

*for the 419th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center*

- I. Call to Order 4:05
- II. Roll Call

Absent: Senator Ghatak, Senator Welsh, Senator Coleman and Senator Robinson

- III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 418th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Discussion: Senator Doreski – On page 16, word smiting should be wordsmithing.

Vote: Motion carries as corrected

- IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Stanish – I have two. From the faculty staff campaign Friday is “Jeans as a Means” day. If you have donated to the college at all in this fiscal year, President Giles-Gee has authorized folks to wear jeans on Friday and to wear shirts that are Keene State related. Also, on Friday at 2:15pm there will be a picture on the quad for all faculty and staff who have donated to the campaign. Come to the quad and be a part of the picture. My second announcement is from the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees is inventorying and looking at recommendations on the committee structure that we have on campus. We have sent out a survey link to anyone who is designated as a Chair of a committee, council or taskforce. If you have received that email and have yet to fill out the survey please do because it will really help us. We are going start downloading that information tomorrow afternoon so anything you can do before tomorrow afternoon would be appreciated.

Provost Netzhhammer – I wanted to give a brief enrollment update as we are past the application date which ended on May 1st for next year and about three weeks away from the deposit date which is May 1st. Up until today we have been lagging behind where we have been in previous years particularly, where we were last year. Today, we first started seeing deposits begin to stabilize so we are hoping we are on the right trend for enrollments to meet our own targets for next year as well as this year. This is a very critical period for the campus in terms of converting those applications into deposits for students to attend next year. With that in mind every Friday is admitted student days, in which students who have applied, been accepted to the college but who haven’t necessarily paid their deposit and committed to attending here are coming to campus. Last week we had the largest admitted student day in the history of the college. Our hope is that the one ahead will actually break that record. We have students who are attending these and what we would ask is what we ask every year as you see students and their parents walking aimlessly across campus take a moment to welcome them to campus and make them feel excited about coming to Keene State College.

- V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – We now move on to the committee reports. We will not be following the agenda tonight because we have some things that are time sensitive. The first, as we ended our last meeting it was noted to begin our discussion on the ISP Task Force report. We did take a vote and accepted the report at a previous meeting and we have Tom Bassarear and Ann Marie Mallon here. I would like to ask because we do have a lot of business to cover in the next two meetings that we limit this discussion to 30 minutes.

Senator Doreski – Two points I would like to make about the report. One is because it is an extensive and very comprehensive report and it brings up a lot of issues that would take a week for us to really go through all of them. My

main concern with the report and I know this was a lot of work to put this report together and a lot of consultation with faculty but I think with all of the analysis of the problem as it were and some of the strengths of the programs are quite thorough the recommendations do not seem to be adequate to the task. A number of them almost seem pointless like having a clearer web page or something like that. It seems to me that we really need a small committee of faculty to review this and break it out and consider either A; the possibility of what can be done to revise the ISP to address all of the issues that seem important to faculty and students or B; consider what alternatives to ISP might be practical to consider. I don't think this is something we can really do in 30 minutes of a Senate meeting.

Senator McDonald – If you look at the SEC report item 7, we did look at having a four person committee that will be put together by the SEC and the Provost office which will set the agenda for this discussion in the next years Senate.

Senator Doreski – I did see that and it wasn't clear to me what second agenda meant so any clarification on that would be appreciated.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I think we were looking to that committee to go through the document and pull up any of the pertinent pieces, organize them in a manner that makes sense and then bring those discussions to the Senate. The document is wonderful and comprehensive but is as you said a challenge to discuss as is in the Senate. If we bring it in as major points, major recommendations and allow the Senate to take it a bit at a time.

Senator Stanish – Reading the report and reviewing the responses from the Program of Studies Advisory Board there do seem to be some suggestions dealing with resources perhaps hiring a Director of Integrative Studies. I think it is a good idea to break these down. There might be some curricular pieces, there might be some standards pieces that I think are outlined in the report and there are also resource pieces which might be outside of the Senate prevue. We might be able to make considerations on what resources might support curriculum but we don't have any power or authority to make any decisions about that. Considering what other bodies outside of the Senate that might be able to deal with these pieces may be important as well.

Dr. Ann Marie Mallon – Both Dr. Tom Bassarear and I were ready to say last time and would say the same now is we have appreciated sharing the report with the campus. That was one of our recommendations in the report which was to not discuss behind veils and walls so that everyone knew what was going on and we were pointing to our 2nd recommendation to the need for a campus conversation. I think both of us would still agree that a campus conversation something a little bit broader than a four member Senate committee but something that really responded more immediately, even if the four members in the small committee in the Senate move forward with it, that recommendation starts with campus conversations, the sooner the better. This is an important program and our students deserve our serious work and I guess I would say for myself that we are committed to it. With open forums we could continue to make it work.

Dr. Bassarear – That was going to be my major point too. I think what happens a lot of times in organizations in academia's a lot of good ideas happen in committees but the kind of cultural change that a lot of the nationwide organizations are talking about require the culture to shift and that requires dialog. It requires more engagement so that kind of campus dialog I think is critical. One of the things that we found that was in the report was there really is not consensus about what integrated/integrative means and I think just the dialog around that would be important. You do need smaller committees to sit and move forth on that but that notion of dialog I think is incredible.

Senator Blatchly – I want to second the support for a broader campus conversation on this and I think about when you are trying to integrate something like this it will take time to move past some of the barriers that we have and will take a broader campus conversation to help move forward. I think in relation to some of our other work that we have set for us in the agenda here it's kind of interesting that we cannot think of a standing committee on the Senate that could rationally be given this task as oversight. Perhaps the Curriculum Committee but it seems a little outside what they typically have been doing. That may be our failing and something that as we think about potentially restructuring the leadership in the Senate maybe we reflect on that inability to find a good place to monitor or drive or navigate this conversation.

Senator Doreski – I was on the original ISP Committee and one of the problems with that committee which was the flip side of what was supposedly the strength was there were so many representatives that at one point at least 31 people were on the committee. Many on the committee felt that we were never really heard. I agree that we want to know as much as possible and what people on the campus are thinking about ISP but to a great extent the task force report had already dealt with that. I think the advantage of a small committee at this point is not to limit the input by any means; ideally we should

be soliciting as much input as possible from everyone on campus. Very large committees tend to have a way of stifling thought. Psychological studies have demonstrated that very often the best ideas come from people thinking alone and not people brainstorming in large groups. I think the previous experience from this advisory on the ISP suggested to that and even smaller groups we often have a lot of trouble coming up with anything. I hope that however we approach this problem that we not allow it to get bogged down in more large committee thinking. Let's learn something here.

Provost Netzhammer – I would mostly agree with Senator Doreski. I think the committee did very good work in getting campus input so going right now and saying give us more input doesn't necessarily advance what we need to advance. I think the Senate or some small group on the Senate should begin to think about how to move forward. We had talked about four in the SEC that could come together in a way that guides us in way that says we are going to start by talking about this piece. Part one – Governance Structure we are going to talk about that and look at the recommendations the committee made. We might add some more recommendations and bring that back. Then we have something we can bring to the campus community and ask what do you think about this. We are asking them for new information rather than to rehash information they have given us already. I think this is a good opportunity to say let's make sense of the report that we have been given before we go right back out to the campus community and say what do you think. Ultimately, that has happened. So much of this is about getting the buy in from the campus. I think it is a discussion that has to start right away but I think we should be strategic in going back to the campus community for those larger discussions.

Dr. Bassarear – I agree with much of what has been said and there are appropriate places for small groups but that you want that large group to get that dialog and get people to go back and forth. I think possibly with administrating the program you want to have a larger group that is representative to look at ultimate changes and yet I think you want a smaller group to do the day to day implementation. If it is too large a group you get bogged down so I think there are some places where a larger group is more effective and some places for a smaller group which goes back to the Provost's comment strategic.

Dr. Mallon – I believe it is not either/or but both are needed. There are a couple of reports out there. There is the ISP Board and response. That seems to me that it needs to be placed side by side with the task force report as well. There has to be some smaller discussion around where the intersection is. There has been a lot work done by the ISP Board, Advisory Board, Executive Board etc over years so where is that report at? We see the task force report and is there common ground where that initial committee conversation could start. It gives places of focus so that again we can strategically go about the larger meetings rather than an absolute wide open forum. That is not going to get us much. We need to focus strategically on the campus and invest in the conversation because they see it affecting their curriculum so to speak. A visit by Professor Nair last week about globalization that was so powerful and so important. That conversation needs to be integrated with the conversation about the Integrative Studies program. She had important things to share and we need to understand that conversation in context with a program that can deliver some of those goals that she spoke about. This places us in focus, if we are thinking about this fall, we can afford to step back and start small as long as we make sure we are hearing the voices that want to be part of the conversation.

Senator McDonald – Any other comments? We will bring this to a close and continue with other Senate business. Thank you very much.

Senator McDonald I would like to move to the Curriculum committee.

• Curriculum Committee

Senator Menees – We have met three times since the last Senate meeting. The first courses in the minutes are for information only. We did look at the Integrative Studies Program and I just put some additional comments there. This has been reviewed extensively by committees across the campus.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Integrative Studies Program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

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

Discussion: Senator Blatchly - Is this also approving the standards issue?

Senator Stanish – That would take a separate motion.

Senator Blatchly – I just wanted to double check that.

Senator Stemp – I need a bit of clarification of the course in the program that currently does not yet exist. It is a Micro Biology course. As far as I know Biology does not offer that course. I am not sure what the procedure is when a program includes a course, if the course is coming, it will be available I suppose?

Dean Treadwell – That course was originally approved in the package that was from last year. The course will be proposed in the fall but wanted discussion between Biology, Health Science and Nursing. In the package there will be a full proposal that will come through there and subsequent Senate that will address that course. During next year Bio 240 will serve the need. This course will not be offered.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Menees- The SCC also has reviewed the curriculum guidelines and the dates for submission for next year which are different from last year. October 3, 2012- Deadline to submit program and associated course curriculum proposals to the School Curriculum Committees and the Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee. October 31, 2012– Program proposals must be forwarded from School Curriculum Committees and the Interdisciplinary ISP subcommittee to the Senate Curriculum Committee by this date. The rationale from our perspective was getting the proposals to the Senate for the February meeting. It is just way to much stuff backed up in the fall semester. We thought we would try to push people. This deadline may appear early and may not work so much for next year but it may force people to look at curricular a little sooner.

Senator McDonald – We will now move to the Standards Committee.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Stanish – Senator Welsh is out of town so I will be giving the ASC report. We have met three times plus several emails discussions since our last meeting. We come forward with a few motions and a few reports to present. The ASC was charged with reviewing the policies that currently exist with scheduling adjustment period as well as reconciling those policies with the current calendar guidelines. What we discovered in that investigation was that last year’s Senate approved the change in policy that would allow students to continue to register on line during the first seven calendar days of classes. This is different from previous years when they were required to get a signature on a schedule adjustment form. This caused a lot of confusion for follow up as well as the policy which doesn’t coincide with the calendar guidelines. We solicited some feedback from around campus and as you can read here we put together the positives from our current policy on schedule adjustment as well as the negatives of the current policy. While we appreciate the positives we would at some point like to bring back some of the positive but we were swayed by the number of negatives.

Motion: The ASC moves that the existing language under the College’s “Academic Policies: Schedule Adjustment and Course Withdrawal,” be modified as follows:

Strike:

Adding a Course. Students may add a course (without fee if the total credits is 20 or fewer credits.) beginning with the first day of the semester through the completion of classes on the seventh calendar day of the semester. Once a course is closed a faculty signature (Schedule Adjustment form) is required and the form must be submitted to the Registrar’s Office by the end of the 7th calendar day of the semester.
In the case of a course scheduled to begin on a date other than the beginning of a semester, a student has the option of adding the course (without fee if the total credits total fewer than 20) any time from the start of the semester through the seventh calendar day after the course start date. Once a course is closed a faculty signature (Schedule Adjustment form) is required and the form must be submitted to the Registrar’s Office by the end of the 7th calendar day after the course start date.

Replace with:

Adding a Course. Students may add a course (without fee if the total credits is 20 or fewer credits) beginning with the first day of the semester through the completion of classes on the seventh calendar day of the semester. Any course added during the one-week period requires the signature of the instructor on a Schedule Adjustment form. The signed form must be submitted to the Registrar's office prior to the end of the period.

In the case of a course scheduled to begin on a date other than the beginning of a semester, a student has the option of adding the course (without fee if the total credits is 20 or fewer credits) any time from the start of the semester through the seventh calendar day after the course start date. The instructor's signature is required on a Schedule Adjustment form. The signed form must be submitted to the Registrar's office prior to the end of the seventh calendar day after the course start date.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Without a fee the total number of credits is 20 or fewer credits. Have we moved forward on the 18 credits; to move to the cap for FT tuition to 18 credits?

Provost Netzhammer – We anticipate firming that up this week.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – Was this referring to the same...

Senator Stanish – Yes – we have not received the official word on the 18 credits and certainly we were aware of discussions going on so we were going on the 20 credits as the status quo. I suppose you could table this motion until next week if we wanted to.

Provost Netzhammer – If you would like that piece resolved or we vote...

Senator Stanish – Or we can vote as is and next year's Senate could make a new motion to change it.

Senator Blatchly - Is there any chance that that would be editorial? There is a clear meaning so perhaps we could vote now and change the editorial part at a later date.

Senator Stanish – That works for me.

Senator Fleeger – I just want to clarify that this is going back to the requirement that there is a faculty signature on a course adjustment form for any student to add a class after the first day of class.

Senator Stanish – That is correct

Provost Netzhammer – I have been paying close attention to the work that has been going on around this and some of the conflicts that were created because of the policy that the Senate approved last year. We have to be aware that every time we require faculty signatures on things and people were talking about requiring faculty signatures for advisement; this would require a significant number of faculty signatures. We are creating paperwork for a lot of people with this policy. We just need to be aware that it requires that people are going to be around and responsive to students who are looking for them to be able to add their classes. It creates a level of bureaucracy, intentionally. It creates a level of bureaucracy for students and faculty that we have to be very committed to addressing. This is going to be an issue. Students will be able to go into Dean's offices when they can't find faculty to add classes. Students will be able to go to the Provost's office when they can't get that signature. While noble intent in design it is going to create a different set of problems. People want the old problem to go away but it will bring in a new one.

Senator Stanish – I agree and it would be excellent for future standards to keep considering this policy and try to find a way to eliminate both of the negative sides. We heard strongly from faculty and I think the ball is in the faculty court. They would much prefer a level of bureaucracy and having signed signatures for the benefit of the students. The idea of having a student be able to join a course in the second week where they could miss a whole week and a half is really detrimental to student learning and puts students at a disadvantage. That was a prime consideration and the ball is really in the faculty court. We want this so badly that we are going to be around to sign these forms and to advise students and make sure they get into the courses they need to get into.

Senator Martin – I think we were trying to balance inequities against each other and I am not sure there is an optimal solution. We are choosing a solution that the campus is already familiar with. It's not correct to say that we are creating

new problems except maybe reverting to an old practice that the faculty understand and were able to administer. There is a great deal of concern among the people who discussed this issue that students who would like to get into a course and are spending their time at their computer terminal trying to get in and waiting for an opening are trumping the students who are actually sitting in a class or meeting with a professor several weeks or months before the class actually convenes. We wanted to give recognition to the people who are in presence in the classroom and the people who have made contact to the Professor prior to the course convening. It is in an effort to serve those students that we adopted a policy that we know creates another layer of bureaucracy.

Senator Stanish – To add to that we heard from the student Senator who sits on the Academic Standards Committee and reporting to the student assembly that this is what the students prefer and not sitting in front of the computer and waiting for that spot to open up. They prefer to go and talk to the faculty and feel like they had some level of control over the situation by talking with the faculty members earlier of the summer. That will give them some level of control as opposed to a more arbitrary feeling of just waiting for something to open up.

Provost Netzhammer – I am not trying to get you to vote against this policy and I want to be clear about that but I want us to go in with eyes wide open. I am taking off my academic leader hat and putting on my financial fiduciary responsibility hat. In this process, what is the obligation of the faculty to accept students up to the quota of the course and make sure that the course is being managed effectively and to make sure even if a student is intending to go that first day of class, we have a schedule adjustment period in which they are entitled to pickup classes. What is the opportunity to ensure that we are managing that effectively?

Senator Dolenc – I don't think there is a one size fits all. I think that giving the instructor the discretion makes a huge difference. I teach courses where you cannot come in after two weeks having missed all of the material and still have a chance of succeeding. There might be other courses on this campus where that works. Not allowing the instructors to make that call and not encouraging the students to speak with us to find out what they are in for by adding a course where they have already missed material does not seem like a success.

Provost Netzhammer – Let me be clear here. The two weeks wouldn't matter. The policy doesn't affect the two weeks. They would always need a signature less than two weeks. With the current policy that we have it affects the first week of the semester so, one, two or three classes, I am not minimizing how important missing one class period is. We call them schedule adjustment periods and so shouldn't a student have the ability to say on that Friday of that first week I realize and I apologize I missed the first week of the semester but it's Friday and we are in that open period. You have four seats left and I would like your signature to be able to take that class. Is there an obligation to give that student that seat?

Senator Dolenc – It depends on the course.

Senator Blatchly – I just want to remind everyone that Chairs have the ability to sign these forms as well so there is a back up before you get all the way to the Provost office. Just a little scenario that illustrates some problems that we had especially with General Chemistry, there is a math test so there is a big architecture to the beginning of the semester. There is a math test run by the Math Center to give people advising information about their math skills to determine whether the student should really be in that course or not. Senator Dolenc was saying it depends on the faculty and the course. It also depends on the student. What are the student's qualifications? Are they really ready to jump in? Many students will be ready and some will not and so it is a matter of properly advising the student if it is appropriate. If somebody comes in on a Monday after the semester begins, there is no opportunity to get that math test so they are welcome to prolong missing some of their requirements for the start of the semester. It really depends on all three of these things. The bottom line is what is best for the student's education outcome and I think adding additional consultation with faculty will give us a better chance of doing that. We are not going to hit it every time but that is how I would handle this and to try and really maximize that effort.

Provost Netzhammer – If the Chairs have the authority to sign these forms I don't see it in policy. It is either implied or because a Chair can overrule the instructor requirement. It says the signature of the instructor on the adjustment schedule form. If you are intending what you are saying then I believe it requires an amendment to the policy. I think this is the kinds of checks and balances departments should have and I would usually be supportive of that but I do not see it in the motion as described.

Senator Martin – I approved the motion as we drafted it and would welcome some proposed language so that we could vote on it today.

Senator Martin – Every place where it says the instructors signature, could you substitute the instructors signature or department Chairs signature is required? There are several times that the instructors signature is referenced in the document and if we could just add or department Chairs. I am proposing this as an amendment to the motion that our committee put forth before the full Senate.

Motion: That the existing language under the College’s “Academic Policies: Schedule Adjustment and Course Withdrawal,” be modified as follows:

Strike:

Adding a Course. Students may add a course (without fee if the total credits is 20 or fewer credits.) beginning with the first day of the semester through the completion of classes on the seventh calendar day of the semester. Once a course is closed a faculty signature (Schedule Adjustment form) is required and the form must be submitted to the Registrar’s Office by the end of the 7th calendar day of the semester.

In the case of a course scheduled to begin on a date other than the beginning of a semester, a student has the option of adding the course (without fee if the total credits total fewer than 20) any time from the start of the semester through the seventh calendar day after the course start date. Once a course is closed a faculty signature (Schedule Adjustment form) is required and the form must be submitted to the Registrar’s Office by the end of the 7th calendar day after the course start date.

Replace with:

Adding a Course. Students may add a course (without fee if the total credits is 20 or fewer credits) beginning with the first day of the semester through the completion of classes on the seventh calendar day of the semester. Any course added during the one-week period requires the signature of the instructor or department chair on a Schedule Adjustment form. The signed form must be submitted to the Registrar's office prior to the end of the period.

In the case of a course scheduled to begin on a date other than the beginning of a semester, a student has the option of adding the course (without fee if the total credits is 20 or fewer credits) any time from the start of the semester through the seventh calendar day after the course start date. The instructor or department chair’s signature is required on a Schedule Adjustment form. The signed form must be submitted to the Registrar's office prior to the end of the seventh calendar day after the course start date.

Discussion: Senator Menees - I am envisioning a situation where the Chair might sign a student into a course that the faculty may have already said no. That would be troublesome to me if that happened to me.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I was also wondering how that might work with some of the concerns that Senator Dolenc had regarding an individual class and whether or not missing two classes is as important. Does the Chair have all that information about each individual class and each individual student as Senator Blatchly said where this student might be able to jump into a class. I wonder about adding this person who may not know the classes as well as they should and maybe not know the student as well as they should. I like the idea of making it simpler for students but I am not sure, again we might solve one problem but create another.

Senator Doreski – I think there is a course management issue here because if you have the Chair signing people in you could end up with the same situation as having students adding courses online. I taught an evening course in the fall once a week and I had four students who wanted to get into that course and I had two openings. I hesitated to sign any of them in, encouraged them even to come in when I found out that two other students had in fact registered for the course. The next time the class met was at the end of the add period and as it turned out, this was my judgment; I ended up adding because two students did not in fact register online. I ended up adding all four to accommodate them. If I had come and found that there were two students had already registered that would have been it. I would have had to say no to everybody. Counting anybody other than instructor to managing the course once the course is starting to meet, whether is the computer system managing the course or the Chair managing the course, the potential for creating problems is there. I do think faculty has to be conscientious about filling their courses. I certainly agree that opposing artificial caps is not

proper. We should all be able to argue for what we think the proper cap for our course is and live with that result. I think having a Chair involved is, unless the Chair is invited to do so by the faculty member who is away from campus or something I think it is a really bad idea.

Senator Blatchly – I think I was looking for some way to have exactly what you are suggesting. A Mechanism by which people could choose to see a little bit of control and that could go to the Chair. Maybe this will get more people to be on campus on a Friday afternoon.

Senator Stanish – Instead of adding *or* Department Chair can we add to the instructor's designee? That will designate the department Chair if he or she chooses. It is the instructor's job to make a designee.

Provost Netzhammer – I think the Registrar would have some issues with having to verify signatures on these forms that come forward. If that is the direction with the Senate than something like *or* just tack onto the end of this if the faculty member is unavailable the Department Chair...so that it makes that possible but limited to the Department Chair. I don't think it is fair to the Registrar to say oh well I designated this person to sign it for me or I didn't.

Senator Martin – Departments are intimate organizations. They are small on this campus and it seems to me that if a faculty member who has concerns about the ability of students to catch up would be able to tell the Chair my course is closed. The Chair if contacted by a prospective student would be able to say that course in question is closed. It seems to me that a little bit of communicating inside of the department would solve the hypothetical problem that we are discussing today.

Senator Stevenson – Is there any policy that governs when the Professor has the right to deny a student that is seeking a seat in their classroom? I would think the student would have recourse if they are denied entry for an arbitrary reason. Without a clear policy on when the faculty member has the right to do that, is something to think about.

Senator Stanish – I agree with you Senator Stevenson and in comment to the Provost's concern about faculty imposing artificial caps and things like that. I think it is a back door way to try and fix that problem through this policy. I think the idea of having an open honest discussion of when faculty can say a course is closed below the cap is a discussion we need to have separately from this policy.

Senator Shalit – Is there a fear with this going forward that too many faculty are closing classes before they are filled?

Provost Netzhammer – I don't think I have a fear of this going forward. I think that people use all kinds of policies to manage their classrooms. I want to be sure that as we move down this path that we move down this path with integrity. Like I said, I am not opposed to the motion and I like some form of the amendment too.

Senator Shalit – Is this an issue you have seen frequently?

Provost Netzhammer – I think when we are in that week that is a period of high anxiety of our students particularly those students that have only 8 credits and are trying to get that 12th credit. I think it is a time of high anxiety for faculty and I don't think as an institution we are really terrific avenging that. Clearly the fact that we implement a new policy because the old one wasn't working a year ago and one year later we are moving back to the old policy which is worse than the one we originally had but I think that is symptomatic to the fact that it is a period of high anxiety so we end that week with a significant number of students who are trying to pick up classes. In part because they haven't been able to find a faculty member or a faculty member that says even though you have picked this up online you were not here on the first day so you can't come in. I think Senator Stanish's point about figuring out what that first week is supposed to look like is a terrific idea for the Senate to take a look at. What does it mean for our schedule adjustment period around that? My office is a little bit removed so generally the first people who call me are the parents who call and say my kid could not get this course and sometimes it's a specific faculty member and sometimes it's the general frustration of not being able to get a full course load. It happens primarily in that week even when we have lots of seats open. To Senator's Dolenc's point, not one size fits all. What they might hear from you is different from what they might hear from another faculty member and that causes a great deal of anxiety.

Senator Martin – I am not sure that program like the Social Studies major that are run by program coordinator would be governed by the language that I proposed. They are not answerable or correctable by the department Chair. Chuck Weed for example was the program coordinator for the Social Science major and I don't think he answered to a Chair.

Provost Netzhammer – That would be slightly incorrect. The last contract we made we eliminated program coordinator from the contract and made all of them Chairs. Your amendment could be modified to just say Chair and to cover program and Department Chair but they are all Chairs in the contractual language that we use now.

Senator McDonald – Further discussion on the amendment?

Senator Fleeger – I would like to speak in favor of the amendment but in opposition to the change and I do that because I am a little bit conflicted because I am one of the ones that got caught by signing students into seats that were already being taken online and the situation like that. I feel that one of the advantages of this new proposal that I was actually looking forward to implementing was the opportunity to leave it in the hands of students and to decide whether or not if there were seats available they could have them up until that first week. I could still sign them in after that if it was appropriate. I think that if we are going to proceed with the change and particularly with those programs that have adjuncts faculty that may not be around on campus. The students in that first week trying to secure their schedules they are really anxious and want to get something nailed down so having the option of having someone other than the instructor sign that form would address that concern that students are going to have. That also pertains to the problem of communication and other issues.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator McDonald – We now go back to the discussion on the change.

Senator Denehy – I am on the Academic Standards Committee and I was the person that voted down on this proposal. I think what this discussion today is showing us is that we haven't done due diligence in determining what the best policy is. We had a policy, we didn't like it, we went to a new policy which wasn't well publicized caught people out of step so we don't like it so now we are going to go back to the old policy and we are going to catch people out of step again. My feeling was that we should remain under the current policy and give this more thought and come up with an improved policy instead of just going back to the previous policy.

Senator Doreski – In this informal discussion I mentioned this to members of my English Department and everyone in that department seemed to like the old policy. I don't know who didn't like the old policy.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Stanish – I would like to jump to the end on page 46. We actually had a motion that we did not bring forward in the March meeting because we were waiting for the Curriculum Committee.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revisions to the admission and retention requirements for the Nursing Program as submitted and revised on February 28, 2012 be accepted by the Senate.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Stanish - The report also contains recommendations for the Senate or other groups in the coming years. The next one in your packet is the grading system report. The Standards Committee was charged with viewing a proposal to change our existing grading system from A, AB and so on to be more consistent with our fellow institutions in the university system. We looked at the information that the Academic Standards Committee gathered the last time this issue came up and we came up with a report that you have in your packet beginning on page 47. This is for information only and nothing to vote on but we are making a recommendation that this discussion continue and the committee gather more feedback next year from the campus because this area was limited.

Senator Stevenson – I just have a question on how you are going to get more information. You can't force people to reply and generally we have open forums on these things and no one shows up or a handful of people show up. I just see this as another example of delaying something indefinitely for the discussion that is never going to happen.

Senator Denehy – If you look at this, we did open forums and asked for information. We would receive a lot more information if people would attend those open forums and respond. I believe that the report that Senator Martin did is incredible information of what we received and I believe if this report was shared with the campus it would cause conversation. It gives people some strengths and weaknesses and some information for discussion. I think this would be the starting point for that discussion.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – May I suggest that these forums happen at a faculty meeting on a Friday and maybe the Student Assembly invites some KSC representative for discussion as opposed to creating another situation and use what's available.

Senator Blatchly – It just occurred to me that we could model the new grading system with volunteers who wanted to take the end of semester grading and do it both ways. Many of the concerns about this are if the GPA's are going to go up or down. We could probably find that out if a couple dozen volunteers would run it both ways to see how that fell out. My suspicion is that it is not going to change that much but of course it would be nice to have a little data on that. It might be useful to sway some of the concerns.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I am more than happy to go through the minutes but I believe the last time this was proposed there was sort of a grand look at how grades were changing and I am almost positive there was data there. I can try and pull that out, maybe it didn't make it to the Senate minutes but I am fairly sure that someone did it.

Senator Stanish – The other report in the packet is a report on the dual major requirements or programs that may exist at KSC. In the fall we were charged at looking at the college's policy for programs requiring dual majors. In the context of concern for student's graduation and completion rates and times in the effect the dual major is a number of credits. In our investigation while students are always able to do a dual major if they so choose what it really came down to was looking at the programs that require a dual major and that is Education. We met with members from the Education department, Dean and Assistant Dean to Professional & Graduate Studies, reviewed background information from last time that this issue was studied which you saw in your packet and looked at data from other institutions about the number of credits and sort of came up with a report here about the students here, strengths and challenges of the current model and some recommendations. These recommendations are likely based on already ongoing activities that the Dean and Assistant Dean of Professional & Graduate Studies are already working on a plan to improve advising the situation and that seems to be the largest stumbling blocks. Students need to carefully navigate two majors as well as the Integrative Studies Program and put that together. As we try to help them we need to become better at advising them and we fully endorse that idea. We also recommended that the Teacher Education Council continue to assess this. It is always a good idea to go back and assess are we really still meeting the needs of our students. We may at one time but is it still. We continue to assess the benefits of the current model as well as continuing to assess models used by other institutions which are really designed for a 30 credit sweep of courses that is part of Education Major. We recommend that the Teacher Education Council continue to do that assessment and report back to the Dean in fall 2014. We picked this date because they will be going before NCATE for accreditation and we do not want to change anything until after that.

Senator McDonald – One thing that came up with that also was the review of the bylaw changes as recommended by the SEC and if there is a change to bring the curricular proposal and the standards proposal to the floor simultaneously in the future. We now move to the AOC.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly – We still have two reviews outstanding and we would like to move the Math proposal to the next Senate meeting. We do have the music review available for you for comment and I am going to ask Senator Fleeger to do a quick summary of the findings from that report. I did want to mention briefly that I have had a couple of emails from the Dean and head of the program talking about some of the changes that have occurred in the Music program since the time of the review. I want to caution the people listening to the story here that this is in effect not the current state of affairs because the material is a year or two old and have made significant improvements as a result of the review process. That is of course what we always hope for that the program review will inspire people and give them ideas about specific change. We can't really talk about it because we are restricted to the review materials that we have but it continues to improve.

Senator Fleegeer - The review documents that we looked at were in academic year 09. There were accreditation documents and also an external review report as well as an optional response document that was provided to the sub-committee. We felt that overall that both the accreditation documents and the outside reviewers agreed that the music program was an outstanding program and in most regards and they were leading the liberal arts mission on campus. They were at that time 8 FTTT (Full Time Tenure Track) faculty, 2 FT Artists in Residence, and 22 adjunct faculty. There was some concern with the outside reviewer about the number of adjunct faculty and part of that was related to the number of adjuncts that were teaching fulltime faculty load. The strengths of the program were identified by the external review report were that we have energized, committed faculty, Administrative support in the recent hiring of 2 new FTTT faculty, there were some improvements to the facilities, they liked the assignments of the librarians to assist the library resources. They felt there was good communication between FT and PT faculty and that the relationships were collegial. They felt the department was well respected on campus despite some of their challenges in limited resources. Areas that the outside reviewers recommend and are focused on was to see if there was some way to address the reliance upon adjunct faculty in the applied music lessons and the service courses. Also consider the addition of additional administrative support staff for publicity function and maintenance of the departmental websites and other departmental needs. The outside reviewers also noticed there were still some severe facility problems and need to renovate some spaces including unsatisfactory air circulation and humidity controls and lack of sound insulation in certain areas. It is also a concern on the part of the reviewers that insufficient funds for maintenance and repair of equipment. One additional concern that was identified was that the BA in Music degree has a number of emphasis areas that are experiencing low enrollment. To the recommendations that were provided between consultation of the review report and the committee there was an emphasis on trying to recruit high quality students suggestions including a scholarship fund may be available for supporting a student efforts consider revising a staffing plan to include a FT Chorale Director. The emphasis on trying to solve working with the administration on the facilities issues and maintenance issues also creating a plan for a fund to be dedicated for instrument replacement and repair and also considering the potential revision to the major to reduce some of the emphasis areas and address the under enrolled. That concludes my report.

Motion: The AOC moves that the report on the review of Music be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Darby – As the Provost and the President know the department has been working with the Administration here at the college since our self study began close to five years ago in preparation for our 2009 review. Most of the recommendations that our external reviewers made and were in fact seconded by the committee report, we are gaining traction on a number of those issues and are looking forward to working with them in the future as well.

Vote: Motion Carries

Senator Blatchly – The rest of the report is essentially informational and we just wanted to make sure that people knew that the AOC did vote in somewhat revised procedures we have been discussing and showcasing the last couple of meetings and is a part of this report. Since I have been Chair one of the things to note if there is an AOC next year we noticed in looking around for a replacement Chair we had a very large proportion of un-tenured faculty on the committee and those un-tenured faculty members probably should not be Chair's of committees like this especially given our discouragement of that activity in the contract. So when we think about filling committees, assuming this continues, we will have to come up with a Chair for the following year and that will need to be someone tenured.

- **Executive Committee**

Senator McDonald – The first item on the report is the Program Elimination Guidelines that were discussed at a previous Senate. The suggestions and comments were taken back and we did some editing and are in your packet.

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

Senator Stanish – I want to say thank you. I think you did a great job of appropriating the concerns that I had both about the definition of a program and about these majors that are essentially a subset. Thank you

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moved to eliminate the Academic Overview Committee (AOC) from the Senate, effective July 1, 2013 be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Denehy- We cannot vote on this today. The Senate bylaws article 11 states we can only vote if it had been permitted. This is a bylaw change and we can only vote on bylaw changes if it was submitted in writing at a previous meeting of the Senate during the academic year. We can discuss this but we cannot vote on this.

Parliamentarian Atkinson – A ruling could be passed today but it would require a unanimous vote.

Senator McDonald – This is not something that has to be rushed and I have no problem postponing the discussion until next Wednesday.

Senator Doeski – My concern with this has to do with faculty governance. I certainly do not want to in any way criticize the President or Administration but some of these reports do imply a need for resources. Facility renovations and so on that may be a challenge to the Administrators in terms of budget resources and so on. If it is left to a future Administration to prepare these reports – I wonder if they would be quite as candid in that regard and again I am not intending any criticism of the current Administration or even of a past Administration. I don't think we have had this problem. It does seem to me that the program review, we took this on as a faculty concern and with good reason. It is a tremendous burden on the faculty and it is a lot of work to do this but it is going to be a lot of work for whatever administrators and I wonder if that is going to improve anything.

Senator Stevenson – I am the one who put the motion forward and basically looking at the administrative function the departments would still be responsible for generating the self study which would be the body of the report. What we envisioned and Provost Netzhammer may elaborate on was that the external reviewers would offer their report which I am sure would be candid. The Deans would also offer their evaluation and give the department a chance for rebuttal to the outside reviewers report and what the Dean would have to say. These would then come forward to the Senate for information only. I would think departments would definitely be candid in what they lack and would hope that the outside reviewers would be just as candid. I think the Senate would be aware of what's going on.

Senator Blatchly – When I first heard about this proposal it was couched as a proposal to study the prospect of eliminating the AOC. I have to say that I am all in favor of that and I am not going to stand and try to defend the AOC as it currently exists in its entirety. I think there are some good qualities which we need to make sure that we preserve but to me the difference between studying this for a bit and actually doing it is the difference of studying a set of rapids and leaping into it. In this particular case we are trying to leap onto a rock which has not yet been created. That seems extremely quick to me and I don't understand what the rush is. We do not have a replacement for this and it seems to vote to eliminate the AOC before you have a replacement is just the cart before the horse. We are also asking for people to implement this who have not yet been named in an interim fashion. We would expect the Provost would need this in the future. We assume we will have an Interim Provost and we are not really sure if that is the case for certain. We don't know who that is and we don't even have a permanent Provost. There are just a lot of unknowns at the moment and seems like the wrong time to really move forward with this. I do think this should be studied it is rather rare that the AOC function as strongly faculty driven as it is but there certainly needs to be some type of faculty input on this. We need to keep this the public nature of the review. There are certain things the AOC does that are not hidden in the weeds but the reviewers are chosen by the AOC under the current plan. If Administration chooses the reviewers and let's suppose we don't get lucky this time when we hire a Provost that person will be choosing reviewers who could have a different kind of agenda. There is a summary that is written by people in the institution who have a faculty point of view and I think it is important to preserve that. It doesn't have to be a standing committee of the Senate but I think it has to have certain qualities and we should take a little bit of time to look at this get some key personnel in place and perhaps even look at the bigger committee structure of the Senate in general. Take a thorough review and see if we want to change things. See how we change things with the Curricular Committee which I think is also under review and make a big package. I would suggest we do something like this and give ourselves deadline, something like October and come forward with what would replace the AOC with and bring that entire package before we actually move forward.

Senator Dolenc – Some of the concerns that Senator Blatchly raised were actually discussed at the last SEC meeting and interestingly I would twist your metaphor in the other direction in that we have an opportunity right now for Provost Netzhammer to help us craft the type of guidelines that would make for a smooth transition that would come up with a process that would be an administrative function and he happens to have administrative experience from a campus where this sort of thing has been done whereas, the most likely interim candidates for the Provost Position here wouldn't bring that expertise because their background is on this campus with our culture and our process. From my perspective if rapids

are in our future I think we are better off going with somebody who has actually been down the river before and can help us navigate it while he is still here.

Provost Netzhammer – I think you could imagine a process that looks very similar to the process that we have now. The work that we did looking at other institutions was just a preview to be honest and what we know from other institutions is that most of them do handle them this way, as an administrative function. Generally, the self study process is the core of that and it is also the core of the systems requirement in that this process begins with departmental self study. The external evaluators also mandated by the system and by our process, that doesn't change. Our process for selecting them both I don't think we change either that in our current practice and in our future practice the selection of those evaluators would be handled jointly by the department and now the Dean instead of the AOC. The outside evaluators would issue the report, the department would issue their rebuttal to that report I think then that's when the process changes. The Dean begins to work with the departments on an action plan. So basically we are skipping one section of this which is the AOC section. Everything else really begins to look the same it's just that the site team the external reviewers report and the rebuttal by the department are then what begin to form that administrative action plan that is still in our current situation negotiated between the Dean and the department. It fills that same process but just eliminates one layer of faculty review and synthesis of all those documents into yet another document that we base the action plan on.

Senator Blatchly – It would be comforting to see an outline of what that would look like. How are concerns of the campus as a whole represented in that process? Right now we have representatives from all over campus looking at the individual review and it seems like according to this process we get reports. We frankly do not have time to dig into this the way an AOC would. Is there some campus representation that will bring the broader concerns in regard to ISP?

Provost Netzhammer – My sense would be putting words into Senator Stevenson's mouth is that last step of bringing this information back to the Senate is that piece. That it is a public document and is available to the Senate and to the campus community. In the same way I don't think there is any interest on anyone's part to take this process out of the sunshine where it currently exists.

Senator Stanish – Just a minor comment that I think is a typo and doesn't affect the motion. The rationale on page 19 both the first and fifth bullet down refers to administrative faction of the Provost's office. I am thinking it should be function.

Senator Harfenist – I just want to reemphasize what I am hearing - a number of us on the AOC were discussing the possible elimination of the AOC and many thought that could be a good thing. In my experience being on sub committees and as a faculty member in Physics reading maps I think departments are looking out for other departments. I think it is important that faculty have some say in the game somewhere. That it is not just faculty members of that department but external to that. Looking and seeing how things are going. I would hope that the new structure would incorporate faculty from around the campus working with the Administrators to take the information and do reports out of it. That would just be my hope.

Provost Netzhammer – If this motion is going to pass then my intent would be if we were going to meet a June 1st deadline – I would be happy to put something in writing for next week. Part of the idea behind this is work reduction. Trying to eliminate redundancy and support a committee that is always overwhelmed by the amount of work that it has in a particular semester and that will continue as we have more programs coming up over the next few years. There is not any attempt to eliminate faculty input even if it is viewed as an administrative function. If people have some idea of what that would look like as I am working on this process then I would really like to hear that. As an example, it is called ARC Affairs Review Committee as you recall, for those of you who are newer to the Senate you will not know this but we used to put every academic program in academic affairs through the AOC review. Academic & Career advising and Continuing Education, all of those programs went through exactly the same process. Six years ago we changed that process to move that out and looked to create a separate process for those academic support units. They go through something that is similar to this and in developing those policies one of the things that they really wanted was exactly what you were talking about. Where is that external look that comes from their peers when this process has reached its completion? What they decided was there would be a report to the academic directors. That is a group of all of the Academic Affairs people who hold the directors title and once a year are presented the report for the Global Education Office. That was the first time we had gone through that process. We have some tweaking to do and in fact Student Affairs is now going to go through the same process. That was one way that they thought there could be a way to get that kind of presentation that would get collegial input done. So if you have ideas about that as we are working on this process I am absolutely interested in hearing what you might have in mind as we put some of these ideas in writing.

Senator McDonald – Our 15 minute discussion on this has expired but this will come up for discussion again next week. Also please pay attention as there are two pages of bylaw changes for next week. Please look these over carefully and remember any of those changes do require a 2/3 majority vote.

Senator Menees- If we are voting on this next week, are we voting as a package or each bylaw change?

Senator Schmidl-Gage- I think we were hoping as a package but if that doesn't work we will go one by one.

Senator McDonald – Or we could go with the package and if someone does not like just one we could pull it out and discuss just that one.

Senator McDonald – Continuing with the SEC report, as you recall earlier, the program review which was in the AOC was tabled. We discussed this in the SEC and this was a program that was brought forward well before their scheduled time because someone thought it was a good idea since they had completed their accreditation study that it might be a good time to go forward. In hindsight that didn't work out well for them. The SEC voted to delay the review until it is actually scheduled which coincides with the next accreditation review process. For now we are taking it off the table. We appreciate all of the work the AOC has done on this.

Senator Blatchly – Because the motion was tabled do we need to withdraw? Is there something we need to do to take this off the table?

Senator McDonald – I think when it was tabled it becomes up to the SEC to reschedule it. It is just being scheduled out into the future. The next item is the time to graduation waiver form and was put in place last year. Accredited programs that cannot complete and want to apply for a waiver this is the form they would use. You will also notice that if a program is preparing to be accredited and once they start to form a process they can also use this application for waiver.

Motion: The SEC moves the Time to Graduation form be approved by the Senate.

Senator McDonald – I apologize, this was put forward as a draft form for this week. This is not a motion. This is for discussion only.

Motion Withdrawn

Senator Darby – It is wonderful to see the word *please* but I think it is a bit overdone and was wondering if you could remove the word on every bullet. It might be more active to just say provide. Instead of having all of the *and/or* and all of the slashes may I suggest using commas. It seems to be a little slashey.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – I met with representatives from each of the accredited programs and they all have it for feedback and thus far they are very pleased and have no changes to the document. I have heard from four or five of them and do not want any changes.

Senator Darby – I am curious of what the intention is on the very last statement on the form, *Please provide suggestions that would eliminate the need for your program to request a waiver.*

Senator Schmidl-Gagne – As we sat and talked about why their majors needed to be high credit there were several things that came up as issues that we need to continue to look at and some of those were around NCATE, some were around course sequencing that could be changed for programs that don't need - Nursing is a good example. The example where there is a psychology class that the Nursing program needs and in order for them to achieve that as our curriculum was when they began their process they would have need to take 3 courses and the Nursing program doesn't need that depth of those three courses so if we could offer one Psychology course on a life span development then there would two courses eliminated from the Nursing program thus reducing the number of credits students would need to take. It was things like that that had come up with insights that they have about how our curriculum is structured and how it could be simplified for their programs thus reduce the number credits.

Senator Darby – On the very last bullet I believe it should state in a tabular form or in a table.

Senator McDonald – Any other comments on the form? The SEC will be meeting Friday afternoon at 2:00pm so please forward any suggestions you have prior to that. Item number 6 as we stated earlier will address the bylaw changes next week. We have brought forward a motion to delay the program review process for ISP to 2013-2014 and in conversation with the Chair of the AOC I was told that was already scheduled. Is that true?

Senator Blatchly – It has been scheduled for 2013-2014 for as long as I can remember working. Some of these are a little complicated to look at and we were experimenting with the new form that can help that a little bit. If you have trouble reading this calendar let me know. It is scheduled under the 2014 heading so we would expect to be presenting it whenever the process is. It could be done in 2014 or done in 2013 and that is exactly what we are asking for and so we are way ahead.

VI. New Business

Provost Netzhammer – The question earlier around the credit overload, the reason that I didn't bring it up earlier was because we didn't discuss at the SEC meeting. I am very comfortable talking about it now if people feel we need to talk about it. We have discussed this in the past and if that would bring closure to some of the concerns that were left I can go over them now and will be brief. You may recall when we made the transition to the 4 credit program we moved the number of credits that students could take before they hit the overload from 18 credits to 20 credits. So students taking 21 credits pay a per credit rate to do that. When we made that decision it was done because we had made a commitment to our students that this would not go on their time to graduation. We knew for a significant number of our students would need to take five classes to make that possible. We moved it to that level and made a decision that at the end of this transition period we would review that policy. The Senate actually engaged in that review over a year ago and made a recommendation that we keep the policy at 20 credits. Without much debate we made that decision. After discussions with the President and the Cabinet there was no urgency to act on that and so it was one of the motions of the Senate that was never acted on administratively to either accept it or not accept it. It just stayed the way that it was. Over the last few years particularly last year we had begun to look at the budget crisis and at the very real cost of students needing to hire additional instruction and as student began to get in those seats we began to look at that again. On one hand this is what we know, students who take 20 credits generally self select into that and do pretty well. Their GPA's are actually better than the students GPA's who take fewer than 20 credits. On the other hand the goal of moving to 4 credits was that students would spend more time in fewer classes, if students are taking 20 credits than that goal is not what we realized. In addition to that there is the financial cost of students who are taking 20 credits. A group was convened in Academic Affairs many of whom are sitting around this table today to go back and look at that process and policy to see if things have changed. That group voted unanimously that it is time to back to the original policy of 18 credits that had been approved. I met with the SEC to make a decision of whether or not we wanted to do a Senate vote or whether we wanted to charge a committee of the Senate to look at that and the sense was that this was a recommendation of the Senate that had gone forward and never acted on. Even though a significant time had passed the Cabinet has the authority to finally act on that motion and they would report back to the Senate. Cabinet did that and that's what I am doing to you today and the intent is to move back to the 18 credits not in the fall but starting in the spring. Starting in the spring, students taking more than 18 credits will pay a per credit overload. The other change that we made that was approved by the Cabinet and not really considered by the Senate at the time is that we have generally gone to our per credit rate after students go to overload. So an instate student who takes an overload pays \$370.00 per credit an out of state student pays over \$600.00 for that same credit for each credit that they take over 20. Under this new policy approved by the Cabinet any student that is taking more than 18 credits will pay \$370.00 whether they are in state or out of state. There is a single credit rate for a credit taken over the 18 credit limit. This allows us to recover some of those instructional costs and gets us back to the goal of what 4 credits was and still recognizes that students will be doing this and at least moderates the cost for our out of state students. That is the policy that was approved and you can find it on the policies of the college if you look at Admissions and tuition and fees. All of that information is up I believe as of this week or last week. If there are specific questions I am happy to address that

Senator Stanish- I am thrilled and think this is in the best interest of our students. I think a campaign to inform students, faculty and everyone on campus is extremely important but another constituency that I run into is parents. Parents are often the ones that are paying the tuition. Explaining to both the students and the parents as to why we are doing this is important.

VII. Adjournment 4:55pm