

Minutes
for the 426th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, February 13, 2013
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:08pm

II. Roll Call

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 425th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Vote: Motion passes

IV. Courtesy Period

President Kahn - Tomorrow at 10:00 Governor Maggie Hassan will be delivering her State of State Address. She no doubt will be addressing the funding issues and the University System requests to enter into a partnership about a tuition freeze for instate students. I have good vibes about it but we will have to wait and see what we hear from her. I will be sending a message to the campus. Each campus President has been invited to sit in the audience and I will get more word on that to you tomorrow.

V. Subcommittee Reports

- Executive Committee

Senator Stanish - I would like to begin with the 2nd bullet where Chuck Weed our Parliamentarian did let us know he could not attend today's meeting.

Motion: The SEC moves that the Senate approve Ockle Johnson as Parliamentarian for the February 13th, 2013 meeting of the College Senate.

Vote: Motion passes

That is the only motion that the SEC has for this meeting but a couple of updates. We do have a new Student Body President, Kelly Welsh but she has class at this time so we are working to find another Senator within the Student Government bylaws to sit and serve on the Senate and SEC. Kelly has been keeping engaged electronically with the Senate as we go.

We were asked to just clarify the current Nursing curriculum which was approved by last year's Senate for the Nursing curriculum and what we eventually agreed on was the online catalog is what the Senate approved at the 419th meeting of the Senate last April. There had been a slightly different document in the actual packet of the 418th as part of the ASC report and that caused some of the confusion at least within the Senate but we did agree that what was on the Blackboard site is what we actually voted on and did approved and that is what is reflected in the current catalog. This did create a sort of philosophical discussion for us about using Blackboard as sort of our archive which it was never meant to be a as well as we really do trust each other for document integrity and I think that trust is well founded but it is a valid question to talk about that in any case. So, going forward the SEC will look at a more permanent archive for the curriculum so that we really have that in a better place.

We were also asked to confirm Senator Darby's view of the votes in the SCC with respect to abstentions and we did agree with what Senator Darby had seen that in the two course proposals that will come up in the SCC report, there were not a majority of memberships voting in favor of the proposals. They did not pass and we did confirm on that going back to Robert's Rules of Order. That brought up another issue for us in that our bylaws talk about abstentions. I read them several times thinking these words don't make sense to me. Really what it is doing is referring back to Robert's Rules of Order and you need to read both pieces of that for it to make sense. We are going to work on clarifying the bylaws so you really just read the bylaws to understand what they are referring to there. The last 3 or 4 bullets here are again a few more updates about things that are going on but I will let you read those. Are there any questions or discussion about the SEC report?

- Academic Overview Committee

Senator Blatchly - I can give a brief update. We do not have a report because we are still in the process of preparing our subcommittee reports. We expect to have a least one by the next meeting and we've got two more and probably in the meeting following that. We have all of the documents in and it's just a matter of pulling the reports together and getting them through the required review period by all people who get to look at these before we send them on to the Senate. We are in progress and we thank you for your patience.

- Academic Standards Committee

Senator Lucey - We have not met since last semester. I do have a protocol question however. We had some discussion with Tom Richard who has some issues that we think should come before ASC and so should I present them you and the SEC.

Senator Stanish - Yes, and we will probably turn around and send it back to you.

Senator Lucey - So forward those to you?

Senator Stanish - Yes that would be wonderful. Thank you

- Curriculum Committee

Senator Darby - Since our last Senate meeting, we met on January 30th to review proposals from Biology, Chemistry, ISP Interdisciplinary Studies (II), Nursing, Physical Education, Sociology. We were joined by Prof. Michael Antonucci (AMST & Interdisciplinary Studies), Prof. Debra White-Stanley (FILM & Interdisciplinary Studies) for their own proposals and also for Interdisciplinary Studies. There are a number of approved course proposals that are presented to the Senate as information and they are given on page 15 of your packet. The proposal to redesign the 'Nursing major' program was approved by the SCC. The SCC reaffirms its vote of November 7, 2012, deleting BIO 241 from the Nursing major and adding HLSC 240 to the Nursing major. A proposed change in chemistry requirements for the Nursing major was not approved by the SCC.

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

Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the INCHEM 111 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the II 322 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Senator Darby - As a note the II 322 proposal is co-sponsored by the Education Department and Psychology Department, and received the approval of Dean Gordon Leversee (School of Sciences & Social Sciences) and Dean Wayne Hartz (School of Professional & Graduate Studies).

Senator Welsh - This is a course proposal I find very interesting. I am very enthusiastic about it, and I've been to several political science meetings where political scientists are starting to study the neurophysiology of party affiliation and ideology and things like that. So it's a course I have almost thought about doing with my discipline and I wouldn't do it without the help of a psychologist, but my question is this. As I was reviewing the packet today, I noticed this is not an IIPSYC class nor an IIEDU class. It is a II class, and I recognize that that's practice but it is not, as I understand it, officially adopted as something that is done in the guidelines, and I think that that practice raises questions that I guess I would seek answers on. For example, how will instructors, and I know we got two very qualified people team teaching this right now, how will instructors be vetted for this course in the future if instructors retire or if they are not any longer teaching this course and it's still on the books, who reviews the qualifications? Who will look over which office oversees the course evals and even mundane things like how will credits for this course without a department affiliation transfer to other institutions or vice versa? I wonder since we are practicing what the answers to these questions? Are there answers to these questions?

Provost Treadwell - I have some of the answers, I think, but I am going to ask you to go through those again. There were a lot there.

Senator Welsh - How do we implement something like this? Question one if the current instructors decide no longer wish to not to teach or they got other obligations or they move on, who vets the qualifications of new instructors? Who decides we need new instructors.

Provost Treadwell - Can I answer them one at a time? Is that possible?

Senator Welsh - Sure

Provost Treadwell - I would expect, as is in the curriculum guidelines, that the co-sponsors of the departments that propose these curriculum be responsible, through our normal curriculum processes, to insure that the integrity of the course proposed, and in this case it was two departments. I don't know that the prefix necessarily designates relevant information, and I think that is important for us. I think are disciplinary prefixes and there is also our Integrative Studies Interdisciplinary processes. Those are important but they don't tend to distinguish the qualifications or the ownership of a course. I think it is important that we respect the departmental sponsors that they brought these forward and expect that they would insert due diligence. With regard to evaluation review, those would go through Dean's back through Department Chairs again for those Departments sponsor or hosting those types of courses.

Senator Welsh - Ok so the official sponsorship of this course at its point of proposal and approval therefore determines the official process?

Provost Treadwell - By our current processes, yes.

Senator Welsh - The future process?

Provost Treadwell - Exactly, and I think that as we look at our departmental and course proposal guidelines the Interdisciplinary committee is appropriate to evaluate those proposals that come from individual departments or come through collaborations between departments to evaluate the integrity. Those are the experts on campus to help us evaluate interdisciplinary and so the guidelines are quite clear. They are born from departments and through the departmental stage up through the Interdisciplinary committee stage.

Senator Welsh - I look to raise the question. I think that if there is confirmation in the minutes of the Senate meeting that proves this course then that confirmation stands as confirmation of practice that it will move forward on this course in the future and that I think is satisfactory. However, in general in the future I think it is a good idea to adopt some sort of official means by which these questions are answered. When those of us who understand the arrangement are gone in the future and others need to do these things and may not be privy to the history of the development of a course.

Provost Treadwell - We can certainly, if appropriate, attend to the course proposal guidelines and make any sort of notations necessary to assure that those sort of issues are clearly stated in the guidelines. I think many of these are. We can certainly work with the Interdisciplinary committee and insure that we've done due diligence with regard to notation in the curriculum guidelines if that will be helpful. I would be happy to work with the Interdisciplinary committee and the SEC to do so. Did I answer all of your questions?

Senator Welsh - The last was about transfer of credits. Does the lack of departmental suffix make it more difficult to transfer this away or for people looking to take this course here at Keene State say over the summer and transfer that back to their original institution?

Provost Treadwell - We did some research on this early on when we were looking at interdisciplinary courses or prefix changes with regard to the Integrative Studies program and the transfer ability of courses. Most course transfers are affiliated with syllabi that discuss course learning outcomes and objectives. So the title of the course and the prefix of the course in some instances make that a very easy decision. But in all decisions, either the transfer receiving institutions or when we receive credits from other institutions, we look to the syllabi. We seek to get that information so we can appropriately affiliate those credits, but I am happy to take a message and go back to the Registrar's office to confirm that that has not changed. That way we indeed do not have any unintended consequences associated with the disciplinary prefix has not been a gate to transfer credit issuance from any of the evidence that we have seen early on or what I have seen over the last three years. I will review that.

Professor Hottinger - I have served as Chair of the Interdisciplinary subcommittee you are referring to, and I can say that in the last 5 or 6 years that I served on the Interdisciplinary subcommittee, both as a member and as a Chair, I think once I was asked by the Registrar's office for a syllabus for one of our II courses that didn't have a specific departmental prefix attached to it. I contacted the Professor, we got the syllabus and sent it forward and the course was accepted as a transfer. It did only happen once. So I think it is something that is fairly common to have these kinds of unusual or very institutionally specific prefixes at institutions and other institutions understand that and work to figure it out.

Provost Treadwell - To add to that, our articulation agreements we are working on with the 2+2 and with RSending agreements, all identify that there are institution specific prefixes, so it can be easily translated and so it doesn't become a barrier. I will confirm with very recent evidence and bring it back to the Senate.

Senator Darby - Senator Welsh brought something up I hadn't thought about. In effect does the college have a mechanism so that in our current practice if there is an II course delivery without a prefix to make sure the discipline or the program who's, in effect, delivering or the faculty member delivering that program, to make sure that, and I do not know what the proper term is, to make sure that work load credit goes back to that discipline? Keene State College has a fact book and that fact book is a public record and within that record there is a notation around the workload of individual programs, and last year this body accepted retrenchment language that speaks of what happens when there are disciplines or programs that in effect aren't delivering products for the institution or were restricted in the number of majors. So in effect I just want to make sure that thinking ahead whether it is Women & Gender Studies or Holocaust & Genocide Studies or the Music Program or whatever it is that ends up, shall we say, delivering II courses without prefix to make sure the college has a mechanism so that workload credit really does fall somewhere appropriate.

Provost Treadwell - If I might just respond to that. We have spent, for the past several years with our new Director of Institutional Research, significant time looking at various workload reporting methodologies that would insure both disciplinary and super disciplinary, if you will, ISP delivery where there is not a clear home. How do we insure that the workload for that faculty member is credited not only to them individually but to their own department so that we have clarity in those reports? I have much greater confidence that we are in a better place than we were even three years ago when we were relied upon the Delaware reporting process where it was very difficult to capture co-taught courses equivalently to individuals in two different departments and some other issues. I believe we have attended to that and what I will try to do for the next senate meeting is to bring forward the way that workload is calculated so the Senators can see the method by which credit is given to the individual with regard to their contract and promotion and tenure files and also to the departments because I think that is important.

Senator Darby - I do very much appreciate that because there are resource allocations and very important decisions that are made that have a dramatic impact on a discipline and the delivery of credit hours as a number, as a numeral, and sometimes plays a very important role in that. So thank you. I appreciate that answer.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Darby - The proposal to add IIFILM 326 was not approved by the SCC. There was a typo and want to confirm that it should be IIFILM 362 - I do apologize. IIFILM362 Interdisciplinary Approaches to Film and as a note the SCC wishes to express the concerns about IIFILM 362 given in your document pages 15-16. The proposal to add IIAMST 391 was not approved by the SCC. IIAMST 391 is Interdisciplinary Topics in American Studies and the SCC expresses their concern on page 16 of your document.

Senator Fleeger - I think having recently been asked to join the Interdisciplinary Studies committee, I am aware that there are some different views on campus about the Interdisciplinary program and what constitutes Interdisciplinary work, and so I would like to make a motion for us to discuss this a little bit

more at this body because I think it would be appropriate for us to get some guidance both through the Senate and the Curriculum Committee as well as to the Interdisciplinary Committee about what this body expects in moving forward so that we can make sure that we are meeting the guidelines that the Senate wants us to meet in our respective duties.

Senator Stanish - In our bylaws it does allow any Senator to make a motion to discuss a document or a course proposal. We could do these separately where you make a motion to discuss the IIFILM 362 and then another motion to discuss the IIAMST 391.

Motion: Senator Fleegeer moves that the Senate discuss the IIFILM 362 proposal be approved by the Senate

Senator Stanish - Just to confirm it does say in our bylaws that any Senator can bring a proposal forward for discussion. We would also need another motion if we choose that we wanted to vote on this. The full Senate can vote on any proposals as well but it would take another motion as well.

Senator Fleegeer - I would like to hear more from the Curriculum Chair about the reasons for not approving these courses.

Senator Darby - They are given on pages 15 and 16 of the document but perhaps I can go through them for you one at a time. I am now speaking of IIFILM 362. Committee members agree that Professor Debra White-Stanley, the proposal's sponsor, is qualified to teach this interdisciplinary course, but are unsure about the interdisciplinary qualifications of other faculty members listed on the proposal. The next item said that the course description indicates that this proposal offers a 'topics course' format, into which a number of courses could be offered. The SCC recognizes the need for more upper-level ISP and II courses, and prefers to have separate course numbers for each topic that would be vetted through the existing curriculum process. The third item of concern is that it is unclear to SCC which official(s) in Academic Affairs is responsible for assessing the quality of individual course offerings within an II topics course, the qualifications of potential faculty, and the budgetary feasibility of offering sections of the course. At the present time, a dean's review and comment are not required by the II curriculum review process. The fourth item of concern was that the proposed course was developed and sponsored by a single academic department (Film Studies), whereas the original ISP proposal (approved by the KSC Senate in April 2006) states: III. Making Connections (4 credits) One course in Interdisciplinary Studies (4 credits). This category provides the faculty with an opportunity to collaborate across traditional disciplinary boundaries in designing and delivering challenging and innovative courses. The College supports having a percentage of these courses team developed and team taught the first time the course is offered. After initial offering, faculty will individually teach the course a minimum of three semesters over a period of three years.

Senator Lucey - I do want to make a brief comment on that. It doesn't mandate that the initial course offering must be taught by multiple faculty. Was there a question or confusion that there were multiple faculty members mentioned in the proposal? It does say that it may be offered after the initial offering by one faculty member. So I don't understand why that was a concern.

Senator Welsh - I can speak partially to that. Certainly I remember when we adopted the ISP proposal. The main point of discussion in the Senate around the proposal was that it was a work in progress and that it was certain to be amended in the future and actually the only thing we did to the ISP proposal as a Senate body was add an attachment that specified how we will amend the ISP. We knew that changes

would be made. I am not certain how often that process that we specified and attached as an amendment has been followed, but it was the concern, and I think the general sense from reading the II section of the original proposal, which to my understanding has not been changed, is that this is a description of collaborative design, collaborative teaching, collaboration of faculty across disciplines and to the extent that is the description of what these classes are in our guidelines. That's what these classes are. I fully understand that there is a more expansive way of looking at these things, but we had not designed that into our language so when bodies like the Curriculum Committee are looking to evaluate the appropriateness of a particular proposal to what we have specified, collaboration between faculty in different disciplines is sort of a theme that comes out and it is not present. It is something that raises attention if people are paying attention to the proposal. Perhaps the thing that needs to be done since I know that now there understands that disciplines are and that there are interdisciplinary disciplines on campus. Perhaps the thing that needs to be done is to revise the proposal itself and come up with a list of alternative types of interdisciplinary classes and probably a list of the qualified interdisciplinary programs that meet the requirements. I am certain that not every program would. In addition when we do that perhaps to set up safeguards, mechanisms you know the kinds of things we were discussing. How do we vet instructors? How do we look at evaluations? Concerns of that sort but to my knowledge those things have not been done. Now we have a faculty collaborating across disciplines descriptions for what II is.

Senator Blatchly - I would like to ask the SCC if they are in possession of a syllabus for this course. My understanding is that new courses and course additions are required to be accompanied by a syllabus. Do you have one?

Senator Stanish - I believe it is on Blackboard.

Senator Darby - There are sample syllabi, plural.

Senator Blatchly - There is one for American Studies but I don't see the one for IIFILM. Are you in receipt of a syllabus?

Senator Darby - The answer is yes.

Senator Blatchly - So that certainly eliminates confusion on my part. Was your decision in part based on the syllabus not being sufficiently detailed or was it a more general concern?

Senator Darby - I don't think the syllabi per say were the items of concern. There was concern philosophically around the topics course format and that seemed to increase the discomfort level among some in the committee. I apologize I didn't upload the syllabi. Perhaps I could ask the cosponsor to make sure it's all right with those others whose work is represented to make sure it is correct so that it can be available for public view.

Senator Lucey - Just a comment. There is a little bit of history here as I recall being on the Senate for three years, taking a year off and then coming back, and that is the SCC, of course different players, different time, and different course proposals, but the SCC tends to react in this way to topics courses. There is something about this issue of the topics course that keeps coming up. A lot of them have been II courses that I recall, and it just never seems to get resolved. Again different people, different times what is it about the topics course format that we don't like and somehow that has to be articulated or discussed because it is recurring.

Senator Hanrahan - I think what we are seeing is kind of a permanent 399. Why don't we just make 399 permanent if we are just going to allow people to put whatever they want in every semester in practice because a 399 is never a course. Typically you are only supposed to have a 399 once and make it permanent but people keep offering 399 because they don't want to go through the process of curriculum review. But when you have a topics course is almost like making a permanent 399 and that's what we were concerned about.

Senator Bedell - I just wanted to reiterate the sentiment of some of the concerns in our meetings that we had seen the syllabus from professor Stanley-White for this particular film class that she had talked about. We felt that she was qualified to be teaching this Interdisciplinary course because of her interdisciplinary background, but by creating a topics course as opposed to the actual course proposal for her specific II, we didn't necessarily know that other people had the interdisciplinary background to be teaching other courses. They can come and just slide this into this II course if it's a topics course as opposed to having to go through the process of being vetted and demonstrate their ability through their syllabus and credentials to be teaching something that is interdisciplinary.

Professor Antonucci - Just two things. Firstly, to speak to Senator Bedell, I am stunned that you would be in a position in the SCC to question the Film Department's Chair, it's faculty, the Dean of Arts & Humanities and the Provost herself, the Vice President of Academic Affairs who would oversee the quality because those course evals that you fill out run that gauntlet at least once maybe twice in the course of a year. Those are very serious documents and we take those pretty seriously. On that level be assured that those who do the hiring and do the evaluation of program curriculum interior to the department that that is a process that is serious and sacred that is taken care of internally and for some reason, and this is my other question, is that the two votes on both of these proposals, two votes, two votes, 2/7 of a committee have brought us all here and have us on the clock talking, preparing perhaps for a vote to vote to push this forward. Two votes, three abstentions and in one case the IIAMST 391, the votes were...can somebody read those off?

Senator Darby- This is IIAMST 391 - 3 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention and 1 absence.

Professor Antonucci - I am not quibbling about being the co-sponsor of IIFILM 362 - Professor White-Stanley is not quibbling about quorum or majority here. We are talking about two votes. 2 out of 7 do not make it a majority vote. 2/7 makes it perhaps enough of a fearful cloud that would sway Senators to vote to abstain. There are fewer solid votes in this than not. I just want to bring those two points of information.

Provost Treadwell - I would like to address a couple of the issues raised about the process, specifically the Topics Courses in general on the campus and what our practices have been in the past, and I do think this may be an appropriate place for us to have a conversation, with the Senate body with the interdisciplinary courses, and then lastly to open the discussion that perhaps the more philosophical issues beginning from what was part of the original proposal for the ISP back in 2005 that we have referenced at the beginning. With regard to process clarity I would like it noted that the process does require a Dean's signature. I do think it is important that I state for the record and call of our attention to the fact that at the departmental stage there is the requirement, and I will just read quickly I don't want to belabor point, but that there is a complete catalog ready course proposal or program proposal required, that the department approval or vote be recorded, notify affected departments or the programs give three weeks to receive advisory opinions, and consult the library liaison for course and

then submitting copies to the Dean's office. From the Dean's office they obtain an administrative approval which would speak to the resource questions and some of those other issues, again, consistent with our processes, record any comments that are germane and then forward those proposals onto the School Curriculum Committee Chair or in this case the Interdisciplinary Integrative Studies Program Subcommittee coordinator. The process does provide for that and I think it is important for the SCC at least with regard to that question that the Dean's approval or some sort of leadership clarity it is required and I would question if we are not seeing that that's an issue we need to raise. I need to work through the Dean's because it is my expectation that these would go through that process that is a requirement. One last thing, it would go onto the coordinators, School curriculum or the Interdisciplinary subcommittees. They review these, record their vote and forward them onto the SCC. There are the checks and balances by a process that we would expect for our entire curriculum and it does apply for the Interdisciplinary courses as it would for any departmental offering. Reaching back to the comments that we had in the beginning, the second issue is in regard to topics courses. I do think this has been an issue to Senator Lucey's point that some of the conversation of what are these courses and the disciplines and what it has allowed for us. We have done this with our ITW courses. We have done this with our IQL courses, where unlike a 399 these courses must identify clear outcomes and clear objectives and so that you approve through the curricular processes the outcomes and objectives tied to the topic course itself. So the themes may change but any faculty teaching those must meet those same outcomes. That's the spirit of a topics course proposal. I can appreciate perhaps some of the discomfort that we are having tonight in regard to the topics courses. In the Interdisciplinary programs where we don't have disciplinary faculty all of who can easily move into these but I don't think it's a question of using topics courses. I think it's a question of how we would as a Senate body, with the council of the Interdisciplinary subcommittee think about ways by which we can assure the topics courses would allow that flexibility as we have elsewhere. These are not experimental where we need no curricular review and the topics framework is approved and the process. The themes will rotate, and therefore the faculty and I think that is where the question is surfacing. So I appreciate that and I do think we need more deliberation on that issue is something worthwhile. I will welcome the committee to speak to this as well if that is acceptable. The last thing I just want to state is that this is a long time ago but when we approved the Integrative Studies Program there were many many conversations within the committee and at the Senate floor about the fact that we wanted to try to enable and support transformation of our curriculum and so the invitation for team teaching was an effort to create that space. It wasn't a mandate. It was never expected that this would be the only way that these courses could be delivered. Having sat at many of those discussions personally I think we have many recorded notes that we haven't revisited. Perhaps there are some of the guidelines about how the science and national research with regard to Interdisciplinary has advance since 2005. We have many experts on campus who could help us and we have a task force that this semester is revisiting the entirety of the ISP to try and look at clarity and structure. I know the interdisciplinary element of it which Senator Welsh has served on is one of those key elements where we are seeking recommendations. This is an area of work but I just want to make it clear that from my position of having been involved in those early discussions and now as Provost having reviewed those records when I saw these comments come forward. This was never intended to be a requirement for all proposals. It was meant to be an invitation by the institution to commit resources for team teaching where that was appropriate for people that wanted to propose those courses. I think it is a distinction between a mandate and a must for every course and an incentive for creating new pedagogy on our campus. I just think that is important to note and I would open it up for committee members or anyone who wants to speak more to it.

Senator Stanish - We have reached the end of our 15 min discussion so to continue we will need a motion to extend discussion.

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

Vote: Motion carries

Professor Hottinger - I just want to reiterate that all II courses live in departmental homes so oversight is by departmental chairs. The Departmental Chairs would insure that any instructor who teaches a topics course is qualified to do so and that their syllabi meet the requirements of the outcomes that are approved within the general curriculum process. There aren't any orphaned II courses that are just floating around out there without oversight. All II courses live in departmental homes and have continual oversight every time the course is offered.

Senator Welsh - I feel like my other point was that and this is really assuring and certainly courses living in departmental homes is a big piece of the quality control for all courses taught at the college. I think the main point in raising it is that the departmental home life of a course is significantly less clear if we do have II without a suffix. If there are informal protocols that we can follow now, I think that is fine. However I think it is something the ISP committee can do. I think it is useful and necessary to find and implement some rules passed by the Senate about what it means for it to live in a home if there is not a suffix or prefix attached.

Senator Blatchly - Some comments encouraged me to go poking around to see I could find words for this distaste for topics course or a nervousness about topics courses or whatever the phrase would be. I found in the Curriculum guidelines, at least this version I am looking at an entry called "Topics Courses" and I thought it might be helpful to read part of this. They are useful, the section begins with a good use for a topics course which is to provide something that is not ordinarily offered in the catalog but it follows with a couple of important sentences. "However specific topics offered within these topics courses have not undergone the curriculum approval process required for courses listed in the catalog. Therefore, specific topics cannot be listed as either elective or required courses for a major or minor program." This is still in respect to the II courses and this is still a little ambiguous because ISP is neither a major nor a minor program but it is an important coherent program with a specific set of requirements one of those which I believe is an II course if I am not mistaken. That may be some of the history whether it is applicable to this or not I think it is important to recognize the history and the nervousness about using these for required courses in the curriculum as opposed to a more purely elective offering. It is clearly appropriate for a topics course. It's not against topics courses it's just a question of should they should be part of a required program.

Senator Lucey - However, topics courses do count toward major and minor credits in certain programs and long standing in the catalog.

Senator White-Stanley - If you think about it does that mean that if a topics course is going to be offered using 5 different subjects that one of those subjects cannot be required for a major because that subject may not be offered again for another 2 years. Is that the meaning of that phrase or is it that one cannot list the topic itself. Are we talking about a specific iteration which only XY&Z faculty member would be qualified to teach not being required for the major? So this rule is actually a logistical issue as opposed to a sort of blanket prohibition. Again, its topics classes because it would seem that way to me yeah, a lot of majors and actually in film we have a topics IA, topics IH classes and I am still trying to figure out what makes II's so much different than those

Senator Bedell - Just to answer that question, it says the exact wording is that these topics courses have not undergone the curriculum approval process and I think that is why that can't be required if I am not misunderstanding the specific language there.

Senator Blatchly - I believe this is from the SCC Curriculum Guidelines.

Senator Bedell - The other thing the SCC had talked about all semester, all last semester and especially towards the end when we were looking at some of the more difficult proposals that we were looking at was that we recognized in some programs there have been situations that other Senates before us have maybe let things slip by that aren't necessarily appropriate or that curriculum approved may have been questionable at times. We have kind of reached a point where we have to stand on more of a moral basis of what we decided, and well yes, this is the precedent but what is actually right for the curriculum. Do we move forward or do we look more at curriculum and set a more appropriate and a better precedent even if it has not always necessarily been done. In this example, despite the fact that topics courses are being counted across campus as something required for the program, if in Senate policy if that shouldn't be happening, is it now that we draw a line in the sand and decide that we now going to start doing things in a more appropriate way with the way we are supposed to be doing them?

Senator Stemp - I think part of the difficulty associated with not just the assessment of the two courses or of the one course we are discussing, in addition to what Senator Blatchly just presented, is the fact there are existing guidelines that the College has written that are approved but there appears to be a very poor understanding of what those guidelines actually happen to be among the faculty themselves and others that are affiliated with the curricular process whereby clearly some things in the past have been permitted to happen that we have said in our own documents shouldn't happen. In the absence of clear documentation as it relates to how you're supposed to treat curriculum matters there is either a difference in interpretation of the particular guidelines in the form in which they are written or have been approved or there is the basic absence of recognition of the existence and of the following of the language that in fact has been approved by the Senate at this level that I suppose would be a blanketing of the process of how this is supposed to work. Intention and interpretation and a number of other ways in which we have been approaching our curriculum up until this point have at times run parallel to what is actually written down somewhere and at other times has strayed substantially away from our own documentation. Part of the difficulty in some ways for the Curriculum Committees whether it's at the school level or at the Senate level is to try to figure out what in fact are the guidelines that are being implemented or that are supposed to be implemented during the process of curricular review. In this particular instance in the absence of any other guidelines that exist, the portion of the document that was read out as point number 4 or 5 by Senator Darby that is what the SCC is aware of as the officially recognized version of how in this case these particular classes are being assessed. If there are other documents or other mechanisms by which they are being assessed part of the problem in communicating this between different constituencies on campus is that some of us know where these documents may be and some of us don't. Some of us recognize the authority of maybe one version of the document that others of us are unaware of. If there are other ways in which these particular courses are being assessed, the membership of the SCC is unaware of them or any kind of officiating adopted form. If we are being left to our devices to use what is written down as the official language by which we assess the courses, then this is essentially what we have to work with.

Provost Treadwell - I am struggling with the sense that our Curriculum guidelines are unclear. Many of us around the table have served on the SCC and I think the guidelines are quite clear with the departmental approval stage, the Dean's approval stage and the interdisciplinary subcommittee

approvals parallel with school curriculum committee and then moving it to Senate. I question the fact that our processes are quirky and unclear and I guess I would need more clarity with regard and perhaps Joe you could help eliminate that. If the processes themselves are unclear then we need to understand that further because they have been implemented for some time. The question about topics courses and this issue of not being able to be used for major or minor credit then I need to question the Registrar's office on this because that is antithetical to what has been the framework for topics courses for many many years. Topics courses have been approved by disciplines. They list the outcomes, objectives, and the criteria. The topics rotate thematically, but they are held to that same standard, and they are used in fact for major/minor credit all through our curriculum. So we need to clarify this issue. I have read it and checked the syllabi. So it's "the may be repeated as the topics change" element that is an issue here. There is room to evaluate but I don't think, and I can strongly suggest that for our President I wouldn't want to suggest, that our curriculum review processes are froth with confusion, and we don't have clarity with how to do this work. I think actually our faculty does a very, very good job. We live by these processes and we do quite well at it, and while I think it is areas where perhaps you may question the integrity of other groups that we have these discussions, and that's appropriate for us to have these conversations and to do so in a respectful way but I don't think that it's the processes are not there or not clear for us. The clarity of some of these issues like the topics courses and the respect for those committees that are empowered by this body to review these courses must be held. I think it is appropriate for our Senate to do so and I apologize Senator Gianno I didn't know your hand was up.

Senator Gianno - To the extent to the interdisciplinary courses are straddling disciplines. I think some of us had a concern both on the SCC and off of it that at least it's not clear to what extent disciplines are represented in the process of approving II classes to the extent that these courses are not going through an evaluation process comparable to all other courses on campus. All other courses on campus have to go through the School Curriculum Committee which has a representation for each discipline in that school automatically. I don't really know and I would appreciate more information on how this works on the II subcommittee. Are all disciplines represented there as well as all interdisciplines? I think part of the problem is what do we mean by discipline? What do we mean by Interdisciplinary? Does Interdisciplinary no longer include discipline? I am interested in hearing what other people think but it seems to me if you are interdisciplinary, the discipline should be part of the conversation and it's not clear if disciplines are part of the conversation or that all of the disciplines are part of particular conversations relevant to particular courses.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Just quickly to Senator Stemp the Curriculum guidelines are on the Keene State College Senate Website. They are clearly marked as 12-13 and all of the forms are there. Those are submitted to me and I post them along with the AOC guidelines and any other relevant documents and that is our active file of documents. So they are there and they are what are approved. After we are finished meeting I move those documents into a folder and then at the appropriate time I move them into the Senate Website so it's keene.edu/senate and they are all there.

Senator Stemp - I am not debating the existence of guidelines that we have that are publically available to faculty and staff and others. The issue is that if those are in fact the officially recognized mechanisms by which we access curriculum are we using those?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - That was the first point. That they are there and they are accurate and up to date. The second is that as we look at this statement about topics, it says here very clearly, 'however specific topics courses offered within topics courses have not undergone the curriculum approval process which is required for courses listed in the catalog. Therefore specific topics can be part of

curriculum.” This is what I think Debra was trying to say. Topics can be listed as part of a curriculum but her specific class with its topic “...whatever” can't be part of the curriculum packet. Topics as a category can be in the curriculum package. It's the specific label that can't be. I think that is the recognition of it hasn't been approved so specifically and it might change over time. That's how I read that.

Senator Welsh - May I just jump in with a quick clarification? I think there may be some confusion. Senator Stemp has been talking about guidelines, the Provost has been talking about guidelines and I think one of the things I have noticed since I have been sitting next to him is he is saying guidelines as he is indicating downward is a copy of the ISP proposal and the description of the various classes. He is not talking about curriculum committee guidelines or other kind of collegiate guidelines and protocols. He is talking about descriptions of classes, classes of Integrative Studies, categories, things like that, where there is indeed some ambiguity.

Professor Antonucci - I want to read something to you from the chapter called *Interdisciplinary and Anxieties*. Some thoughts from here that speak to what it is that we are having a conversation about. “There are few terms in 21st century Higher Education with greater buzz factor than interdisciplinary, the name for teaching and scholarship that brings together methods and materials from more than one academic discipline. Almost no one says a word against it and it's evoked by professors and by Deans with equal enthusiasm and it goes on because the possibility is there and we have invested in this for the contemporary academy with all these possibilities hovering over it. Talks about Interdisciplinarity tend to have an anxious tone but it is hard to see how interdisciplinarity is an adequate corollary to anxiety. The anxiety feels extant. Interdisciplinarity is a professional and institutional issue. Interdisciplinarity is attainable to the extent that professors are professionally motivated and institutionally supported to practice it” ... and it goes on. So when we get to the idea of professors who are professionally motivated, we have those, we have those here. When we have an institution that is motivated to support that, we have that at Keene State College. In fact, where they come together to create the atmosphere to answer the kinds of questions that are raised here today about intergravity into interdisciplinarity are through the II Subcommittee which holds two workshops per semester and has done that for the past seven years. You total that up and it's over 20 pushing 25 different sessions that have been run during the semester, twice a semester to talk about just the issues that Senator Gianno raises here. It's a very good question. It's a very basic question. You raised the question, is interdisciplinary necessarily multidisciplinary? For some folks it is but that's not how it's practiced here. That's not how we do it at Keene State College. That's not the purpose, that's not the point. Straddling sometimes but more of a fusion drawing on methods this is the stuff of interdisciplinarity as it's practiced at Keene State College. I invite any of the II Subcommittee to compositionally we talk about that. The II subcommittee will be coming up with those dates for those 2 spring workshops coming up on Friday. We look forward of having one in March and one in April I am not sure when.

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

Senator Gianno - I think I just want to add that it's more about fairness. If you have disciplines that are reviewing other disciplines why is it that something that is interdisciplinary is not being reviewed by other disciplines? Something that is straddling at this point is not under the same kind of oversight as all other curriculum. It seems to me simple fairness.

Professor Mallon - I want to say that I appreciate and I want to thank Professor Antonucci for his intention and I appreciate the interest on the part of the SCC members and other Senators to have the

larger conversation about the nature of interdisciplinarity about the nature of collaboration and what collaboration looks like, about the nature of departmental ownership of, etcetera etcetera, about our fields of study. I do think it's a larger conversation, and I do think one place to have it is through the committee that is the Interdisciplinary committee. Another place to have it is the hopefully the revised Integrative Studies program. There are ample opportunities. It's a big conversation. Our College engaged with it not so long ago and there are still issues to work out. That is a conversation that we should have as faculty, as staff and as students. I appreciate Senator Bedell's comments as well. The other larger issue that we seem to be debating here is about the form of topics courses and what's in the guidelines and what's not in the guidelines and the how topics courses are used. It's all well and good to have that larger conversation. Perhaps the Senate or perhaps the SCC is a place to have the larger conversation. I would like to point to the specific issue that is being raised here which is whether or not according to the guidelines that we have used before and according to the description and the definitions that we have used before these two courses just as Professor Antonucci had said received just 2 negative votes that these two courses do not move forward. I believe that these two courses are being held hostage to a larger conversation that I know this College needs to have. Indeed the Integrative Studies program from the beginning welcomed. I would like to see that we have a conversation but I would like not have two courses that have been carefully put together by faculty in their departments and department homes that are contributions to the ISP and to the College curriculum. I would like to have those two courses not be held hostage for larger conversations. I believe they should go forward because they are courses that have followed the guidelines that have received the kind of vetting that other courses have received by departments and by individual faculty, etcetera. I would like to see us trust that process as well as trust each other in moving those courses forward. Thank you

Senator Hanrahan - I will use my own discipline Computer Science. We have 490 topics in Computer Science class. My understanding was we had a game program one that was offered once, we had mobile computing, all these new topics. I thought it was three times but someone told me after one time if we wanted to make that a permanent course we had to bring it to the curriculum review process. I am just thinking and I sort of agree with Dr. Mallon, these two courses I think were designed and part of the SCC wanted to bring the conversation to the full Senate and that's why votes were as they were. Maybe it was not fair to bring these two courses up at this point but it is raising a very valid point in that if our discipline has to go through the curriculum process with wanted to make a particular topic a real course only offering it once. I think the same standards should be applied to the II courses or any topics based course. We can have it there and have it as a category but after 1, 2 or 3 times, if the topic is being brought up over and over again, I think as any discipline it should be brought up as a permanent course. I don't know how the guidelines have to change to do that. That's my opinion.

Senator Antonucci - We did that with respect to the IIAMST 380. It was a course that ran as a 399 and then it became I think that was the topics New England Exceptionalism or something. It couldn't run. It had run its course as a topics course. As a topics subject it had enough play, people liked it, and it became a permanent number. This is just what that rule is trying to subvert, people making a career out of topics, have one topic done and create another. We have done that and our program knows that and we are trying to eliminate 399's, which are ineffective someplace else, it's called the Registrar's Office, right. Where else do you want us to go? That's my question to the SCC.

Provost Treadwell - For the good of the order what I would like request is that I have the opportunity to work with our Registrar's office and to review the Senate documents with regard to topics courses so we can separate that issue. I do believe as Professor Mallon has raised that I think these courses that are before us today have adhered to policy and practice of the campus. I think I will seek to clarify the 399's,

the topics courses and I will bring that to the Senate meeting through the SEC so that there is clarity, and I will share that with the SCC as well. As we seek some clarity for guidelines that are ambiguous in any way just so we can separate these issues. With regard to the longevity of and the review of topics courses beyond that which is before us today is consistent with past practice with regard to topics courses in both disciplines and interdisciplinary offers. Just to try and separate the issues I can take that on.

Senator Blatchly- My understanding is that at the end of this we get to vote whether these courses pass the Senate?

Senator Stanish – Today, if a Senator wishes, can make a motion to vote on it. However with our 48 hour rule, today we vote to vote but will not actually vote on the course proposal until March.

Senator Blatchly - On the topic of topics with the risk of getting into a kind of Clintonian what is “is”. Let me just ask for the sponsor of this course what we really mean by the word topic? Is it fundamental the way we have used the word topic? Is it fundamental to the structure of the course or is it more of the motivation for getting to the learning outcomes? As I read the learning outcomes, we are still talking about the Film Studies course; there is a writing learning outcome. It seems to be fairly independent of what you’re writing about as long as it is broad enough, Cross disciplinary boundaries to reopen patterns and connections. There need to be at least two disciplines represented I suppose but apart from that it is not fundamental to this. Then there is a diversity recognizing the difference of how the shape approaches. What is actually meant by topic in this case? Is it motivation or is it something fundamental to the structure to the course?

Senator White-Stanley - The topics class means that a series of different interdisciplinary courses would be offered under that rubric. So if it's IIFILM 362 it could be offered as my course Politics and Adaptation or another course that is also interdisciplinary. This is something that is highly desirable for our program. Faculty speaking together have decided this is a real need in terms of pushing our students to connect film with other disciplines and to bring the skills that they have obtained in these cross disciplinary endeavors back into film making. As a group we have decided to pursue this. So yes the fact that the course is interdisciplinary is very integral to the vision of the entire faculty into proposing this.

Senator Lucey - It seems as though it is topic and theme. The word thematic, the way we use topics in the Art Department is based on content or methodology. It depends on what that sometimes can be. Sometimes it can be Feminist approaches Art History that's the topic so the methodology sort of rules it. Sometimes it's the content or coverage that is sort of or region what have you. I think it is meant to be flexible and I think that theme is the word.

Senator Blatchly - I think that was my specific question for this course. Whether it is more the theme that is the motivator for the course or is it the, in case of the content that might be much more fundamental to the nature of the course and much more difficult to let it float the way this is proposing.

Senator Fleeger - My interest in this was trying to promote this conversation, and I think it is very important for us to have and get some clarity across the different bodies that are involved in this, and we can approach this in the future. But I don't think we are really going to resolve it tonight, and I also know we want to give some consideration to the second proposal as well. So I would like to make a motion to bring this up at the next Senate meeting for further consideration and vote at that time.

Motion: Senator Fleegeer moves that we postpone discussion of IIFILM 362 and reconsider this at our next meeting for a vote be approved by the Senate.

The reason I am making this is because I think that there are other discussion that need to occur outside of this context which can be helpful and bring some clarity to the document, if necessary

Senator Hanrahan - Point of Order - would that allow us to vote on the specific proposal at the next meeting?

Senator Stanish - It depends on which way Senator Fleegeer words the motion. If we are simply making a motion to postpone discussion till the next meeting, then we would not vote on this proposal at the next meeting. If we are making a motion to vote on this proposal at the next meeting, then we would. So is your proposal to postpone discussion?

Senator Fleegeer - No, I would like to make a proposal to vote on this at the next meeting.

Senator Stanish - Ok, there will be discussions but also a vote.

Senator Fleegeer - Yes

Senator Stanish - Would you restate the motion with the word vote in it?

Motion: Senator Fleegeer moves that we vote on IIFILM 362 at our next Senate meeting.

Senator Welsh - Just for information only and will be useful for that discussion. One of the assertions that I have heard is that both of these proposals have complied with guidelines in process. I do have a question to clarify that. One of the points that I heard earlier is that Advisory Opinions were sought in interdisciplinary courses and there was some question about whether they were necessary, what the purpose was, etcetera, and so my question is have there been advisory opinions on these courses?

Senator Darby - The answer is no.

Provost Treadwell - I would just clarify within the guidelines that it is not required that advisory opinions be sought. It's for affected departments so, for instance the way we've used this throughout the history of guidelines, if the affected department's teaching load is effected' the resources in another department are affected by the action of an individual department who is presenting the course for a program, then advisory opinions must be sought. That is how we have applied it. So it would be my interpretation and understanding of the guidelines that specific advisory opinion from all disciplines on campus, there is no direct impact on them, so I don't believe that under these guidelines that there would be a requirement for an advisory opinion from every discipline that might be named in an interdisciplinary course. That is not how I have read this as resource demand that has been the purpose of advisory opinions. Workload, resources what's written. So that would be my clarification for regard to the guidelines about advisory opinions.

Senator Darby - Senators will notice that the issue of advisory opinions is not one of the areas of concern.

Senator Sapeta - I would like to ask for clarification. We have not been asked to vote on anything pertaining to this particular course.

Senator Stanish - Not yet, that is correct. Right now we are discussing.

Senator Sapeta - I am a little confused if we haven't been asked to vote on that report. Am I making sense?

Senator Stanish - Senator Fleeger made a motion that we will vote on whether or not we will vote and if would like to vote on the course proposal at the next meeting. We need to vote to vote today. We will not actually vote on the actual course proposal until next meeting assuming the vote to vote is affirmative.

Senator Sapeta - Nobody actually proposed to vote on this particular course. There was only a motion to discuss this topic.

Senator Stanish - Actually Senator Fleeger did just make that motion. Did I answer your question?

Senator Sapeta - No, that's ok.

Senator Lucey - Quick point, we've got nested motions here, and I don't want to lose sight that we have two course proposals here. We are technically only talking about one, and we can't talk about both because it wasn't actually part of the motion.

Senator Stanish - Right now we are discussing the motion to vote to vote for IIFILM 362 in mid-March.

Senator Sapeta - Shouldn't we propose to vote on it first and discuss it and then that discussion says we postpone to vote until next meeting?

Senator Hanrahan - We can't vote on it today.

Senator Stanish - Right and we didn't.

Senator Sapeta - Before we can propose to vote on it today and then we can say during the discussion let's postpone the vote till next meeting? I don't understand how I can vote on something that hasn't been brought to the table yet.

Senator Hanrahan - Do we need a vote? There was a motion and seconded and then it just comes up next time. I don't think we need to vote.

Senator Stanish - Yes, we need to. On page 6 in our bylaws where we began, "if any Senator wishes to discuss a proposal, a motion and second are required to bring the proposal to the floor for discussion." That is where we began. Then "a majority vote is required to bring it to the floor for a vote." We had that motion now to bring it to the floor for a vote. That was the second motion.

Senator Hanrahan - Effectively what we are doing is voting to bypass the SCC and vote on it as a Senate body.

Senator Stanish - It is within the Senate Curriculum Committee part of the bylaws.

Senator Bedell - I just had a question for Provost Treadwell. Earlier you had mentioned you could look into both the specific guidelines for what's appropriate for the idea of topics courses and also the precedent. Would you be able to present that before we vote at the next Senate meeting? Just so we have more clear information on both the precedent and what the actual guidelines state.

Provost Treadwell - I will make sure it is part of the emailed packet.

Senator Gianno - While it is true that according to the guidelines advisory opinions are not required that's true. The thing though that can be in the general process for the approval for curriculum proposals you have a certain disciplines there that are actually voting on the proposal whether they are going to be affected by that course change or curriculum change or not. The advisory opinions are only asked for among disciplines that may be affected outside of that group. In this case there are no disciplines that are automatically being involved in the curriculum decisions. I don't know if this clear or not, but this is an anomaly in terms of how the curriculum process works. It does not follow the curriculum process of the rest of the campus.

Senator Darby - We are discussing the consideration of whether to vote, should that pass, there will be a couple of technical things that would need to happen before we even able to vote if we decide to do so. Number one the record would have to be corrected around the proper number for the IIFILM course. I made a typo in the report and again the correct number is IIFILM 362. Next, I did find, after a little bit of scramble, find electronic versions of the IIFILM sample syllabi. However they are coupled on a PDF with an older iteration of the proposal. In my opinion it is in the Senators' interest to have these syllabi on Blackboard. So a request to the IIFILM proposal sponsor to send me sample syllabi. Next, the proposals sponsors will need to secure the Dean's signatures. I would be more than happy to walk them over to Dean Harris's office and have him review and sign, and I would be happy to pick them up.

Senator Lucey - Are you saying these didn't go through the Dean's office?

Senator Darby - I do not have a Dean signature.

Senator Lucey - We are talking about one proposal.

Senator Darby - Both of them do not have a Dean's review and signature.

Senator Lucey - And they should by the time they get to us?

Professor Antonnuci - Joe we had this conversation in September when I asked you specifically don't we need the Dean's signature? You said it varies.

Senator Darby - We did have a conversation...

Professor Antonnuci - I asked you when should it go to the Dean, and you said sometimes it goes before and sometimes it goes after.

Senator Darby - Yes, however...

Professor Antonnuci - This is precisely the lack of flow or direct process.

Senator Darby - I recollect the conversation slightly differently. However the point is the proposal sponsor is responsible to make sure the proposal has all components completed. However, as a Senate Chair it falls on mine, it was an oversight on my part.

Provost Treadwell - I would just ask that for both of these proposals we adhere to process. There should be a Dean's signature, and we should resubmit through the approval cycles in advance of that next meeting. I will attend to the issues that we committed in regard to clarify thematic and topic courses. That will help clarify the issue. So let's make sure we adhere to process as we try to go through the next couple of steps. With all good intention and great respect to all of you but we are quite clear on this so let's make sure we do that. Thanks

Senator Blatchly - Just for clarification, it sounds like your recommending that we vote "no" on Senator Flegers proposal and that we ask that these proposals go back to the SCC with the proper signatures. What are you suggesting?

Provost Treadwell - My sense from the conversation was that there was some ambiguity about what is required. So these went through the processes already and my sense is that the Chair of the SCC and the Chair of the Interdisciplinary committee there was some lack of clarity perhaps on the signature cycle. So I don't know if the full review needs to occur again, just the need to be sure that the signatures are adhered. If either of those committees would tell me that there is something distinct about this then I am not suggesting that we don't move forward with the motion. I am simply stating from my understanding of what was just stated which was lack of clarity but not lack of full review in those steps but we need the Dean's signature.

Senator Darby - I am fine with obtaining signatures. I think they can be obtained before the next meeting.

Senator Lucey - In the curriculum process is there a statement about who it goes to and in what order?

Provost Treadwell - Yes

Senator Lucey - Should it have gone to the Dean before?

Senator Darby - Yes

Senator Lucey - Just clarifying thanks.

Provost Treadwell - The action from my office would be to provide a communication back to faculty about the curriculum processes. I think it is helpful and its time based on the discussion. I will share those guidelines again.

Senator Welsh - My understanding with the conversation that has just gone around is if we vote "no" it will through the SCC, the SCC will introduce it, and we will discuss it. Is that correct?

Senator Stanish - I don't believe that is correct. I believe if we vote "no" the only way it can come back to the floor is if another Senator makes another motion and we go through what we just went through again. I believe if we vote "no" it would not go back to the SCC. Do you agree?

Senator Darby - I agree.

Senator Stanish - It's done unless another Senator makes a motion. If we vote "yes" then the whole Senate will vote on this next month. Does that make sense Senator Welsh?

Senator Welsh - Yes

Senator Stanish - Does everyone understand on what we are voting on?

Yes

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - Next meeting we will vote on this course proposal which will also include discussion as any motion would. The original motion to bring forward for discussion, we were reading the bylaws again and it says that a motion and a second is required to bring forth a proposal for discussion but it doesn't actually say that a vote is required. How you can have a motion without a vote is a little odd. We could officially vote to bring forth for discussion but we already did that. So I think we are good on the votes.

Senator Lucey - I would like to make a motion that we also consider the second proposal which we have been sort of dancing around, IIAMST 391 with vote at the next meeting. So discussion and vote at the next meeting.

Motion: Senator Lucey moves that we vote on IIAMST 391 at our next Senate meeting be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I am sorry but Senator Lucey could you rephrase exactly what your vote on the motion is.

Senator Lucey - The understanding is that when we made a motion to discuss the SCC's votes here that we opened up a motion for discussion only IIFILM 362 and now we have voted to vote at the next meeting. I am asking that we give the same consideration in this motion to IIAMST 391.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - So your motion is to discuss whether or not to vote, separately? The motion that I wrote down that Senator Fleeger made originally was that he moves to discuss IIFILM 362 and IIAMST 391. We didn't actually discuss IIAMST 391 I think most of our discussion was IIFILM 362, I believe the original motion but I would have to listen to the tape to make sure that I got it right was for both to be discussed and then Senator Fleeger's motion right now was to bring just IIFILM 362 for a vote.

Senator Lucey - I was under the impression it was something that Senator Stanish said and that it had to be separate.

Senator Stanish - I agree with you. So your motion is to bring IIAMST 391 for a vote?

Senator Lucey - Yes

Senator Stanish - Hang on, we need to find out if this is ok, give us a second. Our Parliamentarian has confirmed that Senator Lucey's motion to vote to vote is fine.

Senator Bedell - Did we include the requirement for the Dean's signature for this proposal like the last one. I just want to make sure we do that. I would like to ensure that the Dean's signature is completed on the IIAMST 391 proposal before we vote on it at the March meeting.

Senator Stanish - Excellent, thank you for catching that.

Senator Darby - The answer is yes to Senator Bedell's question.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion on the SCC report?

Senator Darby - We have a meeting in two weeks.

Senator Stemp - Point of clarification for March when we will vote. When evaluating or assessing both II topics courses, the criteria by which we are assessing them does that include the guidelines as they relate to topics courses?

Senator Stanish - Can you put an adjective in front of guidelines? Which guidelines?

Senator Stemp - The curriculum guidelines and the guidelines as they are provided by the ISP Curriculum Committee. So it's a combination of those two are the mechanism by which we're provided the ability to assess the proposals. Is that my understanding?

Provost Treadwell - I am just curious if it might be beneficial to invite the Interdisciplinary committee to discuss before the Senate the process by which they do review these proposals. The types of work that they do as a committee to try to support the standards within the curricular process. It might be useful to have them join us for that Senate meeting and perhaps to provide some pre-reading with their regard to the criteria for the Senate before that meeting.

Senator Stanish - I can do that.

Provost Treadwell - If that is possible it would be very helpful.

Senator Stemp - Just a clarification on that. So if the criteria by which that subcommittee evaluates II proposals differs from what is in the ISP document, is that the set of criteria by which the Senate as a whole, evaluates the proposals?

Provost Treadwell - Can you restate that?

Senator Stemp - If the criteria provided by the II subcommittee for the evaluation of the II proposals are different from what is in the ISP proposals, so the language that was included in the SCC document, which version of those...

Provost Treadwell - Ok so the quote that was shared today...

Senator Stemp - If it's not that and it's something else, are those the guidelines that the Senators are using to assess the two II proposals?

Provost Treadwell - These are not guidelines. This was the enabling document of the Integrative Studies program to invite engagement to this new type of pedagogy. This was just a statement along with all the categories of the ISP curriculum about what those types of courses were intended to provide on our campus and what the role for the faculty was to join in those various areas of curriculum. There is the ISP Committee which has guidelines that were established in the early years and has worked around what these subcommittees did for guidelines with regard to what this committee does. These are not guidelines they were just enabling language to try and get us thinking about interdisciplinary study. This is where the idea about two faculty across disciplines teaching together came from. These weren't guidelines they were enabling welcoming language around the curriculum proposal itself. The guidelines that govern what the Interdisciplinary subcommittee does has come through the Senate and the Integrative Studies Program committee years ago and it's part of what this task force is looking at right now on behalf of the Senate. I will seek record clarity with regard to the guidelines and I think by inviting the Interdisciplinary Committee here, we can hear directly from them what are the processes by which they evaluate the integrity, and a number of courses are denied. There are many many courses that never get moved forward by that committee because they are adhering to criteria that they have been working with under the ISPC.

Senator Welsh - If I am hearing you correctly, this is Senate approved criteria. This is criteria developed per the guidelines and after the ISP program came together. We do have guidelines about what II courses are that are Senate approved that these bodies like the SCC can use to evaluate the pros and cons of particular II courses.

Provost Treadwell - I think the question of whether all the guidelines are proper for the Senate is part of why we have the task force right now looking at this. What the Senate approved was the creation of a task force, the ISPC that would implement the approved curriculum that the Senate did approve. There were guidelines of review. We adhere to the Senate criteria but I think this question of what are the nitty gritty details of what these subcommittees do typically hadn't been brought before the Senate and I think that is part of why the task force has been requested by this body to be quite candid. There are guidelines. They had been approved through the authority granted, the delegated authority of the Senate to the Integrative Studies Program committee, to live the spirit of the curriculum approved by the Senate, but there was not stipulation of all the requirements for those subcommittees. There were general guidelines and the Integrative Studies Program committee did establish expectations for what those committees do. That is what needs to be shared with the Senate.

Senator Stemp - I think that speaks to part of the issue of what we been having because if I am a member of the SCC and there are exiting guidelines whether they are officially approved by the Senate or whether they are coming through a different series of bodies. In the absence of my knowledge of what those guidelines happen to be it is extremely difficult for me to actually access the proposals that come to the SCC and if I mistakenly assume that these are what we are acting as the guidelines, then the

application of what is essentially in spirit generally a proposal which was not adopted as official language. I think that is in some ways at the heart of why there is difficulty for the SCC to try to figure out how they are assessing.

Provost Treadwell - I think the distinction here is that we don't have clear explicit guidelines of what a Senate Curriculum committee body does. There aren't explicit step by step instructions on what the SCC does to review a course. We rely upon our School Curriculum Committees, we rely upon our departments and the Deans, and we evaluate the cohesiveness of the curriculum in ways that have become practice. I think as a campus this is new, and I think Professor Mallon's point is new and therefore appropriate for us to have these broad discussions. I think the concept that the rule and recommendation of a curriculum committee that has been regarded and recommended and acknowledged by the Senate for the SCC to question their inner workings is different for us. We wouldn't question a school curriculum committee that made a unanimous approval to the SCC unless there were clear issues that had to be addressed because the SCC looked at the requirements in the curriculum, meaning name, description titles, cohesiveness and that is where the dialog happens, but we don't often question to this level. That is part of why this discussion is so important for us to gain a sense of comfort and clarity around this. That is why I think this is appropriate, but the idea of a Senate approved explicit process that a committee of the ISP reviews has not been a part of our practice historically, and I think we approved in spirit. We delegated that responsibility to the ISPC and that is why we continue with the task force. But I think to hold hostage these two courses because of that I think it is something we need to continue to discuss and why I think the nature of that committee is so important for the next meeting to talk about what is it that do and understand their authorities as granted by the ISPC.

Senator Stanish - I will say that Provost Treadwell has offered to pull together some of these pieces of information and present that as part of the SEC report at the next meeting. It doesn't totally answer your question but I think it will.

Senator Stemp - I think it will get us to the next meeting.

Senator Stanish - I believe that closes the SCC report.

VI. New Business

Senator Martin - The issue of guidelines is not unique to the committees we have been talking about tonight and I recall from serving on the ASC we were often uncertain of our mandate and uncertain of the criteria that we ought to be applying at the end of our deliberations. So we deliberate, I think, on many of the Senate committees in the absence of guidelines, and perhaps we can generalize the problem that we face tonight and engage in a comprehensive view of the guidelines that do and don't exist for Senate committees and possibly school committees as well. I also served on the school committee for Sciences and I think that those committees are operating in good spirit but the spirit isn't always accurate. I would like to make a motion if I can that this body constitute a review process of all Senate committees that they produce the guidelines that they are operating under.

Senator Stanish - If that is a motion under new business we wouldn't vote on it.

Senator Martin - I can just bring it before the body?

Senator Stanish - Yes and the SEC can take that. Will that work?

Senator Martin - That will be fine. I have a second item of new business.

Senator Stanish - Before Senator Martin begins we are officially at 6:01 and according to our bylaws the Senate shall adjourn at 6:00pm unless we vote otherwise. We need to have a motion to extend the meeting past 6:00. Do we have a motion?

Senator Welsh - So moved

Motion: Senator Welsh moves to extend the past 6:00pm be approved by the Senate.

Senator Schmidl- Gagne - It has to be a ballot vote.

Senator Martin - My new business can wait.

Senator Stanish - Can you just email me?

Senator Martin - You bet.

XII. Adjournment 6:04