

Minutes
for the 420th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 18th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

- I. Call to Order 4:05
- II. Roll Call
Absent: Senator Stemp and Senator Dolenc, Senator
- III. Secretary's Report
Nothing to report
- IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Stanish – Another announcement from the faculty staff development campaign. You should have received an email for the breakfast which is next Wednesday the 25th from 7:30-9:00am so if you donated to the college this fiscal year you are more than welcome to the breakfast. If you would like to donate between now and then you can still come to the breakfast.

Senator Daley – We are having a carnival from 3:00-9:00pm tomorrow along with Mexican food from 4:00-7:00pm on Appian Way. Everyone is invited to come and join in the festivities.

V. Subcommittee Reports

• **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – Over the past several years we have been keeping verbatim meeting minutes transcribing all conversation. At the end of the meetings Cheryl will transcribe up to thirty pages of minutes and it is actually in Robert's Rules of Order that this is not required. The requirements are standard motions and results of the votes to be required to be recorded. With this we had a request from one of the Dean's that we try to lessen the time that we have Cheryl working on this.

Motion: The SEC moves that the revision to the Senate Minutes format as required within the Robert's Rules of Order be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Welsh – I have been giving this a great deal of thought but it strikes me that the more optimal the configuration of the minutes might be somewhere between those two extremes. I think verbatim, is too much and doesn't necessarily capture the intent of what is said as well ironically as paraphrase which I think can be done. I would be hesitant to vote for recording of the vote and reading of the motions because I do think there is discussion that comes before a vote that includes things like one is for one is against and being this is the record of the college Senate's actions on particular things. It is useful for the official record to display some evidence of the depth of the conversation that transpired to get to that vote. I would think a preferred option for me would be some paraphrase of the discussion and if I were to characterize the paraphrase when people talk there should be an indication of the essential points of what those people said. You're not recording everything that was said but if a Senator finds it worth their while to speak at a meeting then there should be a record of what they said at the meeting in the minutes.

Senator Darby – The archiving of voice recordings, I am curious what the quality is of the current recording. This is a very difficult room to record voices in. It is a wonderful room but a disaster of a room to hold a meeting. If we move forward with the motion we might investigate having a better recording system if we are going to archive those recordings. Again, this is a very challenging room to have a meeting in and I assume it is a challenge to record voices in this room – acoustically, this room is a disaster.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think Cheryl could speak best to this but even though we use this to make the transcripts I think the problems that you see in the minutes which are minimal – usually it is a word that could be similar are the problems that we have. I don't think they are excessive the kind of flip floppy words don't change a lot of the substance of it. Cheryl could probably speak better to that. It is key that people say their names, speak up as best you can and there will be very very minimal issues. These have worked effectively for us. It could be better of course and the quality as I listen to it is as good as speaking. If people could speak up a little louder it would solve a lot of the problem. It is usually because somebody is a little bit softer.

Senator Daly – I have to agree with Senator Welsh on this. I think if we were able to accurately narrow down all of the minutes and Cheryl you may be able to attest to this, do you feel as though you would be able to accurately do that if someone is talking that you would be able to do that and anyone reading the minutes could still have an accurate interpretation of the minutes? Would that be easy enough for you to do?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I think the question would be is it possible to have thirty people agreeing on what essence of the meeting will get into the minutes. If I start to pick and choose the essence of the meetings I believe this would pose another problem.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That is exactly why we went to the transcript of the minutes because we were spending a great deal of time in the Senate with people disagreeing with what the spirit of the conversation was. Cheryl and I have worked together on both extremes, the extreme we are doing now and the middle ground which is just a summary and defaulted too because it actually saved time in Senate to have a transcript and just fixing semantic kinds of things but if we recorded the motions and we already do keep these and are already being archived, we felt that that would save time in the Senate and also save time transcribing.

Senator Martin – I think there are a variety of intermediate steps that should be considered so that we can ascertain in a printed record what the legislative intent is of this legislative body and what the deliberations were prior to a piece of legislation and prior to a non decision. That is important information that we do not want to disappear into a sound archive that would be very difficult to search. We need the capacity to research our own actions especially since the institutional memory of this body tends to be fairly short. In fact there is a motion before the Senate to ensure that there be turnover among at least in faculty members. They are making sure that many members of the Senate don't know what a prior Senate did do and would have no recourse or way in which verbal research legislative intent and deliberations. Here is a proposal, instead of summarizing the gist of a conversation that the recorder engages actively to paraphrase closely everything that is said. I said paraphrase rather than capture verbatim of the speaker.

Provost Netzhammer – I just have to say that capturing verbatim will be a less time consuming process than paraphrasing. That requires basically listening to the whole thing and then writing an acceptable summary. In the same way with our students sitting down and copying out of a textbook is a much easier thing to do than reading what's in the text, making sense of that in a different form. If this is about workload reduction I don't think that solves the issue that the SEC was trying to solve.

Senator Martin – I think the information that we might lose is too important to lose in a verbal archive so I would suggest with the false economy to save on one person's time and then have other Senators have to engage in an extensive search of a two hour meeting in order to ascertain what did get said at said prior meeting that they did not even attend.

Senator Blatchly – Could you speak to how the recordings would be archived? Is it by a meeting block or would it be broken up by motions somehow? The problem I see is searching back for the conversation and having to kind of guess where in the recording the conversation would be or may even have to travel over to someone's office to pull a tape or CD out. I am a little concerned we are going to lose the information that is in here and is the information searchable?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is stored on the Q-drive. It would be accessible anywhere you can get to the Q-drive. It is not the most convenient thing but it would be open to you when you were on campus. It is a folder that is accessible to everyone.

Senator Blatchly – So it is accessible to everyone on campus?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I believe it is but I would have to double check. At least it is the Senate. Everyone on the Senate, at one point it might have been open but that might have been for NEASC. It is just a block so if it is a 2 hour meeting than it is a 2 hour recording. I don't think we have looked into different ways to record it so that it could be marked in different ways but is something we could explore.

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – It is blocked and timed so that it shows hours/minutes/seconds on the recording so let's say a discussion becomes more detailed before or after the motion there could be a spot where you could post the timestamp from the tape, so you could fast forward to say 19 min and 23 sec and that would bring you to that motion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – They are digital files so there is not a CD or something.

Senator Shalit - There is a number of automated recorders with software, Have you looked into any of them?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I researched extensively about halfway through my first year doing this verbatim and came across Dragon. The problem was it will only recognize one person's voice which means I would actually have to repeat everything that was said on the tape so that it could at least take it from my voice. I just don't know how much time that would save and after a number of programs they all seem to work the same way in that regard.

Senator Shalit – Recently?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – I believe it was two years ago.

Senator Shalit – Technology has improved

Senator Darby – Maybe the addition of time codes in the minutes as proposed here. The time code posted would help with a search of the files such as when the SEC starts their part of the meeting you could put the time stamp next to their report. A Senator wishing to review would know where to go on the tape.

Senator Martin – Hypothetical question, so somebody has spent several hours searching in an audio archive how does that information get communicated back to the Senate in an informative manner. Let's say I would like to repeat this conversation but there is only an audio archive. It would be nice to be able to cut and paste a text with this and share it with my colleagues. How would I communicate the audio archive?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If we mark it then you should be able to mark the paragraph even more efficiently. Like Cheryl said, if the discussion of a certain motion occurred at 5.05 in the tape and you went there and it was off by a little bit you could find the exact time and share that with the Senators who could also access the audio file and they wouldn't have to do the search that you did if they could move the little scroll bar right to the exact time and begin listening there. What we are saying in the motion is that the audio files become a record of the meeting and that they are the same thing as paper.

Senator Doeski – I don't know the solution to this but we had a recent discussion here in which Senator Welsh raised serious issues about the nature of interdisciplinary courses and the ensuing discussion I think several people touched on really important points. Other people who are not in the Senate read the transcript of this and are really interested in and pursuing these issues. This is the kind of thing that will get lost because it doesn't show up in a motion.

Senator Denehy – Clarification question – The packet that comes out for each meeting, does that get archived? Does that include the ASC report and the SEC report and so on? So we have some record of this meeting.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Yes. What you will find on the Senate website is for the last 7 years for every years worth of Senate meetings are uploaded as one document. It is the entire Senate packet and I believe I also started uploading, since I have been the Secretary, a separate document that is compiled motions of the year. I believe I have put both up there and if I haven't I meant to and I will get to it.

Senator Stevenson - I guess if the audio tape does become the official record of this body I would like to see some provision in there that any Senator at any time can request a written transcription of a particular section should it become necessary and given some reasonable timeframe. You can't request it 4 minutes before a meeting but there should be some way to request a written transcript of sections they want to discuss.

Senator Welsh – This reflects back on several issues that we have discussed in the Senate over the past couple of months and that is certainly good college policy is often at odds with the resources available. To enact that college policy especially in a constrained environment and I think you find yourselves anticipating resource issues as we are thinking about the policy we should follow and there are times when I think that the resource issues are that its necessary to reconsider available resources and if there are not resources available then find the resources to enact the policy. I think with good written records and I am talking about verbal transcription but good written records the colleges Senate meetings are important and if resources are an issue than we should find the resources to make this possible.

Senator Coleman – I believe Ann Atkinson has some papers in her book marked so I was wondering if she could let us know what her take is from Robert's Rules about this whole idea. I know that has been a lot of different options but I would like to see what Robert's Rules suggest.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – Robert's Rules indicate that the Senate runs on action and so it is the actions that the Senate takes so motions and votes are the most critical.

Senator Fleegeer – I was wondering if you could share some information on how much time is involved.

Senate Clerk – Cheryl Martin – I can give you a rough estimate. It really depends on the speed of the speaker, the volume of the speaker, the clarity of the speaker, what's discussed and if there are breaks between the discussions. What I find is a one hour meeting averages ten hours of transcription. The reason for this is because I transcribe from the tape into the shorthand that I take during the meetings. Where there is so much discussion, I want to make sure that what I typed is what I heard so I listen to the tape again. After that I proofread and align text and then send it to Kim for proof reading. Before it actually gets into the minutes it has been touched five or more times.

Senator Fleegeer – So ten hours for every hour of meeting?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – Yes, estimating, obviously at the beginning of the meeting where there is the roll call or the Secretary's report it's much quicker it's when it gets into in depth a discussion that's where it takes a lot of time. Again, it depends on the volume of the speaker it depends on the speed of the speaker. There are some people that when they speak I actually have to download their voice into another program all together to slow it down because I can't listen and type verbatim that fast. That is where it is time consuming.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – After Cheryl is done with it I usually spend another 2-4 hours with it and then it goes back to Cheryl to track the changes on and she double checks what I have checked before it gets into your hands and there are still errors.

Senator Fleegeer – Thank you, it is important to know what type of time issues are involved here.

Senator McDonald – We are at the end of our 15min discussion, is there a motion to continue with this discussion?

Motion: The SEC moves that discussion continue on Senate Minutes format on the above motion.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish – There does seem to be a feeling that a written record or at least some sort of written record is important. I was going to say that it seems we ought to stick with the verbatim record until the Senate Clerk let us know what is involved. I had no idea the amount of time that is involved in this. I am thinking about some of the middle ground that have been proposed, in theory I think having a summary is a good one except that puts a burden on someone to come up with that summary and then we end up debating that summary. I don't think anyone in the room would ever fall into this but it does give someone power to put their own interpretation in the summary that and I don't think we want to open that door at all. I actually like Senator Stevenson's compromise that any Senator or maybe open it to any campus community member that requests a transcript of a particular motion that way as an example that Senator Doreski gave in the interdisciplinary discussion we could have requested that transcript. The Senate Clerk could only do the pieces that are requested and therefore put a compromise on this.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If the Senators want to make what I think is a friendly amendment that is fine however we pull it off.

Senator Stevenson –

Motion: Senator Stevenson moves to include the ability for any member of the Keene State community to request a written transcript of any particular motion to the above motion be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – This transcript, would that then become a more detailed version of the minutes?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It would be what you currently get for that motion.

Senator Welsh - A current practice at each following meeting is the opportunity to review and correct the minutes. It strikes me that before this written transcript became a document and distributed and considered an official record as the minutes are that I think they would require the review of and approval of as we do the minutes.

Senator Blatchly – If I heard the amendment correctly it extends the privilege to the campus community which I support. I think that gives us an obligation then to make those recordings available to the campus community so that technical problem is a foul line. I don't think we need to add that to the motion but it does have that implication that we should recognize and move towards a technical solution.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – That is not a problem. The Q-drive folder can be assessable to the GAL if we like to use that term.

Provost Netzhammer – I think with the overhaul of the Web site happening over the next several months the opportunity to even post the audio files on the Senate Web site will be available. I think the spirit of this whole discussion is that if we are going to go to an audio recording as the record of the meetings we want the widely available to people. I think taking them out of the Q-drive and putting them into a place where people can access them without needing permission makes a lot of sense.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think I can do that now because it can accept media. I would have to play with it a little bit.

Senator Stanish – I was going to ask if Senator Welsh's point of approval of any written transcript would be a friendly amendment to the amendment for or is it already in the amendment.

Provost Netzhammer – Point of order, I don't think there is anything necessarily done. He is right in his observation that a transcript would need to be approved.

Senator Martin – I really hesitate to add reservations but I have taken minutes for a variety of different meeting over several years and Cheryl's experience as summarized here is comparable my personal experience as well. I am speaking with sympathy of the real difficulty of this. Is it possible for us to consider that the very specific skill of creating a transcript isn't a skill that exist on this campus and that would be contracted out for the very limited purpose of the 2 hour meetings that we have for this body and have the transcriptionist which would be fast and at less cost to the institution than the existing application. Could we study that?

Provost Netzhammer – Point of order, we are talking to the amendment and not the motion.

Senator McDonald – On the amendment is there any other conversation?

Senator Shalit – What are we talking about if we just record the actions?

Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin – If we just record the motions, votes and roll call I could probably get most of it done during the meeting and then it would be just cleaned up after.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I actually currently do that so Cheryl would not need to do it at all. As we vote on the motions by the time the meeting finishes up I forward the motions and the attendance to both the Provost and Cheryl, so it's done.

Senator McDonald – I would ask that we return to our amendment. After the amendment we can go back to the discussion on the motion.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – We are now back to the discussion on the motion.

Senator Denehy – To Senator Martin – I am not sure that is necessary I listen to the NH Legislative State House and there are times when I look at the journal of how the House is done and I want to listen to something I just start jumping through the audio. I don't think it is necessary for us to do a transcription when the ability is possible under the audio.

Senator McDonald – Any other questions or comments?

Vote: Motion carries as amended

Senator McDonald – We now move forward with the SEC report.

Motion: The SEC moves to eliminate the Academic Overview Committee (AOC) from the Senate, effective July 1, 2013. Furthermore, all references to the AOC are to be stricken from the By-Laws on or about July 1, 2013, including the following passage.

D. The Academic Overview Committee (AOC) shall be responsible for establishing the process for, and the reviewing of, all curricular programs (those that offer majors, minors, certificates, graduate programs or other academic courses) on a periodic (not more than 10 years) basis. The committee shall be comprised of 13 members of the Keene State College community drawn from the following constituencies:

- Seven members of the Senate (one of the seven must be a student)
- Three non-Senate faculty members (one from each school)
- One non-Senate PAT member (as selected/appointed by that group)
- One non-Senate Student (as selected/appointed by that group)
- One non-Senate member of the campus community designated by the Provost

All members of the AOC shall have full voting rights within the AOC; however, only the seven Senators shall vote in the Senate. The AOC should appoint a Chair and a Vice Chair who serve staggered, two year terms. The Chair and Vice Chair must be members of the Senate. The Chair will oversee the program review process, lead the committee and report to the Senate. The Vice Chair shall assist the Chair and serve as Chair as necessary. If a senator wishes for the Senate to discuss and/or amend a document (such as the review calendar or guidelines) created by the AOC, a motion and second are required

All programs on the calendar for review during 2012-2013, with the exception of ISP shall go forward with the standard review process.

The SEC requests that the Provost provide the 2012-2013 SEC with an outline for an administrative program review process no later than June 1, 2012.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – Under review of non credit programs the Dean will work with the department to begin the process but there doesn't seem to be a role in getting the Dean in the process of accredited programs, is that correct?

Provost Netzhhammer – You are referring to the document that Senator Blatchly commented on? That is correct, for accredited programs generally that process starts as a relationship between the accrediting agency and the department.

Senator Doreski – What on earth is netted data, literally it would be data about data.

Senator Blatchly – That is what it is. Netted data is just a little bit further detail on data so it is kind of like tags that are put on things that are sort of they are faster defined in a specific format so they go into a data base in particular place and are

easier to find. So they would have descriptions on the report, the author the kinds of things you would find in a card catalog.

Senator Stanish – I appreciate that the Provost put together the sort of draft of what may happen for this administrative function and we are not actually voting on the draft. We are just voting on the proposal to eliminate the AOC. I think it is important that the Dean is very involved in self study. My suggestion is with having the Dean being in the process in the department, on one hand that makes a lot of sense the Dean's are very in touch with departments but one of the benefits of having the AOC is that it is a committee across campus so that departments in different schools are all sort of given the same time limit to work on it, all processes work in the same way and everyone plays with the same ground rules. If you leave it up to the Dean's it will be different depending on how they interpret it. Will they all start a timeline in the same way? I would love to see something involving the Provost's office where it crosses all schools and the Dean's taking it from there. It is just a suggestion.

Senator Blatchly – I think it is pretty remarkable that we were able to ask the Provost last week for a draft of some procedural material and we got it essentially by Sunday in my hands to take a look at and further the conversation. I think that is very responsive and applaud the effort. It is pretty clear that he spent some time thinking about this and I have tried to spend some time over a few hours thinking as deeply as I could about how to put together a process or procedure. I am little concerned that we are going too fast even still. One thing that occurred to me just in the last day or so is that have got nothing in the revised proposal for any sent review with discussion of the procedures by which were produced would be handled. If you look at the AOC procedures you will realize they are fairly detailed and anyone who has been on that committee in the last couple of years there is a lot of stuff in there. What needs to be part of the review, how the reviews are handled, how the external reviewers are chosen? There is a lot of stuff that could potentially affect the outcome of the review and that is not really part of the revision that we have. It seems like we are jumping ahead a little bit. I am not sure why we need to jump into this as quickly as it is purposed. I notice there a couple of people who are worried that it is not going to happen and I can understand that concern. Given some of the valid points about comparative institutions that function this way, I think it is a very reasonable thing to consider replacing the Senate roll in the AOC with something that is a little bit smaller but this is a time in which we have control over the procedures by which this review is done. It seems to me that until we have the ability to see what the replacement is it is a little bit premature and really doesn't treat the AOC in the context of the whole Senate Curriculum Committee structure. I would urge that we look at the whole package.

Provost Netzhammer – Thank you for your comments. I think that as we have thought about this that this isn't supposed to be the perfect plan and would not be the ultimate version of what we would use. I think as Senator Blatchly and I were talking about one thing that does concern us both is what is the faculty and staff voice in this process. It is clearly not described in the draft and I think if you take a number of different formats, for example, in some institutions a faculty member at our institution could be a faculty member on the Senate would be an internal member of the site team that visits the departments. This means that someone on the Senate would have access to the self study right at the beginning and serve as an evaluator of the program and could really participate in those deliberations. In some way it would provide a richness that we might not even get today in the way that we do this process. My sense and you know I never vote and the fact that we came together as the SEC around this issue is that the idea behind this proposal is a strong one that every member of the SEC supported and that the details of what this new process would look like would involve consultation with the Senate.

Senator Darby – I have a question about Senator Blatchly's response under external review under column 3. An additional quote to accreditors make necessary that outside this review process can a response to the accreditors still be entered into the record or would that still be submitted as part of this process even though it is not necessary. The program response to the accreditors report is a very important document and I would assume that would be entered into consideration.

Provost Netzhammer – Yes, from my perspective the intent of what we are talking about absolutely. If I could just elaborate, the reason you see Senator Blatchly's comments in blue is because there is other language in this document in which he and I agree. I don't think we were Seeing Eye to eye on what happens with accredited programs and it might be helpful for us to articulate that in this forum. My own sense was that the accrediting process for our accredited programs is as rigorous as our internal programs and the need for saying this is not particularly there we go to an administrative process rather than the AOC process. My own sense in writing this was that it is already rigorous enough for our accredited programs to go through that process. To then create another step for them to draft a self study based on that seemed, in my view, to be superfluous and unnecessary. As you can tell from the material in blue Senator Blatchly has a very different perspective on that.

Senator Denehy – Is this a special document that I received?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I sent it last night to the full Senate. It was separate from the minutes.

Senator Blatchly – First of all it is important to realize that these are not yet official procedures. We are still talking about a draft so that may cut the tension down a bit. I think when I have a conversation about the accreditation standards it is important to note that no one is arguing about the rigor of an accreditation process. They are very rigorous; the argument is more about the fit between the program review process and the accreditation material. I can talk about it from a Chemistry point of view and I am hoping we will be accredited in the next 6 months or so. The accreditation process does not look at all of the courses that we provide support for example the Professional and Graduate Studies. They do not look at the qualifications of the faculty; they do not look at the way the courses are treated or what the assessment process is. It is just outside the purview so any college wide support submission is typically not part of an accreditation process. As we talked about this that was the reason why we lean very much towards asking the accredited programs at the very least provide us with some of the accreditation documents. We also have had to deal with accreditation documents that have 600 files in them and it was difficult to navigate so we are hoping to find some sort of middle ground. It is not an extreme process but that it would be pretty typically handcrafted for an accredited program and people would sit down and try to find some way to make the most efficient path of getting a reasonable package.

Senator McDonald – Any other questions or comments? Keep in mind that this is a bylaw change and will take a majority vote to pass.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – Continuing with the SEC report;

Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate adopt the “Time to Graduation Waiver” form

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves to eliminate all term limits from the By-Laws effective immediately

Senator McDonald – I must point out that this was not presented in written form at last week’s meeting. It can be presented today but the only way this can pass is by unanimous vote of the Senate. I do want to point out that this does not benefit me because even though I am at the end of my term limit I am not running for any open seats on the Senate for next year. I just feel that if we have people that want to volunteer on the Senate then they should be able to and not have term limits. If you do not want that person on the Senate then you would not vote them in.

Senator Stanish – If we do approve this bylaw change by eliminating term limits then would we no longer need to vote on separate bylaw changes in article 3 section G where we were changing “no elective member of the Senate shall serve more than 6 consecutive years of an elected faculty member of the Senate.

Senator McDonald – That would supersede that. By the way the Article 3 was given in writing last week and I kept this separate because it was not given in writing.

Senator Blatchly – Does anyone know why the term limits were imposed?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – My understanding is that there used to be a great deal of competition for seats on the Senate. It was also a way to make sure that there was turnover and people had opportunity.

Senator McDonald – When I first ran for the Senate about 21 years ago we actually had to campaign in front of an assembly of faculty.

Senator Denehy – Since this has to be a unanimous vote my understanding is abstention is not a unanimous vote. So if someone abstains it is not unanimous.

Senator McDonald – Correct.

Senator Martin – I would like to speak in favor of the motion because my study of governance since 1969 strongly suggest and I think there is a literature and people could disagree with me says exist that it is antidemocratic to have term limits. If people want to be represented by somebody an arbitrary limit on their capacity to be represented by that person places an obstacle that prevents them from having the person they want. I will be voting in favor of this because I would like to ensure that people are being represented by the representatives that they choose rather than the ones that they are forced to accept as a result of an arbitrary term limit. The antidemocratic piece is also complimented nicely by the development of institutional memory. I think with a great deal of turnover on a body it becomes very difficult to develop expertise and knowledge of both the business and the history of that body. I believe the development of institutional memory will be served by this amendment.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – The SEC did discuss the grading policy and was tabled until next year. Some people did ask that this be moved forward and we discuss that and we determined that we did not want undercut the motion of the Standards committee and bring that to the table. This will return to the Senate next year for discussion. We now move to all of the other bylaw changes that we have. Senator Schmidl-Gagne sent out a request last week to see if any of these needed to be brought up for discussion. It turns out someone wanted every one of these brought up for discussion. We are going to go through each of these and bring them up one by one to discuss except the ones that by previous votes have already been passed.

Motion: The SEC moves to remove any remaining "gendered" language from the bylaws to be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Denehy – I support the idea of the motion however I don't believe we can put an open change to the bylaws. My understanding is that we would have to have a list of each item that would be changed.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – When Parliamentarian Atkinson and I spoke, this was actually something that we voted on last year as well and in my review of the bylaws I missed one section at the very end when I updated it. A similar motion came forward last year and it wasn't a list of all the places that the language needed to be changed it was intent to. Because these are all administrative changes and not substantive Parliamentarian Atkinson said that was an ok way to do it. I did not want to change more language in the bylaws without having the Senate know that that was happening but I did find a section that I missed in my original review of the bylaws. That's why it appears the way it is and in a very technical sense I suppose I could just change them because we already have the approval from last year to do that but that wasn't what I had wanted to do. I wanted to make sure that people knew more words needed to be changed.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves to Article IV, B: Remove "and shall (with the assistance of the Secretary) submit a year-end report to the President of the College. This year-end report shall include a chronological list of Senate legislation for the past academic year and is due no later than one week after Commencement."

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just for clarity this is in the Vice Chairs job description and since the Secretary already does what the Vice Chair has been charged to do in the job description, you will see that the Secretary job description would more accurately reflect that I do that anyways and that the Vice Chair doesn't do it so it is just a swap of who does what because it is already happening in a certain way. For example, I did it all and forwarded it to Pete and that just seems to be an extra step in the process.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article IV, C: Add "The Secretary shall submit a year-end report to the President of the College. This year-end report shall include a chronological list of Senate legislation for the past academic year and is due no later than one week after Commencement" be accepted by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article V, A: Add "If a Senate agenda does not include motions to be voted on, it is the purview of the Senate Chair to determine, after consultation with the members of the SEC and other Committee Chairs, to propose an online motion and vote to cancel a meeting" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – It sounds wonderful to me but I just want clarification. The online motion and vote, would that be among the entire Senate?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Last year's bylaws included in it how to do an online vote and it is the entire Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves that Article V, A: Remove "Three (3) such absences from any one of the above groups of the Senate shall." Replace with "Three (3) such unexcused absences from any one of the above groups of the Senate or Senate Meetings shall" be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Sapeta – Is this for 3 absences per year?

Senator McDonald – Per year.

Senator Stanish – I am wondering if we have or do we need a definition of unexcused. Who does the excusing? Is it the Senate Chair? What does excused mean?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – They are in the Senate bylaws.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Article V, A: Remove "upon notification by its chair, require an appearance by the senator before a regularly scheduled meeting of the Executive Committee." Replace with "upon notification by its chair and/or the Secretary of the Senate, be removed from the Senate and/or committee" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Let me explain, in the bylaws there currently exists a statement that if the Chair of the SEC is informed that a person has missed 3 meetings it says they come before the SEC. It doesn't say what the SEC does; it doesn't say there is any sort of review process so it wasn't clear. It seemed that as opposed to something in there that we could say that there are just 3 unexcused absences and it is very easy to get excused absences that someone would no longer serve on the Senate.

Senator Blatchly – Could you remind me what the *it's* refers to. Is that the SEC or the actual committee where the absences are taking place?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It refers to actually the motion above; any 3 meetings of the Senate or their standing committee.

Senator Blatchly – It says *it's* chair. What is the *it*?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is the standing committee's Chair.

Senator Stevenson – Are they called before the committee and they say see ya?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There is no clarification of when you get called before the SEC what would happen. It just said you would get called before the SEC.

Senator Stevenson – So now it is just see ya.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Now it is just see ya

Senator Stevenson – This now expands the power of the role of the Chair of the Senate and to the Secretary?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The notification.

Senator Stevenson – I am not entirely sure of the Chair saying see ya.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It doesn't need to be. If there are 3 absences you are done.

Senator McDonald – 3 unexcused absences.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – 3 unexcused absences you are done.

Senator Stevenson – There is no due process?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If we do what say and say what we do – we can change this, the thing that was there that sort of bothered me was that if you got called before the SEC and there was nothing that said what happened. I don't know do we go into some sort of room that the lights are off? I tried to create something that was clear and unambiguous. We can do whatever folks want but I don't think we can just call folks to the SEC.

Senator Welsh – Is this because of this year's Senate and someone was removed from the Senate because of a string of absences?

Senator Menees – Yes, a string of absences did occur this year.

Senator Welsh – Was that Senator removed?

Senator Menees – Yes

Senator Welsh – It seems like that part of the system worked.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Nobody came before the SEC.

Senator Menees – I don't know if they went before the SEC but I never saw them.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – So they just never ever appeared. There was no official action taken they just never were here.

Senator Menees – They were momentarily heard from in an email, after that never heard from them.

Senator Welsh – You keep using the pronoun they, were they asked to come before the Chair of the Senate?

Senator McDonald – Nobody reported to the SEC that I am aware of.

Senator Menees – Yes you did. You said it was ok to remove them and we already had a new Senator that was on the floor.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It could be that some of the students took care of that problem on their own.

Senator Blatchly – I love the irony of requiring someone who can't show up for meetings to show up before the SEC but I think I share Senator Stevenson's concern for due process and not have a Chair just decide on someone who is absent. It seems from this bylaw that there is no recourse for the Senator to show up and say look I really did show up, this person that disagrees with me is trying to remove me from the committee. If we are going to change the bylaws it is not unreasonable to specify the expected outcome but also to add a little bit of due process, give them the opportunity to petition to the SEC. That is not in here so I am a little concerned about it. It seems like the process was working.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I don't think there was a process. Maybe we should leave this one and move onto a different one so we can work on something. We can vote this down and revisit it in the fall.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: Article VI, F: Remove "In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals." Replace with "It is within the purview of the chair of the SCC to bundle courses and curriculum packages into motions as they feel is appropriate. In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – Which should be that?

Senator Welsh – A technical question, *may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies*, which implies that the Curriculum committee will be presenting Standards motions and I am not sure what the presentation of standards policy would be appropriate from the Curriculum committee. This implies that Standards passed these and then they are presented as one. I am not sure I understand that sequence. A general concern, I think this is a motion in which is likely to lead to the bundling of proposals in a more expedited way. It puts the burden on an individual Senator to get a majority vote of the rest of the Senate to vote to discuss specific issues if they are bundled. I think that is less appropriate than a delivered body such as ours than an opposite attachment would need for a motion to be made to bundle an array of classes within the proposals. That motion is a deliberate choice by the body of the Senate to not have discussion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – There is language that allows a Senator to unbundle it once it comes to the Senate.

Senator Welsh – My concern is that it comes bundled and becomes the responsibility of a Senator or a small group of Senators to convince the rest who may not approve the entirety of the packet. The opposite way is more conducive to make available for discussion.

Provost Netzhammer – To your first point, I think that was the idea. We have had so many conversations at the Senate where either the ASC saying, well we are getting ahead of Curriculum Committee or we will be later. We wanted to create an opportunity where the SCC and the ASC could come forward so that those issues of Standards and Curriculum could be considered at one time rather than at very different parts of a Senate meeting.

Senator Welsh – I do understand the desire to do this but it strikes me that the language here looks as if the SCC is making the proposal, a motion for the ASC. I am not sure if that is appropriate or how we authorize the SCC to unblend one of our motions. It is not clear in this language.

Senator Stanish – I share Senator Welsh's concern about sequencing of when the standards policies are looked at versus the curriculum, proposals. The way this motion is written currently it does seem to put the responsibility on the SCC Chair to sort out what are Standards motions and what are not. I think this year that people from the ASC were saying that it doesn't have to be the SCC Chair's job. It seems the two Chairs working together is a better process and then if the Chairs agree to unbundle the proposals then that makes some sense. It seems to me that we need slightly different wording here that might make more sense.

Senator Denehy – We have the same issue in a later motion where those of the ASC being allowed to bundle SCC items. I understand the intent but it seems we should at least look for language that is clearer that says the idea that when there are proposals that have gone to different committees that come to the Senate at the same time. The intent is good but this language does not achieve that intent and could create confusion between committees.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VI, J, 2: Remove "Section J, 6." Replace with "Section J, 8" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is another administrative change that I didn't catch but again didn't want to alter anything in the bylaws without folks realizing I was doing it.

Senator Welsh – When I download the bylaws I see it already says J8.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I don't know what happened then. The fact of the matter is we are moving the AOC and all of that probably scrambled everything. It is quite possible that other things will change so we can leave that one alone. We can vote it down and move on.

Senator Martin – When it says remove section J,6, is the effort to remove the entire section with its code or just the letters.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Just the article. I thought it was inaccurately sending you to J6 when it should have sent you to J8. I don't have it open in front of me and I have forgotten my hard copy.

Senator Blatchly – It's already there.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I don't get how that happened but great. It says two informational reports send you to J6 and I believe you want to go to J8 – the 48hour rule. We wanted to change from J6 to J8 to send you to the right section. That's all.

Senator Martin – It says J2.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I meant J2. I suppose you have different versions of the bylaws than I do but it does need to be updated.

Vote: Motion carries.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VI, L: Remove "All policies, resolutions and recommendations formally adopted by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Chair of the Senate to the President of the College." Replace with "All policies, resolutions and recommendations formally adopted by the Senate shall be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the President of the College or designee" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Currently as I said earlier I forward all motions voted on to the Provost who talks with the President I am sure so that is why it changes to Secretary and changed to President or designee.

Senator Stanish – I am fine with this but just had a question if it made sense to replace President with the Provost because that is our practice.

Provost Netzhhammer – I think it is President or designee. I think there are some issues that the Senate has dealt with that the President has wanted to keep as her own but when they are curriculum she has designated me to handle it. I think this policy that we have used though has been much more efficient. Approvals are coming out to a wider distribution lists and a more responsive way and I think this reflects what we are doing and the practice over the last 2 years that we have been doing it this way has really been beneficial to the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries.

Senator McDonald – On the next item change I am speaking for members of certain committees and it does in fact effect people or more likely a person on that committee and that person was not notified in advance of this change. Generally I catch anything but I didn't catch that. It was not intentional.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII, B: Remove "The Registrar shall serve as an ex-officio member." The SEC requests that the SCC review their guidelines and revise to include an "administrative review" of proposals. This review would be designed to ensure that all prerequisites and policies are accurately reflected in the curriculum and course proposals be accepted by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Denehy – It doesn't make sense to me that the Registrar who is the person responsible for overseeing the college curricular policy implementation would be removed from this committee. What I am proposing is to get an explanation as to why this Senate suggested it.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – This is interesting it was on the list of bylaw revisions from the fall that we started collecting. I can't point out who suggested it so to answer that part of the question, I do not know. It came and I have been keeping a log and I apologize but I do not have that information. My understanding was the suggestion was that it focuses the SCC on curriculum and not on policy.

Senator Denehy – This is a curriculum committee on curriculum is a bad thing?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – No if we remove the Registrar it will cause the SCC to concentrate on curriculum. That was the rationale that was provided.

Senator Darby – I have a problem with this particular proposal in changing the bylaws and not quite sure what the problem is. I am not sure with the administrative review which is in quotation marks within quotation marks what that entails. I am also a little bit of agreement with Senator Denehy about the role of the Registrar at the point of the SCC's deliberations. In short it's helpful because there is turnover in that committee and the Registrar does provide an institutional memory which does help in my opinion guide the members of that committee toward better decisions. I am also a little bit concerned that an administrative review, where does this review happen? Does it happen at a point prior to the SCC? Does it happen afterwards? The answer is afterwards. I think this change would have the opposite effect of a transparent process that I do feel that we have. I am also a little concerned about the inefficiencies of this change. In effect if the SCC reviews something and keep it in mind that the SCC is populated with faculty and students who are specialists in their area but they may not be specialists in adhering to complex curricular policy. The Registrar in my opinion has provided that guidance. As a faculty member unless someone can produce evidence to me I don't see the Registrar's place at that table as an imposition on faculty control of the curriculum. The Registrar is Ex-Officio and in my observation the Registrar does provide guidance to the faculty and students who are on that committee. I am a little miffed at the inefficiencies if the point of review is post SCC. I imagine a flurry of emails and repeated visits by sponsors of programs even greater than what it is now.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – The SEC added the SCC the request for administrative review. I think our thought was that it would happen before the SCC received a curriculum packet but we are going to leave it up to the SCC to write the guidelines that worked for the SCC around what that review process would be and what the timing of it would be. In my own mind that is before that they got it but I don't think we wanted to legislate to the SCC how that would happen. I would guess that that makes more sense. So it would go through its process then hit the Registrar to identify any issues but again we wanted to leave it to the SCC to help identify guidelines.

Senator Stanish – Without really serving on the SCC but in the current guidelines for the SCC it shows the Registrar as serving as the Ex-Officio and I have served on different committees where Ex-Officio means different things and I don't know if I know what the definition for Ex-Officio means here. Does the Registrar have a vote in the SCC? What is the role of the Registrar?

Senator McDonald – No vote

Senator Doreski – I have served on the SCC for many years and Chaired the SCC for a while and I have some institutional memory and remember a previous version of the controversy over the Registrar's role. For a while the Registrar did not sit on the SCC and it created a lot of problems. No faculty member has the overview of the curriculum that the Registrar has. That is just a fact of life. We ended up having to go to the Registrar and lot of back and forth that delayed some curriculum proposals. It just created more problems than what it was worth. I think having the Registrar there at the SCC meetings saves a lot of time and trouble and does not interfere in my opinion in open and frank discussion. I don't see this as a problem at all and I am really opposed to the notion of putting an administrative review in the middle of a curricular review process. I think that could act as a negative filter and I think the SCC should be as much of a faculty process as possible. Certainly it is an administrative review prior to the process and the Dean is involved at the beginning of the process so I don't see the need to mess with something that seems to be working rather well.

Senator Peters - I am part of the SCC and I think it is important to have the Registrar there not only because he knows about the curricular and says a lot concerning the students that even though I am a student I don't know. I would also be against it.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII, B: Remove "This includes working with the School Curriculum Committees and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools." Replace with "This includes working with the School Curriculum Committees, the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools" be approved by the Senate.

Provost Netzhammer – Please make the editorial change of Integrative Studies.

Senator Stevenson – It appears this would legitimize the Interdisciplinary Studies committee in the bylaws. I would like to know where and when Interdisciplinary Studies committee was created and how they got the power they did because there is no reference to such a committee in the original ISP.

Senator Stanish – I do not recall but going to make a guess and see if it triggers someone's memory. I was on the Senate when the original Integrative Studies program was here and I agree with Senator Stevenson that there was no mention of any subcommittees that we currently deal with at that time. However the Integrative Studies Program Committee also looked very different at that time. I seem to recall during the time I was off the Senate there was a proposal made by the Integrative Studies Committee to divide into the Integrative Studies Council and the Integrative Studies Advisory Board and I am wondering if in that proposal there was something with definitions of subcommittees.

Provost Netzhammer – Your recollection is correct but I do not know the document well enough with accuracy about the subcommittees.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I have them pulled aside because you so often need them. If you give me a minute I can look because I moved them all into a folder so I know where they are. Is that helpful?

Senator Welsh – What are we looking for, Senate approval for the reconfiguration of committees?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It sounds like Senator Stevenson was asking how this got created. Is that accurate?

Senator Stevenson – Correct, my concern is legitimate existence of the subcommittees.

Senator Darby – Is the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee the committee responsible for the approval of II courses?

Senator Stanish – My point was I am wondering if when that restructure was approved by the Senate of the Integrative Studies Program Committee, part of that approval was the creation of these other subcommittees.

Senator Darby – Senator Stevenson's point is well taken however as I read this, this was in effect to bring into line in essence the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee because I think with my experience in the SCC we have had some challenges around some of the II proposals and some confusion about those proposals that may have been alleviated with better communication of that committee. This is how I interpreted this was to help charge the SCC with maybe to facilitate better communication with that committee.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – In the motion of the 386th meeting of the Senate, Professor Nielson advised on the correction in the chart of the proposed composition column are as follows; sixth row down and eight row down in a mention of the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee so I need to go back to 2008-2009.

Senator Blatchly – I guess this raises the question of what we are referring to in this motion. Do we know for certain whom the Chair of this Subcommittee is? What the membership is? We are referring to something in a motion and it would be good to know who this committee is.

Senator Doreski – I wonder if this is the committee or if this is still a subcommittee of the ISP, the one that is chaired by Mike Antonucci. If so, this seems elevated from being part of the ISP and a separate entity.

Senator Welsh – I wonder if this raises significant issues that we are having trouble answer right now at this meeting and there for it might be worthwhile to table this motion.

Provost Netzhammer – I would support that. I think this whole discussion could take place in the context of the ISP task force report or the organizational structure that we put in place for the ISP and try to pick off this piece when we are all struggling and trying to figure out what we are talking about doesn't make a lot of sense.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC move that Article VII, B: Add "In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Welsh – What is different with this?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – This is language in a different part of the bylaws. If we approve one, we could approve the other. That is all with this one. I think the next one is a little bit different.

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC move that Article VII, C: Add "If a standards package includes curricular changes, these changes shall be forwarded to the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee. In the case of a curriculum package proposal, the presentation of a program packet may be put forward as one motion which includes the course proposals and any academic standards policies" be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – If we do not want to approve this, this is two things in here. There was the SCC in the bylaws already has the ability to bundle a curriculum package however they like, so part of this was meant so that the ASC could do something similar. Maybe it just all needs to wait.

Senator Welsh – I was considering that this seems similar to the other motion again.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – It is but there is a subtle difference about the SCC can bundle anything they want and the ASC can't. The SCC can put together a curriculum package together as one motion, if there were policies that you wanted to put forward as one motion that is part of this. If we vote this whole thing down at some point we might want to revisit the ASC allowed to bring forward policies that go together, together. Does that make sense?

Vote: Motion does not carry.

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VII D: Delete, motion to include the timeline of the end of the spring 2013 semester be accepted by the Senate.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Motion: The SEC moves that Article VIII, B: Remove "All of these constituencies must notify the Senate Vice Chair and Senate Clerk of the results immediately upon conclusion of the election. Replace with "All of these constituencies must notify the Senate Vice Chair and Senate Secretary of the results immediately upon conclusion of the election" be accepted by the Senate.

Senator Martin - I cannot find this in my copy of bylaws. I am looking at the ones that are currently available on the website and they say revised 1/20/10, is there a version of our bylaws on the website that more recently.....

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Yes, there is. Somehow or another there is still an active link to an old Senate website. If you can find that link and email it to me I would appreciate it. We need to get rid of that link. There is a new Senate website and I can't figure out what that link is that people sometimes find so if you can I would like that. There were approved bylaw changes made May 1st of last year in 2011. I apologize

Vote: Motion carries

Senator McDonald – That concludes the report of the SEC and we have reached 6:00pm and we still have the AOC report.

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that the Senate extended past the 6:00pm meeting deadline be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

Parliamentarian Atkinson – That is supposed to be a ballot vote

Motion: Senator Denehy moves that the Senate suspend the rules and take a hand vote to extend the Senate meeting be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: Senator McDonald moves that the Senate extended past the 6:00pm meeting deadline be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion to extend the meeting carries

• Academic Overview Committee

Senator Blatchly – We have only one order of business here and would like to present for you the review of the Mathematics Program and I will make a motion and ask Senator Harfenist to give a very brief summary of the material.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Math Program and the response from the department be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Harfenist - Keene State College (KSC) has offered courses in mathematics since its inception as the Keene Normal School in 1909 for the training of prospective teachers. Mathematics grew to become a major area of concentration by the time that the newly named Keene Teachers College began offering the Bachelor of Education degree in 1939. Mathematics became a major and minor concentration option for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees soon after 1963, when the school adopted its present name. The Mathematics Department grew along with the College as it began to expand its mission beyond educating teachers and presently offers two major concentrations, Mathematics and Mathematics Education for Elementary Teachers. The latter concentration offers three potential options; mathematics, secondary teaching and middle/junior high teaching. It additionally offers minors in Mathematics and Statistics. In conjunction with the Computer Science Department, a Computer Mathematics Major is offered as well as a Mathematics-Physics Major in conjunction with the Physics Department. At present, the Mathematics Department makes a fundamental contribution to the Integrative Studies Program by offering a college-wide foundational quantitative experience, IQL 101 (Quantitative Literacy), an interdisciplinary, theme-based course. The Department has one of its tenure-track and many of its adjunct faculty develop and teach sections of the course, with several tenure-track faculty involved in the assessment of IQL 101 sections. Two new full-time tenure-track (FTTT) faculty have been hired since the last program review in 2000-2001 and none have left since then, but two positions were lost in 1999 and 2000, so that has left the Department with eight FTTT positions.

Recommendations:

Curriculum

1. The external reviewers addressed the issue of breadth vs. depth in terms of the courses offered to students. They suggested that picking topics that deliberately build on previous courses would produce the effect of having a yearlong

sequence. It should be acknowledged that this is a difficult issue given limitations on the number of courses that students can realistically take and given that such a move would limit, to some extent, the breadth of the students' knowledge.

2. The external reviewers recommend that the department needs to better coordinate its 100-level multi-section statistic and pre-calculus courses in terms of the technology and textbook that students are expected to use. This consistency would create a more unified experience for the students and instructors and would more effectively support those students who work in the Math center and are currently expected to deal with multiple technologies and multiple texts for the same course.
3. Both the self-study and the external reviewers recommended that the department needs to work with Computer Science and Physics in assessing and possibly revising the joint programs so that they remain current. More generally, through increased collaboration across campus, the Math Department can be more proactive in making other departments aware of the benefits to some of their students in taking certain Math courses.
4. The external reviewers recommend that the 3+2 program would perhaps do well to replace 4 credits of physics elective with 4 credits of a Math elective such as MATH 361: Differential Equations. Since the department expressed a willingness and desire to be an active part of the engineering preparation program, they should consider pursuing this sort of idea.

Faculty

5. Both the self-study and the external reviewers recommend making the addition of a statistician to the Math department a priority in any upcoming planning. The self-study provided a well-conceived rationale for this important recommendation though neither the department nor external reviewers listed this as an urgent priority
6. As reflected in the self –study, at the time of the last program review the Mathematics Department had no consensus on standards for promotion and tenure. In particular, the department was deeply divided on standards in the area of scholarship and related professional activity. Recently, however, agreement on departmental P&T was reached. The self study goes on to say that the varied professional interests and activities, teaching styles, and areas of expertise of Department faculty are strengths that greatly enhance the ability of the Math department to deliver a quality curriculum to a wide range of students. The faculty hope to do a better job of recognizing the value of each others' contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service, even though they may be different from their own.

Adjuncts

7. The external reviewers recommended that the adjuncts should be reviewed and given professional feedback on a regular basis.

Student Experience

8. The external reviewers found some indication in the self study that there is a lower expectation for Math minors, as evidenced by the statement "Students completing the Math Minor are expected to achieve these same competencies, though not at the same level as students completing the major." Their recommendation was that as a general rule it is important for all students to be judged equally and action should be taken if this statement suggests that major and non-major students are judged by different standards.
9. While student advising is generally a Department strength, the self study recommends developing an advising checklist for faculty that would assist advisors in better monitoring advisee progress, help students do better long-range planning, and provide intervention strategies for students who are not meeting program expectations.

ISP

10. The self-study shows that while responsibility for the delivery and coordination of IQL 101 exists outside the Mathematics department through the ISP structure – a configuration the department agrees with -- the department still has more to offer IQL 101 than it can currently make available. The recommendation is for the Department to consult with, among others, the IQL 101 Coordinator to determine what would be helpful and feasible (especially as determined from IQL 101 pre/post test data and feedback from IQL 101 faculty), articulate a plan, and then follow through on implementing the plan. For example, the external reviewers recommended that the department work with the IQL director

to create a course format that involves a semester-long project. This would mirror the ITW courses and would help alleviate concerns about there not being enough “Q” in the IQL courses.

Assessment

11. The department has developed a clear assessment plan to which they seem committed. The external reviewers recommended that they need to continue to maintain that commitment and make adjustments to their programs as indicated by the assessment.
12. The external reviewers recommended that the College as a whole should work with the Math department to assess senior and junior quantitative literacy to see if there is a need for students to take additional Math. Then, if there is, the College should work with the department to help address this issue. In particular, the Math department in that instance should work with other departments to find ways to help the other departments’ students improve the quantitative literacy in a way that is meaningful for their students’ goals.
13. The external reviewers recommended that the NCATE assessment process should be more transparent for the certification students. When these students are being assessed, they should be given the assessment rubric ahead of time, so they know what is expected of them. It should be clarified that how an instructor grades an assessment for class purposes may be different from how that instructor grades an assessment for NCATE purposes.

Facilities

14. The external reviewers found that the teaching space for education classes and the office space for adjuncts are "adequate though less than ideal". It’s recommended that the department solicit better space for both cases.
15. The external reviewers recommended that the Math Center should have some additional computers in it, especially if technology is to play a bigger role in the department’s courses. The same is true of the computer lab on the first floor and the computer classroom on the second floor.

General

16. Both the self-study and the external reviewers addressed the limited departmental budget. For the Department to maintain programs that incorporate best practices relative to student learning, the Department budget must include funds to support the specialized Math software and Math education "manipulatives" that help students learn concepts from visual, numerical, and hands-on perspectives. The department should look to alleviate some of the economic burden of procuring software by collaborating on the purchase with other departments at KSC and other state schools.

The Department looks forward to the wider implementation across the campus of a student portfolio management system such as TK-20, as this will permit students to better maintain more of the work produced in their classes and more easily draw from it, and reflect on it, for the purposes of individual and programmatic assessment. The Department urges the KSC Administration to provide monetary support for this initiative.

17. The Math certification programs have received National Recognition from NCATE and the external reviewers recommend that this achievement be publicized on their website and on the “planning sheets” for the Math certification programs.

Vote: Motion carries

VI. New Business

Senator Denehy – Last week the Provost talked about the 20 credit change and moving to the 18 credit model and I was stunned that something the Senate had dealt with three years ago was just sort of sitting on the Provost’s table for three years. My recommendation to the new Senate is to come up with a process for tracking recommendations so we don’t have another situation like that where a recommendation whether is it accepted or not accepted sits for three years.

VII. Adjournment 6:07pm