

Minutes
for the 428th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 10, 2013
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

I. Call to Order 4:06pm

II. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Jean, Senator Warder, Senator Ditkoff, Senator Prosper, Senator Welch

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 427th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Vote: Motion carries

IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing to report

V. Subcommittee Reports

• **Executive Committee**

Senator Stanish - We had asked Andy Robinson to serve as Parliamentarian for us at the next two meetings but Chuck Weed was able to come today and since Chuck has already been approved as our Parliamentarian we can ignore this motion for now but Andy has agreed to serve for our next meeting.

We are in process of holding Senate elections for next year. We realize we are a little behind the deadline as set in the bylaws. Senator Jean and I forgot to get going on that so we are doing that now. We also have some By-Law revisions being presented to you and we can do this a couple of ways. Presenting them to you tonight for discussion as you can see there in senate document 12/13-33 starting on page 23 in your packet. According to our current By-Laws the way to amend bylaws is to present them to a meeting and they can be approved at that same meeting tonight if we have a unanimous vote of the members present tonight or we can just wait and vote on them at our next meeting in which case we will need a 2/3 majority vote of the members present to be approved. Right now I would just like open it up for discussion about these 4 proposed bylaw changes and we welcome any feedback that anyone has on them.

Senator Blatchly - I'll bite. I was looking at the By-Law change that talks about courtesy and one of the phrases in that about how we should follow a model.

Senator Stanish - Adopt the standards of courtesy common to other legislative bodies?

Senator Blatchly - I wanted to read a brief excerpt slightly fictionalized of course of the United States Senate and I wonder if we should really be adopting these standards and it is from Thaddeus Stevens. "How can I hold that all men are created equal when here before me stands stinking the moral carcass of the gentleman from Ohio? Proof that some men are inferior. Endowed by their maker with dim wits, impermeable to reason, with cold pallid slime in their veins instead of hot red blood. You are more reptile than man George, so low and flat that the foot of man is incapable of crushing you." So I wonder then if we diminish ourselves by comparing our language to that of the United States Senate.

Senator Stanish - You certainly can see that that language is currently in the By-Laws. Up for discussion.

Senator Blatchly - I have no interest in changing the motion.

Senator Darby - I want to thank Senator Blatchly for the point however I would state respectfully as it does say common to other legislative bodies whereas the excerpt was from an uncommon situation.

Senator Blatchly - I take the correction

Senator Martin - I see a slight editorial change at the end of the long first sentence in the proposed Article 6. in section C. Floor Procedure under Courtesy. Because peers are equals, because the dictionary definition is peer is equal so this is redundancy.

Senator Stanish - I agree. Thank you, Senator Martin.

Senator Martin - And then under the rationale, I don't know important it is to have a rationale for that, it's grammatical so I don't know. I would propose an amendment to the sentence where it says states the value that all Senators are viewed equal within the Senate. I propose the following language treated as equals. I am sorry for being picky.

Senator Stanish - No, that's ok. I think in my mind I had written "as equal" and didn't type the word "as".

Senator Martin - I propose to add the word treated.

Senator Stanish - Yes treated, yes. Thank you. Any other discussion on the proposed By-Law changes? Shall we vote on them or wait till the next meeting?

Senator Lucey - I move that we vote on them

Senator Stanish - OK - we will start with one motion at a time. We will go with the first motion.

Motion: The SEC moves the Senate By-Laws Article V Meetings be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-33].

Senator Stanish - This means that this has to be a unanimous vote with the members present and no abstentions as well. If that doesn't happen we will simply vote again at the next meeting.

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves the Senate By-Laws Article VI Parliamentary Rules, E. Voting Positions be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-33].

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SEC moves the Senate By-Laws Article VI Officers, D. Parliamentary be revised as proposed in SD [12/13-33].

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Stanish - I think I will hold off on the 4th motion taking into account the edits submitted by Senator Martin. I will present that to you edited. Thank you.

We did also consider the request made by Senator Welsh and others about extending the forty-eight hour rule and while I am certainly very sympathetic and applaud the desire to be better prepared for the Senate meetings, I think that is fantastic, our difficulty with it really is trying to find the balance between time to review the packet and having the most current information on which the Senate can base their deliberations. So given that we couldn't find a better balance we did not propose any By-Law changes and

we are going to stick with the forty-eight hour rule. There is nothing that a Senator could propose a By-Law change for the future however. Any other questions about the By-Law changes?

We also discussed the Program Review Process that will be handled through the Provost's Office with the AOC no longer existing at the end this year. The Provost has been working on new guidelines and really talking about accredited and non-accredited programs. She is trying to make the process as easy as possible and also giving the college what we need to have there too. She is going to share some of the new guidelines with the AOC for feedback and then with the Senate at the next meeting. Anything you would like to say about that?

The ISP Facilitation and Discussion Team have been working on a proposal about ISP Governance and I believe Senator Welsh, one of the Senators on the committee was handing everyone a handout. We just want to offer just for feedback. We are not doing anything tonight but just getting feedback.

Senator Welsh - Right. I wanted to give a status report and update on what the committee has been doing in Senator Jean's place. I wanted to have two voices here to help me answer questions and I urged Professor Antonucci to come, so he is also here to answer questions since he is on the committee too.

Just for review, a big part of our charge was to offer a way of streamlining ISP governance and finding a way to sort of improve transparency, communication and accountability for the program. We talked about that for a while at separate meetings and I realize that the Academic Oversight Committee sunset was an opportunity for us to put something new into that position. We plan to use the committee space that is being vacated and put a new one in that addresses non-curricular ISP issues.

This is fairly consistent organizational structure that we observed when we looked at committee structures of other Senates from data that was gathered in the past. Practices at other colleges and their Senates have general education committees and it is quite common.

We have put together an idea for a new Senate subcommittee that is sort of patterned after the Academic Oversight Committee and that is item number one in the handout. That's our big new thing, it is modeled after the AOC it's got sitting Senators, it's got non Senate members, There is efforts to seek balance among the schools on this committee. That is one of the things we have come up with compositions similar of AOC.

Also, we thought it was necessary and useful to have an organization that we are calling a working group now but I think that is a working title we are looking for a way for better titles. People who are sort of responsible for the day to day application of the program the II Coordinator, the ITW and IQL Coordinators, the people from the perspectives that count the seats and make sure there are enough sections and things like that. That is an array of people that is in part two of your handout that we are calling the working group.

If you want to compare to the existing structure that is sort of what the ISPA the ISPC sort of looks like now. The bridge between these two committees, the personnel bridge between these two committees we thought might be a new ISP Coordinator or Chair. It's an idea that has been around for a year since the taskforce did its work and it was the ISPC that suggested hiring someone. We thought this someone might be able to serve both on the Senate Committee and sort as a convener, listener etc. of the working group. The relationship between these two down the road would one where the working group is administering the program on a day to day basis and they notice issues coming up. They might notice a policy that is not working or a policy that is absent and they take a suggestion for that policy to the second group via the coordinator to the Senate subcommittee.

Curricular issues would go to the Curriculum Committee. The Senate Subcommittee would look at it, they would look at it, and they would hold hearings, discuss it and seek information. The same thing that other Senate subcommittees do and either revise it or pass it on as is to the main body of the Senate for ultimate approval. That is sort of on down the road and it is hard to say how busy both of these committees will be with that kind of task in the future. For the first few years though we imagine quite a bit of business on the part of both of these committees. We imagine both groups would be sort of tasked with updating the programs books, revising and updating guidelines, making revisions to outcomes.

We have looked at the outcomes and thought they could use some updating and modernizing or popularizing revisions of that sort. It sort of brings it all up to speed and get the records up to date and get people on board. That is a fairly work heavy task for the first couple of years as we see it. We've got a couple of meetings to go before the end of the year and just to describe what we will try to accomplish during that time. I have got three little items at the bottom.

We would like to suggest terms and possible reassigned time and a selection process for members of both committees and we just sort of let you know people we are going to replace or how we are reassembled through internal offices and things like that and that there is a possibility of assigned time.

We would also like to look and suggest specific words that would charge both committees. The verbal description I just gave you is loose and fluid and it's something we would like to nail down obviously.

Lastly, we are sort of not complete in finalizing what we would like to use as a process for getting faculty input on this structure. It being a month before the end of the school year we are not really sure how we would hold meetings or something like that. With the time that remains we may get poor attendance because everybody is busy but we were thinking that perhaps having a couple of slots during Professional Development Week and holding discussions during then. We won't have this finalized before the end of the year but I think we would like to have it at a point where discussions are far enough along that we know that it is something pretty close to this is going to be what we do next year and if that is in place then the players involved can start to prepare for next year. Gather the information you know make sure we hit the ground running in September when the Senate reconvenes and they can do these things. That is my review Professor Antonucci; would you like to add anything?

Professor Antonucci - Just maybe right now the Director position is a big giant blank.

Senator Welsh - It is.

Professor Antonucci - Giant blank, open space, we can't say anything about it but at this time given the II Committee and the IQL Coordinators, this is where what we are calling the Working Group can begin to work starting in the fall of 2013. Then we can go and discuss the Director at some point, I don't know but so long as the Senate is moving along as these people are filtering work in then some of the tangles and some of the briars that we have encountered will be cleared and in the spring we can move forward. I think its working.

Senator Welsh - I would entertain questions.

Senator Stanish - Absolutely.

Senator Lucey - A question about numbers, are there enough Senators to go around? I don't want to spoil the surprise of the future of program review but will there be a Senate subcommittee that will sort of replace the AOC that will need seven members and how will that work with the fact that we are adding a subcommittee to the Senate?

Provost Treadwell - There will not be a committee that replaces the AOC that was the agreement last spring. The AOC has been doing it this year to conclude and the process that will be brought forth in the May meeting will describe a continuation of our program review board but a new process by which those documents are moved through administrative structures to insure that issues are attended to and resources are placed. I think that's what we'll see so we don't anticipate two committees needing twice the Senators. That is an excellent question.

Senator Stanish - So the numbers will work out very much the same as they are now. Other discussion?

Senator Bedell - On the Senate subcommittee, I know you guys have some non Senate faculty listed and I am curious as to what the rationale was and if you were also considering non Senate students. I know that I will not be sitting on the Senate next year but I would love to have input and I am sure there are other students who would be interested in running for a position to serve on the subcommittee and give input on what some changes might look like. I don't know if that would be considered or possibly taken into consideration.

Senator Welsh - I will try to field that and have Professor Antonucci back me up here. One of the original concerns that we had was that if we had non Senate faculty, well the reason we wanted non Senate faculty members was to make that the schools were covered because we were not sure that you could cover the schools and represent them by necessarily drawing from members of the Senate. We had student representatives also outside the Senate and we hold them into the Senate group, that being a policy making group, I think we would be open to the idea of a student not coming from the Senate and your interest certainly makes sense. Can I take it down as a suggestion?

Senator Bedell - Absolutely, I think that it is no surprise that across campus from the administrative and from the student side that there are frustrations sometimes with the ISP Program. From my perspective I think it might be productive to have more than just the one mandated student Senator but to have a couple of other students who might be able to give some input particularly if they were from different places across campus. The student who sits on student Senate and is in this committee is very involved but to get input from students who are maybe on Student Gov or a different major it might round it out a little bit so you can see how the ISP effects different types of students.

Senator Welsh - Sure, what about the possibility of working membership of students. I don't know.

Professor Antonucci - That would be interesting.

Senator Welsh - The reason I suggest it is because that group is the place where we envision many of the ideas for changes and policy would come from. The Senate group is involved in sort of putting the stamp of approval and making sure there is public review and things like that.

Senator Antonucci - Immediately I went to the line 1 non-Senate faculty member of the campus community designated by the Provost. I thought oh it's backwards, maybe if it were a campus so Senator Bedell could be that person in this first round and then who knows and that becomes a rotating position that is at-large campus figure rather than an at-large faculty figure because it seems to me that the working group is conceived of or imagined to function more like that of a department. That is to say department with distinct large department with lots of programs subprograms so kind of having that student voice. I think the student voice should be the Senate maybe the revision should have the campus the appointed person be campus wide and not just necessarily faculty.

Senator Stanish - I think that is an excellent suggestion that we certainly welcome as much student involvement as we can. So I think exactly as Senator Welsh said I would suggest just taking it back to the team as feedback and see how we can integrate that in. I think that's wonderful, thank you for expressing your interest. I think we all want students involved in groups we are very thankful to have all of these students here who are extremely involved and passionate about what you do. I am thrilled to hear this so we will definitely send that for consideration thank you. Not to cut that off but other thoughts and ideas?

Senator Fleeger - For someone who is still trying to understand the ISP Program and how it works, I would appreciate perhaps having a more functional definition of what these groups might accomplish. You mention tasks associated of what they might be focused on but I am thinking more of what sort of function would they carry out within the program and also within the campus. That would help me understand what sort of responsibilities the groups would have.

Senator Welsh - I think that over the long run the function of the working group is just to implement the program and the function of the Senate subcommittee is to deliberate when there is a need for new policy or the old policy becomes nonfunctional or if there is a need for some sort of public discussion or something like that. That is sort of the function that I envision or if there are people outside the working group that say petition and want some sort of modification that would be the Senate subcommittees function. I think the working group is just a group that day to day implements this thing. I think in the short term we have sort of come to the point where there is an understanding that there is a need for more information, there is a perception of a curtain that things are behind. We would like to spend a couple of years getting rid of that perception. Increasing public awareness across the college and getting greater match between existing practice and program has written. Those kinds of things and to make sure the Senate has been involved and deliberated where it's necessary. I hope that clarifies.

Senator Fleeger - I am thinking of in terms of moving forward.

Senator Antonucci - I wanted to say that one of the flaws of this current structure that doesn't exist anymore and what we have tried to work to do, and Senator Welsh was very instrumental in this process, was not making the same mistake, sorry if we're here in 2006, making the same mistakes twice. What you'll see here in some way is a two prong general education delivery system which is reminiscent of the ISPB and the ISPC which were just absolutely indistinguishable from each other. With this program they are distinguishable they are distinct in that the Senate subcommittee is located in a campus wide body. They are not invested in themselves in one space called ISP land. You do have here an administrative what you might want to call a steering committee that involves a faculty or a director and then the coordinators and these people are charged to do just that. Not determine policy, not sort out, but to run the program and then there is a common way of getting materials and information and receiving feedback from the participants in the program. Students themselves. This opens up the dialog which will hopefully end the confusion of Senator Fleeger and others about what's actually going on and what's behind the curtain.

Senator Blatchly - Thank you, I feel like I can move forward from both of the previous comments. I share a little confusion still about exactly how this committee would work and wanted to bring a couple of specific concerns, serious ones this time, but also I think I want to add my voice to Professor Antonucci voice in suggesting it is a good idea to bring ISP to the level of the Senate somehow. Whether it's this way or some other way but bringing ISP to the level of the Senate is a great idea. Now we are talking about how we do it. My specific concern with this is I think we are possibly making the path of someone proposing a change a little more confusing and also how this is dealt with. Supposing someone comes up with an idea to change some curricular aspect of ISP. It goes to the ISP working group the ISP working group says yes, ok let's bring this to the ISP Senate Committee, and now does the ISP Senate Committee take that curricular thing and send it to the Senate Curriculum Committee? Do you report to the Senate

Curriculum Committee or if its changing standards are you in a way reporting to the Standards Committee which I think is appropriate. I think we may have to go a little broader with the reorganization as we think about this. Perhaps curricular issues that have to do with ISP should go through the ISP Committee and not Curriculum. Again, I am thinking out loud here but I worry about people getting very confused as they are already. When you have a program change and you try to coordinate the actions of the Senate Curriculum Committee and Standards Committee you got to go to two places. Better perhaps that people are more likely to have to go to one place and get some fairly coordinated relief for what their problems so I really worry about sort of who this committee reports to and as others say exactly what the charge is.

Senator Welsh - The charge is something we are figuring out. We have considered potential overlap and I guess I would describe it as a preliminary decision of the group so far that we are not interested in moving responsibility away from the Curriculum Committee or the Standards Committee with issues that are very clearly one of either of those that would arise that they would still go to the existing committees responsible for them but it strikes us that there an array of other kinds of issues and big ones and fairly regular ones that still require some sort of discussion and examination. Just as an example, Caps on ISP classes, descriptions of the outcomes those sorts of things that don't really fall into an existing committee structure but that warrant a close examination by a committee that is familiar with the issues.

Senator Antonucci - And, or, but I can't remember which it is better to have some place to go rather than not. Right now there is none because of the structure and the way it is played out and the way that it exists currently. This provides two sites for those who have frustrations, for those who have questions or those who have proposed those changes to move towards. You go through the Senate or through the Director when it's feasible.

Senator Lucey - I was going to suggest as simple for an acronym, the IOC which means ISP Oversight Committee but then this came up and I realized that it sounds as though it will function as kind of a Senate driven program review committee. It is going to have issues that deal with Academic Standards and I don't know how you can do the work without being involved in the curricular process. How could you separate that out from all of these other decisions? So it seems as though the newly adopted IOC would really sort of combine all of that oversight specifically for the ISP Program. So ISP for instance well we don't have a review committee anymore but Academic Standards would not be asked it would be the specialized group if it was something that dealt with the ISP. The SCC would only look at department changes, program changes and curricular changes as long as it wasn't ISP. It's a lot of work.

Senator Welsh - It would involve reconfiguring existing charges for existing committees. I think we did not want to give this committee too much work. This is a lot of classes, this is a lot of these kinds of issues nor did we want to overstep boundaries and so for that reason we were thinking about keeping responsibilities of existing committees as is and just creating something that can answer questions that have come up in the past now.

Senator Sapeta - I am wondering if you had any discussions or thoughts about when you add a director position to this and you start reading this kind administrative layer or ISP is this something that may actually become another school? A school of ISP that leads to something much greater. Was there a discussion about that?

Professor Antonucci - In name there is a Director of ISP both on the administrative and kind of a banded faculty position. This would actually locate this labor and this charge into one body in person. So it is not creating a layer. All the kind of managing and administrative that needs to come to this program. I said briars before and I really do mean it there is just a lot of underbrush that needs to be cleared so that students can move through the program as efficiently as they can and the program can move and develop

as efficiently as it can. It would have been easy to say that in two semesters we going to get this but this is a four semester project it's two years that's how we are thinking of it.

Senator Stanish - I will say and correct me if I am wrong I think there is a change in title here but I think currently at least the Associate Provost and the faculty or Co-Chairs of the ISPC that is sort of called Director but functionally they don't currently as a director.

Senator Welsh - I think what I envision and I have experienced being Chair as all responsibility and no power and I don't think that we envision much different in this iteration of the term Chair. It's a person that implements a program and make sure things get done but doesn't set policy or move forward in a school kind of way.

Senator Stanish - We do have precedence with a Director in the Honors program, perhaps. Other discussion?

Senator Martin - I think Senator Separta actually raised an interesting question and it wasn't something that I had thought of but now it is something I am thinking of. If you look at sort of the description of this Program Director's full time position certainly an issue for Provost it has the veneer of a Dean position in terms of this kind of description and the assumption is that we don't need a person like that unless you then construct sort of an organization around that particular person. I am not suggesting that this in fact is where the working group is intended to go but it does create the potential or the possibility of it going in that particular direction and if it does there are clearly some issues about how curriculum is overseen in relation to right now for example with the IN, IS, II and IH courses are generally vetted by School Curriculum Committees. In the event you created another school that is essentially an ISP school. Does that then mean that any course designated as an ISP course takes a different route in terms of how it is vetted or how it is overseen? In some ways that drastically changes the way which curricular matters are dealt with on campus. I am not saying necessarily that it is going there but if it happens to go in that direction suddenly a course that has an IS designation or an IN designation may go to a substantially different group by which it goes through the curricular review process.

Senator Welsh - We are not considering that and that is something that I think we are aware of and certainly cautious about. Again, this is a coordinating and implementing structure as introduced and not a governing or policy making structure. The policy still resides in the Senate same as curricular review still resides in the same curricular review process and bodies and standards still exist in standards bodies.

Senator Stanish - Could I make a suggestion to the committee? It may not make sense to write charges for other committees maybe just put down any of these thoughts that you are thinking in terms of this group. It is just your thought we will continue to follow the path but just to make sure that we have that down.

Senator Hix - Senator Welsh you did just respond to what I was thinking about and it seems to me the idea behind the Integrative Studies is that it is generated from the different disciplines so the school and the department and program would need to have oversight of that curriculum. Then there is that other piece of how you are going to approve integrative courses so thinking that Integrative Studies is the basis within other departments and programs and I was just reflecting on that.

Provost Treadwell - I would just to offer before we get to far down the road of concern to all of the faculty on behalf of my office I appreciate deeply the work of the committee with the proposals and I am not sensing that it was your intention in any way to undermine what I think is the true strength of our ISP which is the curricular process. The springing forth from all our disciplines and the interdisciplinary

collaborations that we see on campus nor would it be within the resource structure that I can foresee in the next year or two by any stretch that we would create another school to administer a program such as this.

I just want to be very clear for the record that any suggestion to create a school of ISP is not on the horizon in any way from my office or from the Academic Affairs Council or for this body. I don't think that is where this committee was going. I think we need to be cautious about the way the charges are structured so that we continue to seek the power of the curricular committees existing processes which we all feel comfort with and the clarity on policy and transparency could exist to help us move the program forward. For those pieces I am deeply grateful for all the work the body had done but just want to dispel the main concern around the table there is certainly no intention from myself or the office that we would create a separate school. I think it is beyond the scope of where the strength of this program actually exists and would undermine that great strength. Just to be clear moving forward.

Senator Lucey - Just a brief after thought I was just thinking we should stop thinking in terms of Director or Dean and maybe start thinking in terms of Chair or Coordinator. That is somebody being pulled out of faculty to serve and have release time or whatever in some sort of rotating position maybe.

Senator Welsh - That is something we have discussed.

Provost Treadwell - One point of clarification. I like that model I think we have other precedent with the Director of the Honors Program. It is an issue however that we will need to be discussed with the KSCEA. I just want to be clear with regard to process and workload and release time. Any recommendations from this committee will be reviewed at this level and certainly be delivered with consultation so that there is clarity amongst the KSCEA leadership and membership as well so we don't create an unintended consequence for that Director whoever he or she might be. I think it is a very appropriate and that we have parallel structure and precedence on campus that has served us quite well. The curricular programs like Honors. ISP could have the same future.

Senator Stanish - Any other feedback for the discussion team on this? Thank you both for your service on the committee and please pass along the thanks to the entire committee for the work on this. I think it's an excellent place for us to get going to deal with a lot of the other issues. It is very helpful, thank you. That brings us to our next item on the Executive Committee Report in terms of the committee structure for 2013-2014. The SEC does feel that we need to put something in place in the By-Laws to replace the Senators that would formally serve on the AOC. If we leave the By-Laws empty we are going to have a bunch of Senators who are not on a committee and we don't want to do that and will not fit our model. So given what I am hearing from Senator Welsh the desire to get some more input on this proposal before we sort of go forward with a final proposal and I completely support that. I think I will have the SEC work on some maybe general language that will kind of be a placeholder for the Senators that we could update in the fall. I think we will find a way to do that so we do have some sort of group going on with not a whole lot of specifics but that can change. That's my thought unless folks have other ideas.

Senator Welsh - That sounds like a good idea.

Senator Stanish - That brings us to our next item that I wanted to get feedback on from you in terms of our next Senate meeting. We were originally scheduled to meet today which we are as well as next week and that's it for the year. As you can see there are several items that are still ongoing. Because Senator Jean and I were behind on doing the faculty elections those will not be completed next week so that is a large number of Senators that wouldn't be able to attend because they have not been elected yet. Also we are still working on another program review process and not that that is a necessity we thought that it would be nice for the Senate to approve that process this year so we can bring that to closure and have the new process implemented if possible. Also, we need to work on this language for the committee structure

so between all of those things we felt next week was just not enough time to get all that work done and looking at the calendar we propose a meeting of Wednesday, May 1st which is the last week of classes. I wanted to get a little feedback from all of you on how you felt about that idea. I noticed the SCC was scheduled to meet then but perhaps we could flip flop some meetings.

Senator Hanrahan - That's the week before finals.

Senator Stanish - That's the week before finals. Not the week of finals we didn't want to do it then. So unless there is no screaming objections. Alright we will go with that change; we have already reserved the space for May 1st. We will update with a meeting request.

The next item on the SEC Report Academic Honesty Policy. Thank you Senator Schmidl-Gagne who remembered that part of the policy itself is that the Academic Honesty Policy should be reviewed every three years. It is written right into the policy. It was last reviewed in 2009-2010, and so it should happen this year. Senator Schmidl-Gagne did go through the document and at least update any name changes. Names of committees had changed; different offices had changed names so she at least updated those so we had accurate names. We didn't change anything of substance there just the names and that is what is included in your packet is the revision to go through and change those editorial type pieces. We wanted to bring that to the Senate for information any discussion and if there is no objection we will at least have that part uploaded to the website as the Academic Honesty Policy as it stands. We were thinking we would charge the ASC in the fall with actually doing the substance of the policy. Any discussion on that?

Senator Stemp - It's a follow up to item number 5 on page 27 and I bring this up because it has current applications for this semester. The feigning illness, the ability to somehow confirm or deny that there is or is not illness seems to be a process that is somewhat subjective and then departments may have policies that they attempt to implement. It is problematic. I don't know if feigning illness occurs or doesn't occur in some of the instances.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - That was designed because faculty were able to find instances where students forged signatures and things. That is there because in a circumstance where it was already proven there wasn't another place to put that. There were a couple of instances where students obtained forms from different doctors and there weren't what they appeared to be.

Senator Stemp - That is more forgery than feigning illness?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - Right but altering college documents is separate so if they got some of Gail Zimmerman's stationary and tried to do something that would fall under there.

Senator Blatchly - Would you like an example? We had an instance in one case when someone came back from spring break quite thoroughly tanned but came back late and said well I couldn't come back on time because I was sick. We said well what were sick with and she said Mononucleosis and we said OK give us a note. We got the note and it was on a prescription pad. I think what had happened was this person had taken a prescription Xeroxed on this thing and misspelled the word mononucleosis. We thought that is probably not accurate so we had to call the doctor's office and they said no no that is the most interesting thing we have heard all day today was this little forgery. It was actually possible to validate in that case that there was a pretty clear forgery of a claimed illness that had no basis in the documentation.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - That was what it was designed to address.

Senator Stemp - Yeah, I understand that and I guess it does get covered in here but there are also circumstances where faculty requests proof of some kind and then there are a series of unintended owner

kind of consequences that then erupt because you had requested documentation for illness. Again, I am thinking of a specific example but how you validate or invalidate I think is to a degree problematic. I think the expectation of documentation of some kind is valid for the perspective of faculty member to the institution but when other factors get pulled into it it starts to become entirely much more complex than it should have been in the first place. Without going into the specifics it sometimes is not easy to implement in a way that doesn't turn to be much more work and effort than it warrants in the first place.

Senator Stanish - Senator Lucey has a comment and he may say what I am going to say but I think this is something we can bring to the Academic Standards Committee and they could review the substance of it. Excellent point.

Senator Lucey - Some of it is very simple and it's just that students lied and that has happened to me more than once. You have to a bit of pressure on them in terms of where their grades are going and then it becomes a question of truthfulness and lying and talking about that as an expression that if you lie you don't get credit too for someone else's on their idea or work and you are supposed to have certain types of behaviors. I would hate to see it go because I think it is important.

Senator Stemp - I am not saying that it needs to go I think maybe there is something of an issue of clarification. Perhaps is there a specific expectation that goes with that in terms of what a faculty member can do?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I think what you are looking at is just a list of possibilities that are there. Maybe that needs to be edited in a different way. I think if you discovered that a student has feigned an illness as Senator Blatchly did then you would go through the normal process. It sounded as if Senator Blatchly was able to have the documentation to attach to the form to give to the Assistant Dean and it could just go through like any other like if you caught student plagiarizing or anything like that. It would be the same but I agree that it could be challenging to get the documentation we need to support a number of things. A lot of times there are hunches that we have and it's hard to find the proof when it comes to some of these issues.

Senator Stemp - Part of it simply the request for the documentation. It is not the actual documentation itself but it is the potential trickledown effect of asking for the documentation in the first place. Illness is an example here and it has it potential pitfalls but others that are problematic are things like deaths in the family. You would end up being Professor Morbid if you request proof when a family member has passed away if it happens to coincide with an exam or a due date for an assignment or something like that. It is not particularly this bulleted point but I think there is a slightly larger issue in trying somehow to deal with this in a reasonable way that doesn't somehow to get to be entirely too much work in terms of what the consequential value should be.

Senator Stanish - So really Senator Stemp I hear you talking about discussion maybe perhaps a policy of what sort of documentation you would require for various absences.

Senator Stemp - Yes, on one level that's it and the second is the delivery of that documentation. That there is some sort of knowledge that if you are away for reasons that you are required to provide that documentation if a professor is not necessarily a bad person by hounding you about this issue. If there is more of a blank policy in place that is fairly likely to be understood by faculty and students maybe it alleviates the individual instances again and again and again.

Senator Stanish - So I hear maybe more of a standards issue rather than an absence policy which I believe is a policy in the student handbook I haven't any idea what it says but that maybe another place you want to look.

Senator Lucey - It could very clearly be stated in your syllabus. That becomes the contract. So if you say documentation required and here are examples of excused absences, family emergency, health and that sort of thing. It's a struggle to get and it's a case of whether or not you believe the student or if they show up and says I don't always look at the obituary but as long as it is there and if find you have an offense in theory you could follow through.

Senator Stanish - Thank you. Any other comments on the Academic Honesty Policy? We will charge the ASC with review of that next year.

The last item on the SEC Report we just wanted to give you an update and perhaps get a little bit of feedback for the meeting dates for next year. Many of you are returning not all of you to the Senate next year and you can certainly give us feedback. More or less except for the December, this is the usual way we have done Senate Meetings and basically meet the second Wednesday of every month during the academic year avoiding spring break if that happens to fall strangely but what we did look at was the December meetings.

We had a couple of issues this year some of which I am surprised hadn't come up before. It was really a two prong thing so first of all with the first week of December is when the NEASC meetings are usually held in Boston so our Provost, whether it is Provost Treadwell or any other Provost is usually away attending that and often in the December meeting lots of curriculum proposals are coming forward and it's important to have the Provost at that Senate meeting. We found it difficult to juggle around the NEASC meetings to allow the Provost to attend the meeting when we are talking about curriculum.

Second of all what arose this year and I was surprised it didn't arise earlier was the final exam schedule. As you all recall by having the Senate meeting at our usual 4-6 Wednesday time during final exam week caused some conflicts because if you are taking or teaching a class Wednesday at 4-6 your exam time was actually Thursday at 3:30 so you may have had another exam Wednesday at 3:30 and I know that that has happened to several Senators this year.

We wanted to try and solve both of those problems and we also realized looking back at the past couple of years there wasn't always a need for two December meetings. I think historically that went back to when those were really the last meetings for student curriculum before we moved to an online catalog. Lots of Senators are shaking their heads, I remember getting these giant photocopied packets full of all curricular proposals and we would be for 3 hours in the last two weeks of the December going through them but then we would be done with curriculum. We have moved away from that and little bit more like a continuous cycle now so it seems like we could get away with one December Senate meeting. Our suggestion was to hold it on reading day still at the 4:00 time there is no exams going on reading day because there are other responsibilities that are happening that day but that was the best solution we could come up with and we certainly welcome feedback and other suggestions.

Senator Bedell - The only question that I have is would it potentially post a problem for exams that start at 6 on Monday?

Senator Stanish - We did look at that and yes they start at 6:00 and you are absolutely right. In our By-Laws the Senate is to adjourn by 6pm unless we vote to extend that time. I suppose there is a possibility that we could vote to extend and then there would be an exam that started at 6:00. Certainly Senators would be welcomed to leave if they had an exam at 6:00 and maybe a little before 6:00 so you could get there on time so there is a little bit there. I don't know how many exams we actually have at that time Monday nights at 6:00 I don't know the numbers if there is many it is very few. The chances are of that

being a conflict I suppose there is a slight possibility of that. We didn't want to start at 6 instead of 4:00 because that was my original concern because if they started at 4:00 then I would really be worried.

Senator King - Is there a possibility to move the time up on reading day so it would start at 12:00pm and finish up 2:00pm because when there are no classes at all I don't know what faculty have.

Senator Stanish - We could certainly entertain that. I was not really tied to 4:00 although there are two reasons why we picked 4:00. One was to keep it consistent so we all remember to show up at 4:00 and suddenly we throw a different time in that is not the greatest reason I think we could handle the change and we can remind ourselves and get over it. The other is that we were thinking if we had work towards the end of the day it still gives a whole day for students and faculty to meet and students to study and faculty to be in offices and are available for students rather than chopping it up in the middle of the day. I would really be interested in hearing from students about how you use that day. If the middle of the day meeting time would fit your schedule better we can certainly entertain that possibility. I know Senator King will be hanging out in the Math Building a lot on Reading day

Senator Lucey - More than anything it seems to more a question of the quorum and so the balance would be potentially how many student representatives versus how many faculty representatives because I always teach at 2:00 in the Wednesday block which has the final at 3:30-5:30 and I have missed lots of Senate meetings as a result of that so I think if it's the quorum being compromised then we do have a real problem.

Senator Stanish - Right, we did have poor attendance but we were pretty close. We had to count so I think that Wednesday 4:00 time is one we want to avoid for that very reason.

Senator Lucey - But in terms of shifting it you are potentially freeing up all of those faculty members.

Senator Stanish - That's right

Senator Lucey - It's just a numbers games that's all I'm saying. A number of Senators could potentially be missing for very valid reasons.

Senator Stanish - Senator King Do you feel students in general whether personally or the future for us would have more of a conflict on Reading Day at 4:00 than noon or is it to just get things done?

Senator King - To me, personally I would say a two hour break would be nice because if I am studying all morning but then there are others that would say they want to study straight through and not be interrupted. But for me I would say that I wouldn't mind coming in at noon for this but that's just me.

Senator Bedell - I guess I am a little concerned and I know that obviously Senators could leave if they had a 6:00 exam and but doing it right before the 6:00 exam so I don't remember what the 4:00-6:00 Wednesday class final time is because usually finals are back to back like that so I wonder if we either would be leave the final after that time and I don't know what day of the week that falls on.

Senator Stanish - We did look at that as well so if you do have a class on Wednesday 4:00-6:00 which none of do because we are here but the final exam is scheduled for Thursday 3:30-5:30. We did consider that as well and again we continue to consider that. My concern with that is that it gets later in the week and so my fear is that students would be leaving already if their exams are done. Many many exams are finished by Thursday and there start to be less and less students on campus. Again, it's a different day of the week and a different time than we would expect so other folks may accidentally schedule other meetings not remembering the Senate is at that time. So that was my concern but it is a consideration.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - If we are concerned about hitting that 6:00 time we could do 3:00-5:00.

Senator Stanish - We could

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - It would still be late in the day.

Senator Stanish - We could and it would give an hour.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne - I think I could manage or the Secretary could manage to send out a few reminders.

Senator King - I know we all have Wednesdays 4:00-6:00 free for the final for that period Thursday at 3:30 but are there any Monday or Tuesday classes that are taking place where they're final would be the Wednesday 4:00-6:00 slot?

Senator Stanish - Yes. So if you have a class Monday Wednesday at 2:00 your final is Wednesday at 3:30. That is a conflict that we ran into this year.

Senator Lucey - How many of you have a final at 6:00 on Monday this semester?

Senator Bedell - We have at least one.

Senator Stanish - We can certainly look at some data and find out how many classes are offered and potentially couldn't attend.

Parliamentarian Weed - May I have courtesy of the floor?

Senator Stanish - Sure

Parliamentarian Weed - This is really out of place I'm sure but it seems to me that we reserved Reading Day for reading or for academic pursuits. We can't schedule an athletic event and I think what we are doing is watering it down and taking faculty away from the students. I am not sure we should be doing that but that is just me.

Senator Stanish - How would everyone feel about a quick little poll? We could put together a quick online poll you could kind of give a preference and feedback. Would people be willing to do something like that? I know its one more thing to fill up your inbox. We could also give you some data on the number of classes that happen at certain times and you could make an informed decision based on number of Senators and looking at number of classes. Any other thoughts on that? Will try and make the final decision hopefully by our next Senate meeting so we can plan for the fall semester and we can schedule those. Unless there are any other questions or discussion that concludes the Senate Executive Committee Report and we will move on to the Academic Overview Committee.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly - Given the hour I am going to move right into our business. We have our two final reviews to present to you. The first one is the American Studies Review. We went through the entire process and were visited by our outside reviewers, they wrote a report. A little bit of feedback from the program and the Dean and have a written report to reflect all of that documentation. It was approved by

the full committee on March 22 and you have seen a copy of the AOC report attached to the Senate documentation.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the American Studies Program be accepted and approved by the Senate.

Senator Blatchly - By tradition I would like to ask a member of the subcommittee to present the major strengths and recommendations from this and American Studies is Senator Sapeta. I am going to turn it over to him for presentation.

Senator Sapeta - The external review process was also efficient and resulted in a very positive report. The program is very healthy with a growing student body and diverse faculty with wide ranging experience. One concern that the External Reviews stated and I want to mention revolves around the lack of faculty members for that program and I am going to read a little from the report of that study and talk about the recommendations. "At present there are five tenure-track faculty members who teach core courses in American Studies. Professor Michael Antonucci has a 67 percent American Studies appointment and a 33 percent appointment in English. Professor Richard Lebeaux holds a 50 per cent appointment with both American Studies Program and English Department. Professor Patricia Pedroza is 67 per cent in Women's and Gender Studies and 33 percent in American Studies. Professors Mark Long and Sally Joyce also serve as Core Faculty. Much of the course offerings for American Studies majors are provided by affiliate faculty, both tenure-track and adjunct, from various departments. As you can see Professor Antonucci is the Chair of the program however he is not fulltime in the program and this was a situation in both studies actually presented to us. Our recommendations are as follows and there are five of them: 1) The College should consider the needs of American Studies when tenure-track lines become available. 2.) The College should consider options for how best to fulfill the service obligations of the program. Currently, these are done mostly by the Chair of American Studies. Options include -- but are not limited to -- making the Chair of American Studies a 100% American Studies appointment and/or making release time for chairs an issue at the next faculty contract negotiations 3.) More effective communication between American Studies and appropriate departments is needed, including larger discussions on when cross-listing courses can be mutually beneficial for various programs on campus 4.) The program should develop a robust plan for faculty development, including the possibility of overload banking and better management of service requirements 5.) The program should consider enhanced student support for the program's IT needs and other tasks. That is basically the report."

Senator Stanish - Thank you, any discussion on the American Studies Program report?

Provost Treadwell - Just one question what is overload banking as you describe it.

Senator Sapeta - For example the contract requires 12 credit hours in one semester and 12 in another one. You could do a swapping for example you could have 16 in one semester and 8 in another one. That would allow you to maybe use your time in a different way. Its only part of the solution but it is actually happening on campus in some departments.

Provost Treadwell - Yes, I just wanted to make sure thank you.

Senator Martin - I have a question on a paragraph on page 42 the second to last paragraph. I didn't understand how the paragraph was written could you elaborate on it informally. Specifically, I don't understand the passage that says another troubling point is made in the self-study: "faculty members are senior enough to say no to chores and tasks that are necessary to maintaining the program's viability, including, organizational efforts with students, promotional efforts during orientation, advising, co-curricular initiatives, assessment, trans-departmental outreach, and administrative communication and

collaboration". Then it goes on to elaborate that the situation is likely the result of faculty being spread thin by their joint appointments. I guess I am not following.

Senator Sapeta - This quote was directly taken from the self-study and was not addressed by any of the other review committee so we felt it was important to actually include that in the report. The five people who are in the department but are in different departments they may be spread way to thin to actually be able to help the Chair with all the usual chores that are required and some of them being more in one department than the other department. This was our way to underline and underscore that there is a resource need for more time and faculty members to do this work.

Senator Martin - Can I ask to clarify the question?

Senator Stanish - Please

Senator Martin - Is the implication that the faculty are short changing American Studies in favor of their other commitments?

Senator Sapeta - I don't know it was not in the report but the quote was directly in the report and so we found it interesting that it wasn't responded to by or addressed by either the Dean or by the reviewers.

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Blatchly - Item two is a Film Studies Program Review to present. Again visited by outside reviewers in December and the time of receipt of the report from them and we have also received some communication from the Dean and the program and we incorporated that in the AOC Report which is attached to the Senate documentation.

Motion: The AOC moves that its report on the review of the Film Studies Program be accepted and approved by the Senate.

Senator Blatchly - Again in standard fashion here I will ask Senator Hix to present the summary and recommendations from this report.

Senator Hix - I did want to point out the review of the self-study for the Film Department was very lengthy and we thought extremely thorough and extremely thoughtful. We were also extremely impressed with the external reviewers who were at a high level of technological expertise and showed a lot of professionalism in their review.

The self study states that the Film Department offers a B.A. in Film Studies and students select one of two options: Film Production and/or Film Criticism. The program's approach and core considerations require film majors to immerse themselves in the reciprocal relationship between these complementary areas of study. The external reviewers noted the film department has quickly become one of the largest and most desirable majors on campus. It also fills both a state and regional niche in providing a relatively affordable and strong media arts education alongside a robust liberal arts curriculum.

The Film Studies Department at Keene State College is a vital and unique program with promising aspirations to develop a comprehensive, practical, and engaged plan of studies integrating film production, film studies and social awareness. With intellectual breadth, the curriculum incorporates the fundamental concerns of a liberal arts education into a thoughtful, media specific interplay with film

theory and filmmaking. The self study points out that: the film program embodies the mission of Keene State College by connecting critical thinking, creative production, and public service. According to the Keene State College Factbook, between 2006 and 2011 the program more than quadrupled in size, growing from 42 majors in 2006 to 180 in 2011.

The Film Studies Department is proud of the work of its five tenured/tenure-track faculty members. The external reviewers concurred, indicating that “it's talented, accomplished, and dedicated young core faculty” is one of the programs most salient virtues. Film Studies students have a strong sense of community that demonstrates mutual cooperation and participation in which they assist one another with filmmaking projects and become involved in extracurricular student organizations.

The Film Society screens 35mm films for the campus and local community. Keene Television has students producing TV programming for the local community and recording campus sports and academic events. The department makes clear that it holds a unique position in providing a balanced education in Film Studies as well as being a unique repository for rare and historically significant films. It is only one of two such departments in the state of New Hampshire. After construction of the new Visual Media Arts Center, they feel that the department and its programs will become of even more import and significance to the local community through such events as continuous film programming and organizing screening and appearances by filmmakers. There is a clear need for more non-contingent faculty lines and to convert a valuable and highly contributing adjunct faculty to a 3-year clinical contract line. The service and advising load for current non-contingent faculty is unsustainable and additional student advising support should be made available until new faculty are in place. Regular reviews of teaching should be implemented for all adjunct and tenure track teaching staff.

The equipment management process and associated staff responsibilities should be completely redefined. The vending of production equipment should be closely coordinated with course needs and course rosters to improve student access to production equipment. A standard of professional production tools, including digital equipment, and related practices must be established. In addition, the creation of a staffed Media Infrastructure/Digital Warehouse must be given full consideration. The Film Studies faculty members should continue envisioning their space needs in the new VMAC including such issues as extended access and the concept of a Communal Media Lab to promote collaborative and interdisciplinary learning opportunities for students across the campus.

A KSC Film Archive should be considered in order to provide a repository to house this important collection which would also provide an area of study for students. The department should develop a plan that balances the essential curricular concerns: Film Theory, Film History, Motion Picture Production, and liberal arts/humanist values, and the subsequent efforts to mold, evolve, and expand the curriculum. The plan should include “a unified pedagogical experience” for first-year students and a capstone experience for each individual student. The film faculty are urged to implement their suggestion to cross-train their Production faculty. The department should consider planning for a BFA component which includes developing more intensive, higher level courses. The department needs a website presence for the program including the achievement highlights of current students and alumni. I have summarized a lot. It was a wonderful study.

Senator Stanish - Thank you Senator Hix. Any discussion on the Film Studies Report?

Senator Darby - I have a question based on the statement under facilities and there may not be the answer considering the recent budget constraints but what is the latest on the VMAC and when it is being built? Where is it in queue or is there a queue?

Provost Treadwell - Thank you for the question as you are all aware that we under a master planning process right now and there are three options that are being discussed at the public sessions to gather feedback and include various versions of how the VMAC or the creative processes of the departments effected by the VMAC and its virtual conception will be addressed. So it is in existence and in with regard to placeholder or process we also had a capital request that is pending at the University Systems and this is part of our biannual budget request for capital infusement for the VMAC project. That placeholder has been in existence since last spring and continues to be carried forward but it is part of the state budget process that we all know. So it is a placeholder and there is financial commitment and also master planning commitment but the ultimate decision will be part of this master planning deliberation that is underway right now very actively and will continue over the next few months but it is a key capital investment and commitment for the campus. Does that answer?

Senator Darby - Yes

Senator Stanish - Thank you. Any other discussion on the Film Studies report?

Senator Darby - On the same point on page 46, under facilities the first sentence, A Visual Media Arts Center (VMAC) is planned to be built in the near future and faculty from film, art, music, theater arts and creative writing need to start collaborative discussions and I would submit to say that this is a little unfair. I think that there have been conversations about this in the past. We haven't had architects here but there has been a process that all these programs I think did participate in. Just to be fair I think conversations started to maybe to develop the composition might be a fairer way to say that. Thank you

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion on the report?

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Blatchly - Really just had a third item and that's an item of thanks. As you see Senator Hix and Senator Sapeta presenting the results there is really the tip of the iceberg. There is a lot of work that is behind that not only by our committee but of course by the programs and Dean's involved in the process to carefully review and what they do to produce the self-studies so there is an enormous amount of work in that. There is a commitment also by the college to do something about this. To take the recommendations that we have made and try to process them. There will be recommendations both from the Keene side and outside the college try to access those and to the best extend possible make an action plan to address various suggestions within the program. It's an enormous amount of work and it's work that has been done for the last decade or so and so there are a lot of ghosts of the AOC members past also in the room here and I want to sort of thank everybody that has been involved in this process because it is quite a big deal of work. Thank you to everyone, thank you.

Senator Stanish - I want to add my thanks as well. Thank you Senator Blatchly for chairing the AOC the past few years. I want to thank the others as well and to all the members of the AOC this year and in the past years. I agree there are many around and extended thanks to those on campus too. I think too as the committee ride off into sunset, I do not think at all that it's a reflection that we don't value the committees work but I think we value the committees work very much and that the committee has done such an excellent job over the last 10 years of developing this process you almost put yourself out of job. We can now take these processes and have them handled more in an administrative way because they are functioning so well and use the Senate's time to look at other issues. Thank you for all your hard work on the AOC over many many years we really do appreciate it. Any other questions for the AOC? We will move on the Academic Standards.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Lucey - There is nothing to report.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Darby - Since our last meeting as a Senate the SCC met and reviewed IIGEOOL 340 course, this proposal was not approved by the SCC in an earlier meeting, but the proposal was referred back to committee by the full Senate at its most recent meeting. Following a discussion with the proposal sponsor (Dr. Edward Pokras) and a lengthy debate among committee members, the proposal to add IIGEOOL 340 was again not approved by the SCC by a vote of 3-3-0-1. IIGEOOL 340 is titled The Environment of Adventure. The vote again reflects a divided committee opinion about the proposal. Concerns about the proposal include: 1) the SCC is uncertain about the criteria by which II course proposals are to be evaluated; 2) the course has been successfully offered three times as an INGEOL course (INGEOL 399), and it's unclear to SCC why the course is to be designated as an II interdisciplinary course; 3) SCC is uncertain whether the course meets the rigor of its proposed upper-level designation.

The next item is something to be amended since we have moved our meeting but the SCC began taking up the issue of revisions to the curriculum guidelines, and will finalize the revisions at its final meeting of the academic year. At the present time, the SCC has no plans to overhaul the curriculum guidelines; we will undertake revisions that provide additional clarity and guidance to the campus community on the following issues: curriculum development; the approval process for all curriculum proposals; and clear, open, and collegial communication among academic programs at the college. Our next meeting is next Wednesday.

Senator Stanish - Great, thank you. Any comments or questions on the SCC report?

Senator Blatchly - Does the committee have a sense that the sponsor of the IIGEOOL course has a clearish path to correct where you perceive as a deficit in the proposal. I am kind of curious and maybe this is just my curiosity but I am just wondering where this meets the sponsor of the proposal if they have an avenue to correct this. It seems like they could go in a number of different directions. They could continue to offer it as an INGEOL course so I am just curious where that conversation is.

Senator Darby - It is my understanding that the proposal sponsor is in advisement with his home program, Geology.

Senator Blatchly - Thank you

Senator Stanish - Any other discussion? Seeing none that will conclude the committee report.

VI. New Business

Nothing to report

VII. Adjournment 5:42pm

Respectfully submitted – Cheryl Martin

