or substitutions.

Provost Netzhammer stated there are other statistic courses that meet that requirement. It was for programmatic needs because originally we were not able to offer enough sections of IQL to meet the demand for students. It includes a range of substitutions.

Vote: Motions passed by acclamation

Senator Menees stated a proposal to redesign the PE Major was approved by the SCC. This was an addition of the Exercise Science option. It was taken out of Health Science and put into PE and they restructured their Major to accommodate that.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision to Physical Education major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision to the Economics major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision to the Economics minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision to ISECON104 be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Senator McDonald asked if anyone objected to handling the next 4 motions in one discussion.

No objections.

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision of BM Music Performance be approved by the Senate

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision of BM Music Education be approved by the Senate

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision of BA in Music be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motions passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IAMU 104 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IAMU 312 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motions passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that revision to the MGT major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that revision to the MGT minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that revision to the SOC major be approved by the Senate

Senator Swiger questioned if this was a standards piece.

Senator Menees replied it was her understanding that standards are for entrance to majors and not for exits.

Provost Netzhammer questioned the plan for students who are well into their major and get CCD to be able to successfully complete either the Sociology major or a different major.

Senator Stevenson stated it would only affect new students.

Provost Netzhammer explained the way he heard it described is this is an exit requirement.

Senator Stevenson said correct

Provost Netzhammer explained we have the potential of someone being at the end of his or her senior year...

Senator Stevenson explained the policy in the department would be if they get below a C in a course, the Chair in writing would notify them that they received a grade below the C and they will need to retake that course if they wish to get a degree in Sociology.

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that revision of the ENST major be approved by the Senate

Senator Blatchly stated in the past many advisory opinions argued against this proposal. Do you have a rationale for not taking those advisory opinions? What was the balance that you saw with regard to advisory opinions and how did you then make the recommendation to move this forward?

Senator Menees explained they viewed it as they were able to have ownership of courses and be able to schedule the way they would like to schedule and have that autonomy. That somewhat outweighed some of the objections from the duplications of the courses in other majors. This would be a standalone that they are willing to control the way the major was and redesigned the major for future, as they like to redesign it. In a sense, having its own home was the big piece to this.

Vote: Motion passed Yes=25 No=1

Motion: The SCC made the motion that revision of the SOSC major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that revision of the TAD program be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the IATAD370 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the AMST program be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the revision to the ENG major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Motion: The SCC made the motion that the addition of the Medieval and Early Modern minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

Senator Menees reminded everyone at this point the SCC is still accepting course proposals and can still make it into the catalog for next year. Programs are no longer being accepted.

Senator Fleegeer had a question for the Chair of the Curriculum Committee. Environmental Studies submitted a minor proposal for approval and noticed it was not brought to the Senate floor. He asked if the committee had approved it.

Senator Menees explained it was an oversight and should have been on the list.

Senator Fleegeer asked what the appropriate course of action in this instance.

Senator McDonald advised since it was not submitted in writing we cannot vote on it at this meeting. However, we still have time at our next meeting for changes to programs and still make the catalog.

Senator McDonald returned the floor back to the Academic Standards Committee. They have a proposal that was tabled since it was leading the proposal in the Curriculum change.

Senator Swiger explained they had reviewed the admission standards for the BS in Physical Education Exercise Science Option

Motion: The ASC made the motion that the admission standards for the BS in Physical Education Exercise Science Option be approved by the Senate

Senator McCarthy questioned if he wanted to go into the business of running a fitness facility it would have been in the exercise. The old program would not have required him to be an Education major and get a certificate to teach Physical Education

Senator Swiger advised that you still do not have to. There are two options within the Physical Education major. In the Physical Education Department, there is still Athletic Training. Physical Education now just has two options, the Teacher Education option and an Exercise Science option.

Vote: Motion passed by acclamation

VII. New Business

No new business to report

VII. Adjournment 5:00

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 2/25/11

Minutes
for the 409th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, March 9th, 2011
4 p.m., Madison Street Lounge, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:05

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Ditzkoff, Senator McCarthy, Senator Clemmenson and Senator Cerilli

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 408th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Discussion:

Senator Doreski - As I look down the page I see over and over again that the SCC made the motion, the SCC made the motion, everybody is making a motion. Can we revive the good old verb move?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Sure, I was just copying from the SCC notes. We can ask the SCC to do that.

Senator Doreski - The SEC will attempt to do the same but it appears to be else where as well as the SCC. The Academic Standards Committee you know.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - That is fine.

Vote: Motion Passes

IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing reported for the courtesy period

V. Subcommittee Reports

• **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald - Last week was the first meeting of the ISP Task force. Mel and I met with the task force to give them their charge and ask them to select a Chair of that committee. I understand that after the meeting they did select Co-Chairs Ann-Marie Mallon and Tom Bassarear.

The SEC had two proposals put forth by Pete Neilsen. One was referred to the new ISP Task Force because it is actually related to them. The other proposal is actually one that has already been submitted to the Senate Standards Committee and will be processed through them.

During the last meeting of the Senate one of the votes for the Social Sciences had an exit requirement and there was a question if it should have been reviewed by the Standards Committee. In reality, the Standards Committee probably should have reviewed it but at this time, it was not forwarded there. The SEC decided not to refer it back to the Standards Committee because during the meeting it was voted on unanimously and did not have any problems at that time. We have since spoken to the Chair of the Standards Committee and offered our apologies to them. One of the things that we hope to do is to clarify the rules for when something is referred back to the Standards Committee and put that in the bylaws.

Senator Menees – I looked at the bylaws and could not find anything except entrance standards. It did not say anything regarding exit standards.

Senator McDonald - It does clearly state entrance standards but says nothing about exit. It is a general thing which we could interpret or not interpret and that is why we want some clarification. It is understandably vague and we do not want that to happen in the future. I also want to say that along the way we do adjust our bylaws when it seems necessary. At the next meeting of the SEC, we will consider bylaws that will be brought before the April meeting of the Senate. If you have any suggestions or would like to see any clarifications please forward those to any member of the SEC. As we look at possible changes to the bylaws this year.

A Senator noted it was the Sociology dept and not the Social Sciences.

The other item that was brought before the SEC was from Senator Stevenson regarding the policy around required military leaves for students. We do have certain statements about attendance and 3 weeks of absences and how that might count. There was some concern that some military absences could last up to 2 weeks and how that would be treated. The SEC has referred that to the Standards Committee for review to see if there should be any specific statements made about that particular issue.

The next item presented to the SEC by Senator Stevenson and Senator Dolenc was a resolution regarding shared governance and is included in the Senate packet, on page 11. It was decided to advance this to the Senate for discussion without endorsement for or against the statement from the SEC.

Senator Dolenc - This resolution is here in part because both Senator Stevenson and I have watched the process where the Board of Trustees, in an understandable attempt to achieve some cost savings began with the Mercer report, an outside committee to look at our compensation package – Total Rewards, which is an unfortunate choice of names that still does not seem to go away. The Mercer report found that in some ways we are behind in comparative institutions. A second report was commissioned from a second outside group called Towers Watson. As this process has unfolded over the last year or so, the shared governance particularly the way we think about shared governance on this campus and value it, seem to have been ignored and pushed aside. Others can speak to their personal experience. I know that Senator Schmidl-Gagne has had extensive conversations with members of the Board trying to explain how we think about shared governance. Chuck Weed is here as a representative of the SPPC and he may care to elaborate. Senator Stevenson and myself felt that if we don't value shared governance here and don't value the way speaking up against the way that process has been bypassed, sidestepped and ignored then maybe there is no place on this campus to have this conversation. That troubles me.

Senator Harfenist - Was the second survey report different from the first?

Senator Dolenc - The second survey was less about comparing us with similar institutions or employers and more about what I view as a flawed process of think only of you. Would you personally rather lose your left arm or your right arm? If you chose to lose your left arm, ok now that you have your right arm, would you rather lose your thumb or your pinky? Those kinds of questions that frankly the KSCEA opted not to participate in. We didn't see it as a useful way to gather information in an understandably hard economic climate where there are some cost saving decisions that have to be made. It was a totally different approach on how they identified cost savings.

Senator Denehy – I am a member of the SPPC as a PAT representative and also believed it was a flawed process and that the survey was given to us in a very strange manner. It came to SPPC in November where the SPPC members expected to have discussion on it. It was given to us as already complete. This is a survey you are going to have. The original survey we had covered Operating Staff, PAT's and Faculty with the same set of questions. When we brought up that these are three different groups that have three different benefit packages we were told it was going to be split so operating staff had one survey, faculty and PAT's had another one. We then shared another concern that it was inappropriate for PAT's to be talking about faculty compensation to the same extent that faculty should not be talking about PAT compensation. The Keene and UNH faculty chose not to take it. Some of the Plymouth faculty chose to take it. It was not until January after the survey was done that the SPPC members learned that the Plymouth faculty had it set up so that there were certain questions about PAT benefits that were not included. That was an after the fact piece of knowledge.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - The councils have tried to advocate for involvement in the process and this time we tried to suggest in at least 3 or 4 separate letters that our goal is to partner with and allow us significant input into the cuts we are talking about. The Chancellor has expressed to the Board of Trustees that the staff are willing to work shoulder to shoulder with the board of trustees. The Board of Trustees has talked about needing to move forward quickly. They have concerns about how fast shared governance can work and felt they needed to move forward with this survey, get the results and make recommendations. Those recommendations were voted on at the February 17th Board of Trustees meeting. It is now back in the hands of the SPPC or some of it is. There were recommendations that were specific about what will happen and there are some that we are working on to have input on. Our concern going forward is that the process continues. Information shared with the SPPC in a timely manner and that they are given the tools needed. We enter into what sort of felt like this crisis moment that the Board had to make decisions and

that we are allowed to go forward with what we have functioned with as long as I am aware. Our concern is that there is this recent past of needing to react quickly to something and not using shared governance. What happens moving forward?

Senator Blatchly – I am a little mystified that two years into a recession there is suddenly a crisis.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Part of it is a result of the stimulus package. When the state accepted money for the stimulus package they had to level fund us at \$100,000,000.00, and since the stimulus funding is ending that is changing, and we have a different legislature in place now than we did in the last several years. Their value around all education and the questioning that we have seen in the news - higher education is a part of that. We know there are significant cuts coming from the legislature. I do not believe that any of the staff are unreasonably saying that you cannot do anything to us. Our first goal is that everyone remains employed and we work back from there. How we go about making the changes from that place on healthcare, retirements, vacation and longevity is what we hoped to have a significant voice in. We know we are looking to save at least 8% of about \$25,000,000.00 so the Board of Trustees said they are looking to save about \$8,000,000.00 in benefits and compensation of that \$25,000,000.00. If you look at the Towers Watson report, you see how they have rather broken it down.

Senator Doeski - I know a lot of figures have been thrown around, \$25,000,000.00 it has also frequently been stated that it is also a worst-case scenario but worse would be zero. It is different from what the Governor is looking for and some other legislators. I assume a \$25,000,000.00 cut the Trustees are also considering what would happen if it ends up being half that or whatever it may be.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - There are some pieces of this that the trustees wanted to look at for up to three years in terms of the spiraling healthcare costs and getting a better handle on how to control that. They have been talking for a long time about those things. Their concerns about vacation, longevity and healthcare are the top three issues that they have talked about for several years now. Whether or not we are in the current economic environment, we knew that healthcare costs were becoming unsustainable and we needed to look at that. It has only been exasperated by the current economic and legislative situation. I do not think \$25,000,000.00 is the worst-case scenario.

Senator Doeski – Are you saying that this conversation would happen even if we maintained level funding?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I believe conversations through SPPC would have continued – yes.

President Giles-Gee - The increases in healthcare costs have been 10% for every year. They have gone up 130% and the current scenario for cuts - if you look at the face value of what the Governor is saying \$95,000,000.00 but when you look at the appendices there it lays the road. Look at the appendices and you note that he cuts away the Post Secondary Education Commission and the financial aid that is included within that will disappear. He takes away monies coming off the Unique 529 savings plan. He takes away the money we currently provide scholarships and grants for our students. He includes that in our operating budget. To be able to replace the financial aid coming from all those cuts then we add in the possibility that we lose money from Pell, money for all students upwards of \$800.00 per student then the significant loss from that alone is more than \$1,200,000.00 just for this institution alone in one year not counting the decrease in other cuts. In addition, the other bills coming in would cut all the funding to NHPTV, which comes off the top of the \$100,000,000.00. It is close to \$3,000,000.00. There are two committees of the finances house one \$17,000,000.00 cut and one \$25,000,000.00 so when we start to look at that in the situation could be more than a \$25,000,000.00 cut. It could go as deep as in the thirty million dollar range. Some of the Board members have been talking with the Governor and legislators about the possibilities of the sizes of these cuts and the timing needing to be able to testify before the legislature with something in hand that actually shows that the system was providing some way that it is contributing to reducing the deficit. Again, the size of the deficit in February was not a good month. The revenues did not come in strongly as they expected so the deficit best case scenario \$500,000,000.00 worst-case scenario \$900,000,000.00 – there you have it. There is no way without an increase in revenue that could cover the gap. This is a very serious time. We are in discussions about how to make up the difference and we will not know what the appropriation will be finally until after the house reconciles with the Senate, which will be late in March or beginning of April. So continue dialog with our legislators and take a look at the bills going through. These are cutting education to the core.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - In terms of the cuts to benefits we want to insure that our community values are in the cuts so if medical needs to be cut we want to insure that those at the lowest end of the pay scale aren't being dealt with the same way as those at the highest end. If it comes to a \$500.00 increase that is different for me than what it would be for a brand new operating staff member. Those are some of the things we want to insure are imprinted on this. We care about the people who are here and know that it is something sustainable for us. It cannot be applied the same to the people who are here because we all have different circumstances. We want to be sure the Trustees understand that and how it all comes out in the end does the best that we can and in the situation with our values.

Senator Robinson – I have serious concerns about how this is approaching the Board of Trustees. I do not doubt what the operatives have said about the process, the results and the way that we feel about it. Nobody wants to get their benefits cut but for us to be as a college Senate admonishing the USNH Board of Trustees seems unnecessarily confrontational. Having sat in a few meetings, I know that the Board of Trustees has the best interest at heart. I know when our SPPC members go to talk with the Trustees it is my sense that they listen and are well represented so there is some shared governance going on. I know that Helen sits on the Board of Trustees and certainly makes her feelings known. It seems for the KSC Senate to admonish the BOT is inappropriate and unnecessary.

Senator Hartz – I am curious about what the other side of this was. Naively when I think about Mel and Helen, I see you working with the Trustees on a routine basis. I was curious if I could put you on the spot and shed light on what you think the consequences of this move would be.

President Giles-Gee – Thank you for putting me on the spot. A Senate does what a Senate needs to do. Shared governance is a very important tenant of the institution and the Senate just needs to take care and express exactly what it needs to say and what it expects in the future. I think one thing that was clear was that the Chancellor and other members of the Board to recognize that the process of shared governance was not followed the way we would have liked. My expectation is that it would in the future so if this is what it is saying - it is all I can say as a Board member as well.

Senator Netzhhammer – I would echo what Helen has said. I do think it is important for this body to do what it thinks is right but I am not sure this is the path I would go. One of things that we do know is that when we raised this as a concern, Trustee Small came to campus to meet with our staff about this issue not about the governance issue but about the concern of the process and the way this was going. It would not be accurate in my view to reflect this as a Board of Trustees being unresponsive to the concerns of Keene State College and our concerns of shared governance.

President Giles-Gee – I have to concur, even the Chancellor coming again and speaking with our councils about these issues. Has it been perfect, has it been as extensive as our shared governance has been on this campus? I do not think all of campuses have as many open forums that we have here. The question is how does it get to the point where this body could feel comfortable with it and get that communication. Is this the way to do it? This has a great likely hood of ending up in the media. What does that say about what this body is really saying? Does it talk about how much the SPPC and the councils have worked with the Board and staff to try to move this forward? There has been a lot of positive work so I am not sure that communicates as much as they have contributed through the process by the bodies here.

Senator Dolenc – The original language in much of the resolution started with Senator Stevenson and I have to confess that I had to go look up the word admonish to be clear what it meant. I was impressed because admonish means to mildly scold in a good willed manner and I think that is precisely that a body that values shared governance should do to a Board of Trustees . While they may have come and met with us, the fundamental process that Senator Denehy described has not changed. There is still no evidence that the cost cutting measures that are going to be taken are going to be done in any way other than the one-size fits all which Senator Schmidl-Gagne described as not consistent with the values that we have. I recognize there are some concerns here and I would request that we have a ballot vote when this does come to that point because we all work for the Board of Trustees at some level. We do not all have the same job security.

Senator Netzhhammer - Point of order. There is not a motion on the floor.

Senator McDonald – At this point we need to put forward a motion to discuss this for 15 minutes.

Senator Netzhammer suggest before we vote on it....

Senator Dolenc – Moves that the Shared Governance Resolution be voted on by the Senate

Senator McDonald – We had our 15minutes of discussion on this. Is there a move to continue discussion?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – So moved

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that discussion on the Shared Governance Resolution end be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion does not carry

Senator Schmidl-Gage – At this point there are a number of issues that have been forwarded as discretionary recommendations to SPPC and they are working on coming up with specific recommendations with the other college campuses that hopefully will reflect our values. The Chancellor in our meeting with the Financial Affairs committee actually called what had occurred as shared governance as an aberration and has publicly reused that word and owns it. Our concern is that it is a precedent and thus far in the last few weeks, it has not been but it continues to be something that we are quite wary of. I want to be clear that yes there are some areas of the Towers Watson that appear to be decisions that will go forward. There are other areas that we are working with the other campuses to come up with specific recommendations but the long term is our concern because we believe this is not the end of looking at cost saving and want to be sure that from here on out it wasn't a precedent and was an aberration and we will use shared governance. What I appreciate about this resolution is that it talks about us as a community coming together and saying that shared governance is our value and we want to continue working in that way.

Senator Lucey – I am thinking about language and the section where we say about flawed process of ignored shared governance. Recognizes that there was not an aberration goes on to say ... asks that our shared governance be upheld or respected in the future. Maybe just a change of language is enough to state that and allowing for some recognition that it seems a number of people including the Board of Trustees has recognized that something went wrong.

Senator Denehy – just an observation – it speaks to the shared governance and the discussion is I think it has been about 5 years since the Board of Trustees coming to campus and had open forums with faculty and staff and I think that is indicative as to why we are looking at this document today.

Senator Fleegey – This motion aside I wonder if there are other actions that we could take that might promote more accountability of the Board of Trustees to that mission of shared governance. I wonder if this standing alone or are there other actions that could be taken along side this. Do we not have a Trustee that is supposed to represent Keene? Would it not be wise to make more specific outreach to those individuals and communicate with them more directly. I am just wondering what beyond this action might be best in terms of encouraging a broader discussion of the interest of this body.

Senator Lucey – In your comment Senator Denehy, were you suggesting that a top down, Trustees wanting to have the open forum and wanting to have conversation.

Senator Denehy – They stopped having them. Every time they would come to campus, there would be open forums of Faculty and Staff and they just stopped approximately five years ago.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Tim Garland the Operating Staff Council Chair and I met with the Chancellor last Friday for several hours and he did talk about that and it does seem that is should be something that should come back. We have gotten away from that – we have been doing campus presentations, which I think are equally valuable to get to highlight our Library and our CELT this last time. There has to be some sort of balancing act is what he was inferring to and that we need to create space for the Trustees and staff to interact with each other and we would consider suggestions along those lines.

Senator Hartz – I was wondering if there was a way to make something more positive. The financial crisis is so extreme I am concerned about how this going to be played in the press with all of the negative attention such as the fall out of Wisconsin. Is there a way or something that could be done a little more positive? I go for basis and not take what feels like a little bit of a slap in the face appreciating the definition offered for the word admonishment. Wouldn't it be cool if the Senate could say we found \$1,000,000.00 under the carpet of the Hale building and we could do that? I mean what is available that the Senate could do in a more constructive message.

Senator Doeski – There is kind of a national angst that is at work here that we cannot do much about. We could word it more positively in the last two sections – Whereas the Board of Trustees unanimously passed the same Towers Watson recommendations on February 17th, 2011 despite system wide employee concerns about a process that compromises shared governance. Therefore be it resolved that this body encourages the University System on New Hampshire Board of Trustees to value our shared governance process and be it further resolved –and to take out the apostrophe in Trustees there... At least if that got into the newspapers it could not be held against us particularly.

Senator McDonald – Is that being offered as a suggestion or amendment?

Senator Doeski – I will offer it as an amendment.

Senator McDonald - We now need to discuss the amendment

Senator Stemp – I think the term admonishes may get us in more trouble than we might initially think sitting around the table amongst ourselves. I don't know whether or not dissemination of a summary of the document or direct quotes from whatever we have to say makes it to the larger public there are sufficient or substantial numbers of those exposed to the term admonish will be able to recognize the way that Senator Dolenc did what specifically the term means. I think the general interpretation will be that admonish is a much harsher term than it is. Mostly thinking about the fact that the likely venues for dissemination for a summary of the statement or quotes from the statement will be clearly directed at those that it can be used to instill negativity towards the Senate itself or toward the college or the larger decisions that are going to be made that will affect the University System. Personally, I like admonish but considering the discussion that has happened up until this point perhaps the minor revision suggested will serve us better in the long run. I do think the Senate should respond and make a statement of some kind.

Senator Dolenc – My feeling is that they made a mistake and that there have been repeated conversations and repeated attempts as Senator Schmidl-Gagne described to them how our shared governance works and my sense is that has not made a meaningful difference to make the Whereas statements that we are making and I don't think there is any inaccuracy. Then, to say so please don't do that again is really different than what we intended with this resolution which is to say you made a mistake and it really isn't consistent with the process and the sense of community that we have. My feeling is that at the very last be it further clause ends it on a more positive note that we urge the Trustees to work with and it doesn't seem inappropriate to me to say you made a mistake which is part of what is going on with the first be it resolved clause.

Senator Lucey – The thing that makes me nervous about what you just said is that apparently there is evidence that there are Trustees, that there are good conversations going on or have been going on recently, and that we are not acknowledging that those positive things have taken place. In other words, we have friends we do not want to lose them.

Senator Harfenist – I can see both sides of it. This amendment and the way Senator Dolenc initially had it. I would probably want to say a lot more but on the other hand in this politically charged atmosphere I worry about backlash. I hate to say it but I think we need to worry about what the papers and how the State views this. Just look around the country - there is heated rhetoric and I am worried about that.

Senator Stemp – This is going to sound a little pompous but I think the sophistication of the language that has been chosen, is appreciated by most of us at the table. I am not too sure if it will translate as clearly to a larger audience. It may not simply be how bits and pieces of this are potentially disseminated in other areas. Clearly, this has been carefully crafted and worded to express a very specific interpretation in response to what we feel a process that has not been followed in terms of shared governance but

whether or not this particular statement will be read and weighed the way you have written it. I am trying to find a politically correct way to this but we all have lots of education. We are people of letters. We do a lot of reading through critical thinking and critical reading and whatever else we do. We make distinctions that are very subtle in terms of the language that we choose and the ways in which we attempt to express ourselves. I am not sure whether this ability to distinguish or pick up on some of the subtleties of what we are trying to say will easily translate to a larger audience. I think that it may potentially come to cause us more grief than we might have intended.

Senator Ghatak – I wonder if the word admonishes would seem to be the word of contention. What if we substitute it with something else? This body expresses serious concern by the process that has been diverted. I agree with Senator Harfenist and feel strongly about this. I think admonish is too soft. We do need to think about the backlash. I wonder if softer, we would be presenting the same way.

Senator Doeski – I have mixed feelings about my own amendment because I want to admonish the Board of Trustees but on the other hand I do think that the last thing in the world we need to do is to even slightly alienate those members of the Board of Trustees and I know there are several of them who are certainly far from being our enemies. I am not concerned with just the word admonish. I think many members of the public may not understand that word correctly and shame on us because we are the ones supposed to be educating them. I am also concerned about flawed process and ignores and maybe most of all the word subverting which is really a loaded word. I am not certain on what to do. Again, I see advantages to some extent in stating this more positively as I amended it and I see that even if a little firmness does not do us any good I am certainly sympathetic in the feeling that we need that. I do not think I could vote to send this resolution in its original wording to the Trustees. I think it is politically unsound however much I agree with it.

Senator McDonald called the question and stated the vote is only on the amendment that is on the floor. He asked Senator Doeski to read the amendment one more time.

Motion: Senator Doeski - Whereas the Board of Trustees unanimously passed the same Tower Watson recommendations on February 17th, 2011 despite system wide employee concerns about a process that compromises shared governance. Therefore be it resolved that this body encourages the University System on New Hampshire Board of Trustees to value our shared governance process and

Vote: (hand) 16 – 6 - 1 Motion Carries

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that we end discussion on the Shared Governance Resolution as amended be accepted by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Schmidl-Gagne re-read the Motion:

Whereas: the members of the Keene State College Senate are deeply committed to the value and practice of shared-governance, and

Whereas: The KSC Senate has inclusive membership with administrative, student, PAT, OS, adjunct faculty, and tenure-track faculty representation, and

Whereas: it was acknowledged at the Board of Trustees' Financial Affairs Subcommittee Meeting on February 7, 2011 that the Towers-Watson survey and recommendations by-pass the shared governance process, and

Whereas: the Board of Trustees unanimously passed those same Towers-Report recommendations on February 17, 2011 despite system-wide employee concerns about a process that compromises shared governance, therefore

Be it resolved: that this body encourages the University System of New Hampshire Board of Trustees to value our shared-governance process, and

Be it further resolved: that the KSC Senate urges the USNH Board of Trustees to work with employee groups on individual campuses to come up with equitable solutions, not top-down mandates.

Senator McDonald – Senator Dolenc and Senator Stevenson do you agree with the accuracy of the above including the amendment?

Both responded yes

Motion: The Senate moves to approve the above resolution

Vote : (ballet) 17 – 4 – 2 Motion carries

Senator McDonald - In the SEC meeting it was pointed out that we are misusing the term proposed amendment and friendly amendment in a previous meeting. He asked Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson to explain.

Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson – A friendly amendment is only an editorial change to the original motion.

Senator McDonald – The report for the AOC intended to be included in the packet today was omitted in some fashion.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder – We are completed with the Individualized Major report with responses. Since it was not in the packet, we will not be able to vote on it today. We will be doing the Individualized Major and Theatre and Dance at the April 13th Senate meeting. I will send the Individualized Major report to Senate members via email tomorrow so you have a head start and as much time as possible to review it. We will send the Theatre and Dance report to you as soon as that is ready.

By policy, the AOC provides the Senate with the AOC report as well as responses from the program and any appropriate Dean. We do not send you the self-study or the report of the external reviewers but if you would like to read any of those please email me and I will send them to you. The AOC Blackboard site is only open to AOC members and I am not sure there is another way to make that available to the Senate as a whole.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I will keep all of that to prepare for the next NEASC visit so I will also have it in a file that I can upload to Google docs that we can make available to folks.

Senator Warder - We will be providing the Individualized Major and the Theatre and Dance Reports for the April 13th meeting and the Physical Education and Athletic Training for the April 20th Senate meeting.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees reported the following:

Motion: The SCC moves that the Computer Mathematics BS proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the Revision of the ENST minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IIAMST 210 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IIAMST 250 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion:

Senator Stemp – How do they define American Cultures?

Senator Warder – Based on what American Studies is, it means the United States

Senator Stemp – Am I allowed suggesting an alternative title?

Senator McDonald – I do not think we can make an amendment to that otherwise it will have to go all the way back through the School Curriculum Committee and the SCC.

Senator Doeski – The use of the word American is a word chosen deliberately in keeping with the general use of the term in the academic world. It does refer to issues of citizenship rather than geography. The program has certainly discussed with considerable interest the notion of expanding regardless of what is done with the rest of the academic world to incorporate Canadian and general North America and Caribbean cultures. We do encourage students to look at courses that are available in those areas. At the moment, this term is in keeping with the way it is used in the discipline.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IENST 151 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IENST 152 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IPE 311 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IOSOC 305 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the IHIST 222 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the ISOSC 223 Course Proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees – One course was not approved at the SCC meeting:

IHHIST 350 19th Century Germany

We did not approve this course as we viewed it as a duplication of a course in the History department, HIST 351 19th Century Germany. In addition, there was no provision to prevent students from taking both courses for credit. We would also like to see more of a distinction between the two courses. The SCC will have further discussions regarding duplication of content in ISP and non-ISP courses offerings. Although our rejection of this course was a single action, it has brought to our attention a problem with ISP courses being duplicates of non-ISP courses.

Senator McDonald – This was the last meeting of the Senate that something could be approved and makes it into the catalog

Senator Menees - We voted for SCC Chair for the 2011-2012 academic year, and reelected Susan Menees.

VI. New Business

There was not any new business to report

VII. Adjournment 5:18pm

Respectfully submitted by Cheryl Martin 4/5/11

Minutes
for the 410th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 13th, 2011
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:06pm

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Rust, Senator McCarthy and Parliamentarian Atkinson

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 409th meeting of the Keene State College Senate

Vote: Motion passes

IV. Courtesy Period

President Giles-Gee – I am very pleased to inform the Senate that Congress has restored Pell Grants to their former levels. That will impact all of our in state and out of state students. The SEOG Supplemental Grants have been cut by 2%. This cut is not as large as had been expected. If any of you see Senator Jeanne Shaheen, do thank her for voting to support returning Pell Grants to their former level. We do know that on Monday the New Hampshire Senate will be reviewing the proposals from the System regarding our budget. I have to speak with pride on the efforts of our student Trustee Hannah Hays and our student body member and Senator Donnie Clemmenson for leading our students and engaging them with understanding about the potential cuts to financial aid and to our budgets. They will be supporting the System and the College on Monday in Concord. I will be testifying there and telling some of our students stories who will be there as well. I am very grateful to them for their support and for the rest of you who are sending letters and other communications to our Senators and Legislators in the House about how this level cut could affect the college. If you have not seen our advocacy site KSCAdvocacy.org please look there if you have any questions about what you can do to support the College.

Senator Clemmenson – We have four buses and plan on taking about 204 students to Concord to rally at the State House. Unfortunately, the students at UNH voted down the funding to take their buses there. Keene State will be the only campus to come through. We will be sending an email out to all faculty on campus either later today or tomorrow, asking even though many have strict attendance policies that you give credit for that class for attending the rally. We plan to have a sign up sheet on the busses once the buses start rolling. This will give faculty the opportunity to check the list and make sure their student attended the rally. We would appreciate it if you could help the cause and us as well.

V. Subcommittee Reports

Senator McDonald – We have several people with other commitments today and we are going to try to make it possible for them to attend them. We are going to start with one small section of the Executive Committee report then move to the Academic Overview Committee then go back to the Executive Committee report.

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – The first part of the Executive Committee report is that at the last meeting Senator Blatchly recommended we have an update on the Nursing Program. As you recall we passed the motion for the Nursing Program but there were some unanswered questions. Today I have invited Dean Treadwell to come in and answer those questions.

Dean Treadwell – We have received since that Senate meeting, the State Board of Nursing's approval to begin our processes for Marketing, hiring faculty and to open our enrollment period for nursing candidates here at Keene State. We are eagerly anticipating our site visit by the State Board of Nursing during the first two weeks of August. We are on track for State Board of review and accreditation as of this August. Secondly, we have completed a Substantive Program change document required by NEASC and have the Board of Trustees' approval. That document has been forwarded and we anticipate a positive vote this Friday from the NEASC review of the Substantive Program change that we did submit. Those are the big updates.

There were specific questions asked that we could not respond to at the time of the Senate meeting last fall. One question was with respect to the up-front costs. I would like to report that all of the development phases are fully supported by the University System of New Hampshire Board of Trustees. In fact, that funding has supported all of the marketing for Nursing and Dr. Fleeger's salary who has been working with us on all the development phases. The Board of Trustees went beyond their initial commitment given the budgetary restraint the college is under and has extended Dr. Fleeger's salary by an additional two months. They have actually extended their commitment to us to launch this program and to carry us fully into the summer. We are pleased to announce that the Board of Trustees did approve just this past week that Dr. Fleeger will be transferred from the University System to Keene State College to serve in our Nursing program. On all fronts, we are well supported by the Board of Trustees both financially and in staffing support.

There were questions about two courses, BIO 241 and ISPHYC 312 that do not have course proposals. Dr. Karen Jennings in the Psychology Department have developed and approved an INPSYC 312 course proposal that did move through and scheduled for spring of 2012. I will also report that the BIO 241 course, I have met with the Biology Department and will be working with Dr. Lauren Launen and the department in general to develop that course proposal. As we begin to move into the fall semester, I asked that the Biology Department support us with the existing Micro Biology course until such time that a new course can be on the books and developed by the new faculty member who will be teaching that course. The new faculty member will engage in helping develop the course this coming fall and into next year with Dr. Launen. We have commitment from Biology that they will support us with the current Micro Biology course work until such time we have a fully approved course that can be on the books for that Biology course 241.

There was also a question about the two upper level INNURSE courses. Again, we do not yet have the faculty hired. I have reflected to the Senate that we want the opportunity for those faculty members to develop these course proposals. I do anticipate and relayed that expectation to Dr. Fleeger and to each of the candidates as we begin to move forward with the fall semester. Between July 1st and September of this year we will be developing the INNURSE 309 and INNURSE 310 courses. We will not need those courses in the curriculum for approximately 2 ½ years. We believe we have adequate lead-time. We will refer that to the faculty who will be teaching those courses to develop those proposals.

With respect to hiring, searches have been launched. Dr. Dunn and Dr. Whittemore will be joining Kim Schmidl-Gagne, Dr. Fleeger, a nurse from our Wellness Center, a nurse from Cheshire Medical and from Hospice Home Care who are serving as a search committee to hire both the Director and the Nursing Faculty lines. We also launched our search for the Administrative Assistant to support that office as presented in the budget. Kim Schmidl-Gagne and Dr. Fleeger are Co-Chairing that search as well with Pat Hitchner and Karen Balnis from our Dietetic Program. That search has been going forward. We interviewed two finalists yesterday and anticipate one will be hired in the coming weeks. The faculty will be joining us in July.

The last thing I want to report that was not asked specifically, but I think would be helpful to share with the Senate. We opened to applications for the Nursing program recognizing the balance of increase in revenue to new dollars to the College associated with the students should they join us in the fall help us reach our enrollment targets. We opened our application process on March 18 of this year. As of this afternoon, with the work of Peggy Richmond, Burt Poirier and Dr. Fleeger, we have 45 admitted students in that Nursing cohort. We were aiming for an entering class of 48 and we are tracking with about 10-12 new admits each day. We are receiving daily reports of admission and follow up with phone calls with all of the admits to convert the admission acceptance to

actual deposit so we get our R-plus 48 target for the entering class. We have not yet begun to open our interviews for completers. This is the RN licensed completer track. We will do that work between July and August as we aim for the fall semester and that we would enter courses into January as you may recall. We have done a number of information sessions at hospitals to standing room only. We have approximately 53 applications for the commuter cohort as well. We have not yet capped those to see how many RN completers will be admitted. Admission trends look to be healthy and we are moving forward in earnest

Senator McDonald – We will now move to the Academic Overview Committee to complete the report that they have.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder - It has been an unusual year in terms of programs and review. I want to turn it over to Chair of the Sub Committee for the Individualized major Dr. Antonucci.

Dr. Antonucci – The Individualized major is incredibly difficult to review and it is hard to track. The Program, Self-Study and outside review team agree that the Individualized major at Keene State College has certain strengths and certain matters that it should address.

Both the SS and ORT conclude that:

1. The IM gives students the opportunity to design a program that meets their educational and career needs, and to be mentored by faculty with interdisciplinary perspectives.
2. The IM gives students the flexibility they need to create a major that does not exist at the college.
3. Faculty are typically very supportive of students wishing to pursue an individualized major.
4. Additionally, the ORT states that:
 - The supervision of the program by Associate Provost Rancourt is effective.
 - The IM program provides an effective means of advising students.
 - The IM program requirements seem well adapted both to the needs of the students and to the capacities of the institution.

Challenges for the IM Program

Both the SS and ORT conclude that:

1. There is a significant lack of information available concerning the experience that students and faculty have in working with the IM program. Gathering additional information about items like time to degree, program completion rates and the applied learning experience would permit the IM Program Coordinator and the College to undertake a more comprehensive and meaningful assessment of the IM program. While the reports didn't specify exactly what information/data should be collected, these data points would help to address basic questions about the program:
 - The effective date for every IM
 - The number of earned credits students have when they begin their IM
 - The effective date of when these students graduate
 - The degree that students with an approved IM actually graduate with
 - Administer a questionnaire for students with an approved IM, 6-12 months after the effective date, to gather information about the challenges, successes and learning students have experienced within their IM. The ORT also recommends collecting information about student attitudes and academic experience.
 - Administer a similar questionnaire to the faculty serving on the advisory board to gather input about their role, the contact they have with their students, the challenges they observe related to the IM, the progress the student is making

Recommendations for the IM Program

The bulk of recommendations from both reports focus primarily on strengthening the infrastructure of the IM program. These concerns are not simply administrative in nature – some of them are linked directly to pedagogy and institutional impact. Addressing these structural concerns will help the already strong IM program to increase its value to students and more fully accomplish the institutional objectives held for the IM program.

1. The current review of the IM reveals concerns about students' fulfilling major learning outcomes associated with the Program, including content, professional and intellectual skills. Both reports mention the potential value of establishing generic or model program(s) for the individualized major which would be direct advisors and students alike in establishing suitable learning outcomes. Such outcomes would provide greater program coherence and, potentially, allow students interested in pursuing a degree in the IM to determine whether or not the Program is an appropriate option for their educational and professional needs. Generic outcomes might also assist students and their faculty advisors to construct the academic degree programs that are currently unavailable within current curricular limits of the College, but possible due to faculty expertise and interests.
2. The ORT made several specific recommendations not mentioned in the SS. The review of these recommendations -- perhaps by an advisory council of some sort -- would add to the rigor of the IM program and make deliberate steps to make the program's mission evident to a broader set of students.
 - Examine the impact of establishing a higher GPA requirement beyond that required of students in other majors.
 - Students preparing to teach in the elementary grades should be encouraged to consider the program.
 - Consider changing the course credit requirements to prevent a student including 20 of the 36 credits at the 100-level.
 - Resolve the confusion about whether an IM has to include at least one discipline that provides a BA or BS degree.

Motion: Senator Warder – the AOC moves that Report on the review of the Individualized Major and all responses be accepted by the Senate

Discussion:

Dr. Rancourt – I have a few things to say about the recommendations and concerns with the reviewers external report. Over the years that I have been responsible, there is no doubt we have moved on campus to having our programs have program outcomes. That in the Individualized major, faculty would recruit sponsors and mentor students. We have to do more with identifying the kinds of outcomes that are specific to at least two disciplines that the students are choosing. They have to have both content and intellectual skills outcomes that are expected from students taking in particular, an Individualized Major.

The second issue is assessment. Since we are part of the accessed fall programs and the Individualized major is a major program, we have a responsibility to do some sort of assessment around it. However, it is not a program like other programs. One of the things that was discussed a few years ago that I think we may want to follow up on is how we in fact do assess Individualized majors. One example is to have a follow up review where mentors review samples of student work, who are complaining about Individualized majors. To determine the extent to which the work reflects the outcomes that identify that particular program. So at least we would be able to add the alignment between the outcomes and student skills.

I do not understand why they would recommend that students doing an Individualized major should have a higher GPA than students in other majors. I disagree with that recommendation. I do agree with the recommendation with anything that would lead to greater program coherence including culminating experience. It would be something worthwhile for an Individualized major. I think an Individualized major is a great option for Elementary Ed students. I did not understand the recommendation to not allow students to complete 20 credits of a 100-level. I do not understand the last recommendation on resolving the confusion about the BS Degree, as it is quite clear in the proposal to which degree students are applying for because the disciplines they are describing will lead to a BS or BA.

Senator Doeski – There are a lot of issues with this. The only one I would like to take notice of is the one that has to do with the recommendation of a Council or Advisory committee. Anytime I have a student approach me with a request that has to do with an Individualized major, I have always turned them down because they wanted to do something that did not fall under the description, which requires two separate disciplines. Most faculty, that I have talked with about this over the years have been puzzled as to why there is no such group of faculty that oversees this program. It seems to me if you are going to ask and expect students to work on

two disciplines you really need a group of faculty with a wide variety of disciplinary experience to look over this proposal. I am not quite sure Dr. Rancourt is opposed to that. It seems to me that the program has needed something like that for many years.

Dr. Rancourt – Students submit proposals and cover all the bases. They have to have a council on call at all times to make recommendations in regard to whether or not they approve. I trust that the 2-3 faculty that is sponsoring the proposal has the expertise to determine whether the proposal is viable. I do not see the need for additional faculty to weigh in on whether or not the proposal is viable given that the mentors currently do.

Senator Doreski – I have to disagree with you and I do see the need.

Senator Clemmenson – What is the current GPA requirement for an Individualized major?

Dean Treadwell – 2.0

Senator Sapeta - What are the statistics of those graduating? Is it growing?

Dr. Rancourt – There are a number of students graduating on a yearly basis. One of the things that we need to do is track more effectively when the students declare the major and when they actually graduate. It has been consistent, somewhere between 10-15 students a year graduate with an Individualized major. There have been times through the years where we might get twenty or more proposals. Interestingly enough part in the last 3 -5 years we got 3 or 4. In the last 3 years, the proposals have increased again to 10-15.

Senator Gianni – I think one of the concerns has been that there are students at the front-end do an Individualized major because of the interest they have. They are creative and show a lot of self-understanding. However, Individualized majors that come at the back end just before students are going to graduate are problematic. I do not see where you address that here.

Dr. Antonucci – The Senate Sub Committees responses to respond to what is written by the Self-Study and Outside Review team. Any questions that you have might follow under standards. It is not pertinent to this report.

Senator Graham – This point to the problem of tracking, to the data on the whole movement that Individualized majors take as they make there way through. We have lots of antidotal evidence but we really do not know the answer to that question.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Graham – Next item on the agenda is Theatre and Dance and I will hand that over to the Chair of the Sub-Committee, Senator Lucey.

Senator Lucey - We found that Theatre & Dance certainly thinks about the mission of the College and tries to align their goals and student learning. There was no issue there. In terms of the structure of the goals within the department, there have been many changes in the past ten years with the marriages, separations and divorces with the changes in curriculum. There have not been many changes in terms of staffing and physical issues, classroom space etc. These were some of the main issues. Faculty qualifications and staffing have been fantastic. Strengths of the program curriculum are in tune with coming up with program outcomes and assessment practices. The curriculum is extremely complicated because there are so many different ways you can combine their specializations and options within the major and some of those include Elementary Education or Teacher Certificate. The department came through clearly with the self-study and external report that this department gears towards the success of their students and student excellence. The biggest problems and challenges that the external reviewers and we saw was classroom performance space. Very few spaces are dedicated to Theatre or Dance. Very few spaces are dedicated to a department and the kinds of equipment that are necessary, particularly toward this move of a more robust foray. Academic technology is increasing within the field. Scheduling conflicts and the problem of dancers dancing on unsprung floors, which is dangerous. Where they were keeping their props and such had a lot of pigeon damage but I do want to report there is a new roof. They understand current budgetary constraints and other College wide needs. In a realistic way, this is what they said they would like to see if they had to ask

for more space. Even though they need many different spaces, Dance is the space that needs to be addressed the soonest. Teaching staff and resources, they do have a complicated curriculum, and there are still some growing pains in that curriculum but they would like to see better staffing, whether it is hiring an additional line or a PAT to fill some of the teaching positions.

Motion: Senator Warder – the AOC moves that Report on the review of the Theatre and Dance and all responses be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We are now going to move back to the Executive Committee report for By-law changes. I am going to ask the Secretary to go over these.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Over the course of the year we had solicited the information from the Senate about revisions and also did a review line by line of the By-laws. I am going to review and discuss the changes that were reviewed by the SEC at their last meeting, and then put a motion forward to accept all of the revisions as one package.

Article IV. C. – Officers. We had begun a process about 2 years ago where as the Secretary during the meeting compile a list of motions and any documents attached to those motions and send them to the Provost at the end of the meeting. He can then move those forward to the appropriate bodies so that our policies are all up to date. It seems to be a system that works well and thought it best to include that in the position description as stated in what is highlighted – (including providing the Provost with a post Senate Meeting summary of approved motions) now appears in the Secretary's description.

Article V. B. Meetings. Reading that it appears that Interim Committee is actually the Senate Executive Committee. There was a language change at one point and not all parts of the By-laws were updated. Then (See Article VII, B) should be A because B didn't exist.

Article VI. C. 4. A. - Courtesy of the Floor. After reviewing with the Parliamentarian we recommend removing the list because it is not necessary and going with what we believe is the spirit of the Courtesy of the Floor and going with B which would now be A which states "Courtesy of the Floor may be extended to any member of the College Community upon request of a senator. Such courtesy shall be denied only upon objection of a majority of the senators".

Article VI. C. 4. B. - Limitation of Debate: This has caused significant confusion on the Senate over the four years that I have been on it. With consultation with the Parliamentarian, we suggested changing the language so that the vote is now in the affirmative. What you see highlighted in yellow is the new language that says at the end of 15 minutes we will vote and if the vote is yes we will continue debate and if not the debate will end.

Article VI D. 4. - This semester we engaged in online voting and we do not have a procedure for that. After discussing this with Ron Rodgers and clarifying that there are no open meeting rules and regulations that we are required to follow, we put forward the following procedure if we have to do an online vote. It is clear that this will only occur in emergencies and only for administrative things such as cancellation or rescheduling another meeting. No substantive debate shall occur on line.

Article VI F. - We talked about memorandum and type written form. We have moved forward a little with technology and we have already put things in place via email to the recorder so we simply updated it. The next piece of that was a proposal from the SEC that a curriculum package proposal can come forward as one package. So when we have a completely new program that has many courses that can come forward as one package. If there is consent to doing that, there is now language there to do that.

Article VII O. – The Executive Committee. The language earlier in the document talked about when the Senate is not in session, being when the SEC may have more authority with decision making so we just made that the same language that appears earlier in the document. So take out "during breaks during the academic calendar" and put in "when the Senate is not in session" so it is consistent throughout the document.

Article VII P. - Curriculum Committee, we ran into the exits policy issue so we clarified that both exit and entrance policies would need to go to the ASC. We also added the term “if a Senator wishes to discuss and/or amend a document created by the SCC, a motion and second are required for discussion”. Therefore, it is not open for discussion, if the SCC puts forward a document and the Senate wishes to amend that, there is now a procedure to do that.

Article VII Q. – Academic Standards Committee – All other committees of the Senate had elections during the spring semester so when we enter the fall, leadership was already in place. The ASC was the only committee that did not have that. We also added a policy of recommendations imbedded in curriculum proposals from the SCC should go to the ASC. That is now clear. We added the term exit qualifications and just a little bit of language change at the end.

Article VII R. – Academic Overview Committee – the SCC guidelines do not come before the Senate as information to be discussed. There is a policy in place where someone wants to discuss or amend we can do that. The AOC was in a position where anytime they wanted to change their calendar or guidelines they had to come to the full Senate for a vote. There was not an option for them not to have that. This policy here gives them the same latitude as the SCC. They can update their calendars, guidelines and present to the Senate as informational and should there be an issue a Senator can request a motion to discuss and amend them.

Article VIII – Special Committees to the College Senate – It is clear in the SEC description that the SEC is charged with creating tasks force. This seems to be a redundancy and it was just hanging out there and did not seem to fit so we are removing the Special Committees from the By-laws. It is clearly the charge of the SEC to do that.

Article IX C. 2. - Ballots – We discussed with Ron Rodgers the election of a faculty observer to the USNH Board of trustees for a three-year term. That has not happened in recorded memory for any of the campuses and the Board of Trustees will also be removing that from their By-laws. It only makes sense for us to remove it as well. All of the meetings are open and if anyone interested can attend.

Article XII - We also ran into a situation this year where we had a few motions that did not meet the 48-hour timeline so we rather suspended the By-laws even though we do not have a way to do that. Article XII talks about temporary suspension of the By-laws and how that would happen. This now changes Article XIII.

Senator McDonald – Suspension of the By-laws would require a unanimous vote by the Senate. I understand that it would mean a Senator that is present.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Yes

Senator McDonald – I just want to make sure if we do not have someone present, it would not preclude that.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is the vote of all the Senators present. In order to hold the vote it has to be a forum, and that was covered earlier.

Senator Menees – On the Limitation of Debate it reads, “At the end of fifteen minute the Chair will conduct a vote on whether or not to close the debate. If the vote is affirmative, debate will continue”...That sounds opposite. Should it be conduct a vote on whether or not to continue debate?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Yes, it should.

Motion: Senator Schmidl-Gagne moves the By-laws as revised be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion:

Senator Hanrahan – On Article VIII if we delete it then we need to renumber the Articles below it.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I will, I think Outlook had fun with the document but I will make sure it all makes sense before I post it.

Senator McDonald – This would take effect at the end of this Senate session.

Senator Darby – What is the rationale for Article VIII being deleted? Is it abuse or not used or is it because the Executive Committee has been charged with it?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – We are deleting it because it is clearly the Executive Committees responsibility. It states in the Executive Committees description that it is their responsibility to charge a task force.

Senator Darby – What is the difference between task force and committee? Article VIII says committee not task force.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is all covered in the SEC's description.

Senator Darby – Could you explain why we recently suspended the By-laws.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There were a couple of motions that did not make it into the packet that went to the Senate. We did not suspend the By-laws because we do not have a procedure for that. It was agreement of the Senate that we would go forward with those motions even though they did not meet the 48-hour rule.

Senator McDonald – They did not make it by 7 minutes.

Senator Darby – The new Article XII would cover such cases. Are there other reasons why we would want to suspend the By-laws? Have we done that in the past?

Senator McDonald – Not to my recollection.

Senator Hartz – Article VI - Vice Chairs responsibilities – the last sentence. “The Vice Chair submits 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”. Should we present that report at the first Senate meeting of the new academic year to the whole Senate body? It should ride through out the Academic year and serve as a checklist to see if an action has been followed through. The Academic Oversight Committee is a great example, recommendations for new spaces for Dance, recommendations for new faculty lines. I worry that it will get lost. As a Senate body, how do we measure and reflect what has been discussed and what has been acted on.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – At the end of every Senate meeting I send Provost Netzhammer everything that was approved and he has a distribution list that he forwards those to everybody from the Registrar, Deans and ACA.

Senator Hartz – So there is a mechanism in place to follow through.

President Giles-Gee – I have delegated the responsibility to attending to those recommendations to the Provost. I did that within a Senate meeting. We did that with the understanding that the Provost would follow up with the recommendations except for the ones that go to the Board of Trustees. I report on those specifically to the Board of Trustees that require their approval. I suggest this report is designated to the Provost.

Senator Hartz – There seems that there should be a way to reflect and the Senate has a part of things moving forward.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I also keep track of these individually in a separate document. For the ten Senate meetings there is a document that repeats everything that Provost Netzhammer has received. I send that to him once we close up at the end of the semester.

Provost Netzhammer – This is an action is taking place. It should probably come from the Secretary to the Provost. On a regular basis, I am getting recommendations and I am communicating within a few days back to the Senate leadership and the people who need to know that information that I have approved or in rare instances disapproved with my reason for doing so. There are other things on that list like courses sent to the Senate as information and they are not sent to me for approval, they are sent to me for information only. I disperse those as well. We did not even have this two years ago. To your larger point, we begin work with the departments on an action plan after the AOC does its report. Just this week with policies, an email was sent to the Academic Affairs Council. Does the 40-credit requirement for upper level go into effect this fall or the following fall? We had to go back and find that. Having some mechanism that comes back to the Senate where we review what the Senate sent forward the previous year and how that was disposed of adds that level of accountability that we should expect from the action of the Senate.

Provost Netzhammer – To the question Senator Darby asked – we are going to vote on this as a package.

Senator McDonald – Yes

Provost Netzhammer – If anyone is interested in separating the motion so that one item can be considered differently than the others - is now the time to ask to separate the motion?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We now move to Senate document [SC 10/11 30]. This is not coming before the Senate for a vote but as information. We are seeking comments and input. If you recall, the Chancellor sent a letter saying that Keene State College needed to increase the number of students who graduate in a 4-year period. Several suggestions were included in that including a suggestion of decreasing all majors by 50 credits and the possibility of decreasing down to 120 credits total for all majors. The deadline for submitting the report to the Board of Trustees in June 6th

Provost Netzhammer – That is the actual presentation.

Senator McDonald – This was time sensitive. The SEC and all of the Sub-Committee Chairs have joined to take on this task. We do not feel we have overshadowed anyone's program by doing this. In looking at what would actually be required to increase the success rate of graduating in 4 years took measures that would reach all across the board. These are outlined on page 26 and 27. We would like to have discussion on this today for no more that 30 minutes. If after the 30 minutes, you have comments or suggestions please forward them to anyone on the committee. The committee will be meeting on Friday and will fashion a proposal for next weeks Senate meeting. We have to have this out to Senators no later than Monday at 4:00. This is a serious matter and is not something that should be rushed but time does not allow any other way to do it.

Dr. Dunn – I am bringing forth some comments from Health Science. We realize as a department this is a time driven issue but because this is such a major curriculum change one thing that is concerning to us is that there has not been any kind of public forum. The way we have operated in the past as a College when we have had any shift in curriculum whether it was ISP or going from three to four credits even the Honor's Program, we have had campus wide discussions. Here we are looking at changing our Bachelors degree and modifying our curriculum within the major. This is a major concern for our department because this has not had any kind of forum for public discussion except for here. The only reason I am here and know about this, is that it was a discussion in a Chairs meeting we had in our School. For such a curricular change, this seems to be hidden. There is no time to have a large discussion about that. The other concern is that every time we have asked for data for time to graduation, we have not been given any data. It would be interesting to see what the data is for our College as a whole for time to graduation and to see what it is individually for our department. We are considered a high credit major being told that the time to graduate is not good for those high credit majors and every time we have asked for that data, we have received any information.

The other piece that we would like to bring forward is that if there is an exploration piece like what is outlined in this document, that some further exploration will be done with ISP. We are aware that there is an ISP Task Force that is looking at all the different issues that have come to the forefront of ISP. I think ISP should be considered for further exploration and revision with some of the outcomes that comes from the ISP Task Force. One example that frustrates our department the most is that even though we have

major requirements and those major requirements do not count toward ISP, they should to some degree, but they do not fall within the perspectives category. It is not considered a perspectives type of discipline. We have students taking Natural Science based courses within our department but you cannot put that toward an ISP course. For example, we have nine Science based courses in our curriculum and one of those nine counts as a Natural Science.

There should be some kind of process in place as to how this is going to be implemented. If everyone in the fall who needs to do revision to their curricular, are they going to be required to put forward program proposals? If that is the case, then departments are only going to have a short amount of time to talk about how they are going to eliminate four or eight credits from the major. Serving as a Curriculum Committee member and Curriculum Committee Chair, those committees are going to be burdened to no end with a huge amount of proposals. Those committees have seen much more come through over the past couple of years. There needs to be some kind of plan in place to have this implemented whether it be staggered to allow departments to make major changes and give them the time to talk about how they are going to eliminate if it is eight credits, how they are going to go about it. We would like to see some sort of highlight on how that will be happening.

Senator Darby – The second paragraph on page 26 reads, “All departments would provide evidence that a major could be completed in 3 years”. In the previous paragraph, the language speaks of a waiver. Would waivers also cover the statement that all departments would provide evidence that a major could be completed in 3 years?

Senator McDonald – Could you please give detail in what you are talking about with the waiver.

Senator Darby – I am seeking clarity because the previous paragraph speaks of a waiver but the next paragraph begins with the word “All”. In effect, an accredited program is a program seeking accreditation should they be granted a waiver of this requirement. Does this requirement also include the language that a major must be completed in three years?

Senator McDonald – My interpretation of this, the waiver was only in place for accredited programs that could not drop four or eight credits. We are asking those programs to also look at being able to graduate in 3 years.

Provost Netzhhammer – My impression of the discussion was that we did not want to put anything in place that would jeopardize accreditation.

Senator Clemmenson – I think there are five accredited programs on campus that can seek waivers. There are concerns the entire Student Assembly had. The first one is #5 “The Academic Standards Committee should consider if the College should enforce through registration holds or other means available a requirement that students get academic advising”. We already know that we have such a shortage of Academic Advisors. Even if we did not have a shortage would we have quality academic advising? How do you ensure that 5500 students are getting advising and how do you keep track of that? If something gets lost in the loop, they are going to be penalized and lose their registration, kicked out of their classes, register late and have to pay a fee. How do we make sure these students are being advised and that is actually happening?

The second concern was looking at the graduation dates. #6 on page 27, “The Academic Standards Committee should consider if the College should limit participation in commencement ceremonies to only those students who will have met the requirements for graduation by May of the current year”. Many students get behind one semester because they have to drop a class here and there. You are taking 20 credits or 16 credits then all of the sudden you have to go down to 12. For example Architecture, studios are tough. You are taking 12 credits but you have to take two studios or along those lines, you are putting in all that extra work so you do not have the ability to take 16. You are now talking about not graduating with all of your friends just because you are finishing one class in the summer. It does not seem right and does not sit well in general. We have always had the policy that you can walk with your class as long as you are graduating in December. I think we should continue honoring that policy with registration whether you register for summer or fall. If you are going to complete your requirements by then, you should still be able to do so. The policy does make it transparent that Keene State is giving you the opportunity to graduate in four years. From a student point of view, the other items mentioned really need to be looked at.

Provost Netzhammer – The comments that you made are issues that should be examined by the Senate and not drawing conclusion in the document we have put together. The evidence that competes with what you just talked about is that of the students who meet the requirements to graduate by May and walk through the ceremonies - 2% do not ever complete. Students who plan to graduate in the summer and walk through the ceremonies - 17% do not complete. Students who are planning to go to graduate in December, the numbers are well into the 20's. We pull that data when the Academic Standards Committee gets to look at this. The issue with what you are talking about is that many students who go through ceremonies and never complete. That is the concern of the committee of why we think this is something that is worth exploring. We are just charging it to the Senate Committee to examine what are the advantages and disadvantages.

Senator Clemmenson – I would hate to see 87% of students that do register for the summer are penalized because of those 13%. We are talking about the majority who do come back and complete. As long as we have the line in place that says you have to be registered, it is not as if you are handing out the diploma on stage.

Provost Netzhammer – The rebuttal to that is that twice this semester we have dealt with issues in which students put that they had graduated on their diploma. They have walked through the ceremonies and they consider that their graduation and they had not actually completed the requirements and simply because the employer checked, it was discovered. That raises an issue that students represent themselves when they go through ceremonies even though they have not completed the requirements.

Senator Fleegeer – I am interested in the rationale for the four and eight credit reduction in the Division by total of those credits. Could you tell me why the credits are in those ranges and why four and eight were determined?

Senator McDonald – We tried to work around the idea of limiting it to 50 credits, taking into the assumption that it would still allow for those who are accredited. We were trying not to go that drastic. There are about 30 majors and in some cases would have cut them in half. With this and going by division seemed to meet the goal and trying to move up the graduation goals within that time. By going by division, it seemed too worked well. It is as close as we can come to across the board. Two majors have 40 or 36 credits would not be affected by these changes. But on the other hand, it is not those majors that are causing the delay in graduation. We hope to get feedback in the next few days to make changes and improvements to this.

Senator Fleegeer – Is this envisioned, as a one time and then there would be subsequent discussions? I am just wondering about a program that has 72 credits and if they are reduced by, eight they are still at 64. I am just wondering, is this a one time once you take your initial 8 that it would be done.

Senator McDonald – One discussion that we had was to have a review with all programs that have high credits and this is why they have those high credits. Should they receive further consideration as to can they remain that high. As to the information on public forums, we got this in mid to late March before we even decided to get together a task force to discuss this.

Provost Netzhammer – We got it at the beginning of February and discussed how we would approach it and got people from the Senate in February and the task force started meeting in March.

Senator McDonald – It has been on a fast track and mostly because of deadlines. I just want to clarify we do not have a proposal today except that in June and they would have a plan for us in August when we return.

Senator Hanrahan – Some majors were preempted in trying to reduce their credits in the last few years. It does not seem fair because those majors were preempted. We dropped down from 68 down to 54 I believe when we did our major a few years ago. We are now being asked to reduce it by another 4 credits. If they can show evidence, they made this change in the last year or two that should count. A few majors have done this ahead of time; I think they should be supported if they can show evidence of that.

Senator Hartz – This is from the Trustees and their concern is our time to degree, is lacking by some measure. I am curious about the evidence that drove the committee to these recommendations. What is the connection between this proposal and the goal? This will affect the rates in a positive fashion. Completion rates – we have those measures by the programs of the college on our WEB site. What the major programs are? What our completion rates are? Are we putting forth the right effort where it should be?

Probably the big programs have most of the big numbers where we are not meeting the rates. Are we going about this the right way?

Provost Netzhammer – Part of the frustration is that this is not something they just brought to us. They brought this to us three years ago that we did not act on. I believe they feel that we have had a lot of time to talk about this. We had a number of false starts and recommendations from committees that said we are not going to move on this. While it feels to us that having to do all this in the space of four months is crazy, I think the sense of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor in particular, is that we gave you a lot of time to do this and now you're just getting to it. This is sort of the political thing going on around this. Is this a graduation rate problem? Far less than it is the retention rate problem; we actually graduate in four years almost 50% of our students. We only retain 65% of our students. If there are only 15% that are not graduating in four years that number is good. Part of what you see in the additional items for consideration, are connected to the retention of our students that would allow more of them to be here and graduate in four years. All along, we have recognized the fact it is not just about four-year graduation rate, we cannot improve that unless we improve the retention rate. The President has charged the Management Council to look at increasing our strategies for retention among other things that we can do to improve the retention rate of our students, which will improve our graduation rate. New Hampshire has lagged in what other States have done around these issues. A number of our faculty come from other States and are surprised that we are just having these discussions. Years ago, they capped majors State wide at 120 credits. There is a four-year graduation rate issue but there is also a taxpayer's concern issue related to this as students continue to stay beyond four years that the cost to parents and the State increase as well. All of that is coloring the memo we got from the Chancellor. Pretty much, it looks like this, fifty credit majors, 120 – 140 accredited degrees, 16 or more open electives that students can take so that the number of general education plus major requirements leads to an opportunity for students to make a mistake. The Board of Trustees should be thinking these things. As Representatives of our State and our State University, that factored into the proposal this group put together.

Senator Blatchly – I was really discouraged when we have something titled time to graduation, the very first entry really does not have anything to do with time. What if we start with the time issue? We have some clear time constraints, let us ask majors to show a plan to get somebody out in three years. If you cannot do that then maybe we start looking at cuts. I have not seen evidence that suggests that that is the problem in every case. You have a broad based cut on all of the majors whether they are a problem or not. If you can have a student out in three years then there is not a problem the problem lies somewhere else. We have a student in Chemistry that will be out in five years but he did not start until he was a junior. If you start in your 3rd year, I do not see how you can expect to get out of Keene in four years. We start with the time issue and if people can solve the time issue should that be not good enough. The other piece is the advisement; many people are not advised effectively. Whatever we can do to fix that would be worthwhile. Start with the time then move to the credit – prove that it is a problem then fix it.

Senator McDonald – The title high credit majors came from the Chancellor.

Senator Doeski – It already is proven that all programs can have students graduate on time. Not all students complete on time. It is my experience that students that do not complete on time do so for one or two reasons. They flunked a couple of classes along the way so they have to take classes in summer or fall semester or they drop out for a semester because they have run out of money. I wonder if the Board of Trustees is discussing better ways to fund this so that students can graduate on time without having to drop out to pay the tuition rate here, which is one of the highest in the country for a school like this. We are asking a lot of these students. If high credit majors were the issue how could we expect a student to pass a nursing program that sets a new record for high credits here. I am not sure what this is really going after is going to help.

Senator Clemmenson – Students have both the issues of flunking classes and running out of money. We have Music and Education that has 150 credits.

Senator Darby – Music does not have a major with 150 credits.

Senator Clemmenson – We have majors on this campus that require upwards of 4 – 5 classes a semester, that is 20 credits and that is a giant burden. You implement a 4-credit model to allow students to focus and learn more content in those four classes. For students to have to take five classes a semester and not get out in 4 years is not right. They are putting in more and more effort and

spreading thinner and thinner. It is as if you are asking them to put more work in they are going to fail because they are overwhelmed to graduate in 4 years. We know the budget is a major issue and students are feeling just like faculty is feeling it. It is important for the transparency and for students to see they can graduate in four years. If they are not going to graduate in 4 years then we need to call it that and let students know. I believe this policy needs to be looked at seriously.

Senator McDonald – We now bring the discussion to an end and if you have any comments or ideas please share them with members of the committee. There will be a vote on this proposal or something similar next week.

The last thing for the SEC is the Planning Council Assumptions. This is only a draft and is here for your contributions and comments.

Provost Netzhammer – We could take comments at next weeks meeting.

Senator Warder – If you have any concerns or comments please email him directly before Friday there is still time for discussion before the final meeting.

Senator Swiger asked that the ASC agenda items move to next Senate meeting.

Provost Netzhammer – Yes

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Menees – We had several proposals come in over the last several weeks.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IIHLSC 445 course proposal be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

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

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the ISPSYC 312 course proposal be accepted by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

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

Vote: Motion carries

We set curricular dates for 2011 – 2012

Senator McDonald – We will move the ASC items to next weeks meeting.

VI. New Business

VI. Adjournment 6:00pm

Respectfully submitted by Cheryl Martin 4/16/11