

**Minutes of the 385th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, September 10, 2008**

Call To Order: 4:00pm

Roll Call:

Absent: Meriam Pages, Rosemary Gianno

Announcements:

New Senate Clerk – Cheryl Martin

Re-elected Parliamentarian – Ann Atkinson

Senator Stoup announced we have By-laws that reflect our traditional floor procedures and effective ways of getting our business done. Discussions go through the chair as opposed to directly to each other. Comments are kept to two minutes and should remain to the motion on the floor. If discussions on any particular topic go over fifteen minutes, we will need a motion to continue discussion otherwise Senator Stroup will call the question. Where the by-laws are not explicit, Roberts Rules of Order preside.

Senator Stroup passed around an updated membership of Senate Sub committees. Charges for these committees are spelled out explicitly in the by-laws.

Update of December Senate meeting dates: December 3rd Rhodes Hall N210
December 10th Mountain View, if necessary

Secretary Report:

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 383rd and 384th meetings of the Senate of Keene State College

Discussion: Senator Dunn – In regard to the 383rd meeting, the minutes do not reflect the language that the SCC brought forward the revised curriculum guidelines, revised course proposal form, revised program proposal form and the revised signature page form.

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as amended as an accurate record.

Courtesy Period:

Senator Timney reported the following event:

Wednesday, December 3rd - Owl's Nest beginning at 7:00p.m. or 8:00p.m. An evening of comedy to include humorous news stories and perhaps some stand up routines.

Senator Stroup reported the following events:

Tuesday, September 16th - Student Center Appian Way Conference Room, 12:00p.m. Professor Anna Schure will be speaking on the title, *Does Reading Literature Make Us More Compassionate?*

Wednesday, September 17th - Mountain View Room, 4:00p.m. *The Omnivore's Dilemma*, by Michael Pollan, is the "Keene Is Reading" book for the 2008-09 academic year. Dr. Renate Gebauer, professor of biology and environmental studies, will give a brief presentation, "Corn, Meat Lots, and the Environment," followed by a discussion.

Thursday, September 25th - Mountain View Room, 4:00p.m. First Adjunct reading – Six adjunct faculty members who teach writing at KSC – Rodger Martin, Mimi Morton, Ali Lichtenstein, Ellen Moynihan, Jack Hitchner and Jeff Friedman - will read their poems and stories.

Senator Denehy reported the following:

The spring 2009 schedule is in process of being put together and should be ready by September 29th. This will provide three weeks for advising before spring registration which begins on October 20th.

President Giles-Gee reported the following:

Correction for the record:

President Giles-Gee wanted to clarify the statement in the Equinox regarding the Amethyst Initiative. She did not sign the statement and had issued no opinion. She agreed to a debate but did not want to put forth a position. The online version is correct but the paper copy did get out.

The Search for Vice President for Advancement is ongoing. The pool is strong and the search committee will be reviewing candidates on September 12th. The Chief Officer for Diversity and Multiculturalism search is expected to close next week

Reports of Committees:

Executive Committee:

Senator Stroup stated the Senate web site has been updated with by-laws, membership and motions that are in front of the Senate.

The Senate floor was turned over to Provost Netzhammer to discuss the proposal on a jointly offered nursing program with UNH.

Provost Netzhammer gave some background and information from questions he has received pertaining to the state wide nursing initiative. In mid 2005, the Governor and Chancellor had discussions addressing a great shortage of nurses in New Hampshire by bringing nursing education to all of the system institutions. Dean Gordon Leversee began participating in discussions around what this might look like. Who would have responsibilities? Was this something that even had a remote possibility of working? What would a trans located or shared program actually look like?

This past April, we were summoned to a meeting that was designed to get discussions moving again. Provost Netzhammer and Provost Julie Bernier from Plymouth State became involved in direct discussions with our counterparts at UNH and reported back to the Governor.

~This is a state wide initiative that we have been asked to participate in.

~It is an initiative worth bringing forward and having discussions about on our campus.

~Students would be admitted to both KSC and UNH. They would be on the KSC campus for all four years of their academic undergraduate program.

~Students would be receiving a bachelor of science in Nursing, and graduate with KSC students as part of our Commencement ceremonies.

~A nursing major for an accredited program is 129 credits with 80 of those credits consisting of nursing courses offered by UNH and the rest offered by KSC integrated studies program along with 3 or 4 allied courses.

~We have received a curriculum draft from UNH that includes all the nursing courses. Ann Rancourt is putting the general education courses with that and should have something to share with people in the next couple of weeks.

~There is no need to approve the curriculum. It is a curriculum that currently exist, is approved by the Board of Trustees and UNH offers it.

~SAPC is not waiting for us to approve a curriculum before we offer it. The nursing program curriculum as it exists, is being offered by UNH and would be approved through the UNH process. The actual arrangement of this will have to go through The President's council and the BOT for approval

~Accredited and professional programs because of certifications, require higher credits and there is no opportunity for students to take a double major and graduate in 4 years.

~Most of the UNH faculty are clinical faculty and would be UNH employees that would be hired by, work for and paid by UNH. They would be housed on the KSC campus but working primarily at Cheshire Medical Center (CMC).

~UNH and CMC are interested in providing much of the space for the nursing courses at CMC.

~Library resources and access to databases would be provided by and paid for by UNH.

President Giles-Gee explained the public institutions that represent the system are here for the purpose of providing education broadly across the state. When certain institutions have unique programs that are in demand by other parts of the state, the question is how those programs will be delivered? There is an interest in terms of how we can assist in the delivery of a nursing program.

Senator Stroup noted the very good work of the AOC last year, such as, thoroughly revising the guidelines, flowcharts and even developing a schedule that goes through 2025 of program review. The plan had been to continue under the old rules with review of chemistry that is ongoing right now whether this was the year the AOC didn't need a full slate of membership as stated in the by-laws. After discussion in the SEC, the decision was made that it would be useful and the AOC should be fully charged.

The SEC report shows last year as a sub group of the ASC, there was a task force on the calendar that had a number of recommendations they wanted considered and followed up on. One charge to that group is to go back to that list of recommendations and see which might be considered and come forward for motion in the upcoming year.

The second that is included in the SEC report is the catalog currently lacks any policy about minimum or maximum credits for major programs. The ASC is charged with drafting a policy for a possible maximum number of credits for majors that includes affiliated courses required for those majors. This should include a mechanism of appeal for variances from this policy for programs specific accreditations purposes.

Senator Stroup mentioned the discrepancies in the catalog, between 36 and 80 is an extraordinary difference and gives us reason for necessary discussion about the relation of the major to the educated person with more clarity and consistency.

Senator Stroup: If discussion and information comes forward in a consequential way, catalog deadline is not as important as the results of the discussions. Senator Stroup also mentioned that we do not have residency requirements for majors. The ASC is charged with bringing a residency requirement for majors motion forward.

Provost Netzhammer clarified there is a NEASC and college wide policy. In order to earn a KSC degree, twenty five percent of credits must be completed at KSC.

Curriculum Committee:

Senator Dunn reported the fall meeting dates have been set. Reminder - all curriculum proposals are due to the School Curriculum committees and Interdisciplinary ISP committee by October 1st. They will then be forwarded to the SCC by October 22nd. The SCC will be meeting three times in October and twice in November along with any additional meetings as needed.

SCC curriculum guidelines, updated course proposal and program proposal forms have been attached to the senate packet.

Senator Dunn is following up with the deans on how well the intent of curriculum changes form was used at the end of last semester. She will provide an update at the next Senate meeting as to the success of that form.

The SCC has a proposal for history and will be meeting on October 1st to review it.

New Business:

Senator Timney has been asked to bring forward the following questions:

- 1) Are students being told it is illegal to put posters on the wall that contain alcohol advertisements?
- 2) Is it true that students are being written up by residence attendants because they have been playing Beirut, a drinking game with water?
- 3) What are the schools policies are for freedom of expression?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne responded based with the understanding of issues that have recently arisen. It is not the posters but the boxes that once contained thirty racks. This has raised two concerns, first is fire safety and the second is the college has a current policy that students who are under age, can not possess containers that were designed or designated that once contained alcohol. The second part concerning the playing of the game Beirut with water, students cannot possess paraphernalia that has the intent or designation to be used for the abuse of alcohol.

Senator Timney is concerned with establishing preconceived intent

Vice President Andy Robinson stated materials that would ordinarily be used for drinking games are not allowed.

Senator Stroup wanted to make sure the conversation as it has been raised as new business, is relevant to the mission of the Senate.

Senator Clemenson stated it would be helpful to have clarification as to what students can and can not be documented or written up for.

Adjournment: The senate voted to adjourn at 5:25p.m.

Submitted by: Cheryl Martin 9/18/08

**Minutes of the 386th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, October 8th, 2008**

I. Call To Order: 4:00pm

II. Roll Call: All Senators present

III. Secretary Report:

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 385th meeting of the Senate of Keene State College

Discussion: Senator Timney – Friendly motion to make minor corrections on the 4th page. SSC should be ASC and NEAC should be NEASC

Vote: The Senate voted to accept the minutes as amended as an accurate record.

IV. Courtesy Period:

Senator Rust reported the following:

The Continuing Education office is seeking course proposals for summer 2009 by December 12th. This will allow courses to be listed in the Discovery magazine that goes out in January.

Provost Netzhammer reported the following updates:

The Nursing program is being delayed by UNH due to a process of taking their Department of Nursing and turning it into a School of Nursing.

The college received a 1.1 million dollar gift of art work from Robert Hubbard. Conversations are beginning with the Diversity Commission to lead us in discussions as to the forum and approach to the appropriate placements of some controversial art, particularly, the King of the Maquas piece, a 4 ft high bronze statue by Jud Hartmann.

President Giles-Gee reported the following:

She would like to congratulate those who participated in the “Why 21” drinking forum including Dan Saucier and Andy Robinson for facilitating the coordination and bringing balance to a very tough issue.

The Integrated Learning program at Keene State has been designated a lead campus action network which will serve as a role model for a number of institutions across the country. Congratulations to all faculty for development of a program that is nationally recognized.

V. Subcommittee Reports:

Executive Committee:

Senator Stroup reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet and reported the following:

Thank you to Senator Jean for her continuing work with Dean Leversee in filling Senate memberships in the School of Sciences.

Resignation of Senator Payson due to medical issues. A new call for a 3 year position as an at large faculty member will be going out after this meeting.

Extending courtesy to the floor to co-coordinator of the ISPC, Professor Pete Nielsen, to help answer questions.

4 motions were approved unanimously by the ISPC and sent to the SEC to be brought to the Senate floor or the appropriate sub committees.

One motion involves the Thinking and Writing program and Advance Placement test. There are issues involving admission criteria and needs to go the standards committee first.

Motion: By Senator Stroup to approve ISPC course numbering policy. Numbers for ISP and non-ISP courses cannot have the same number (ex. HIST 161 and IHIST 161).

Senator Dunn questioned how departments would be notified of this process and would they have to go through the curriculum process to change their courses?

Senator Hanrahan - Will this effect the concept of departments trying to negotiate different types of the same section to satisfy both the traditional general ed students and the ISP students?

Professor Nielsen explained:

- The Senate would notify departments offering courses under both categories
- There is an existing curriculum review process done by the Senate
- This pertains to a very small number of courses

Problems have arisen particularly for first year students - they know they have to take a HIST course and sign up for it, realizing later, they really needed the IHIST course. We do not want to get into a situation where students want to trade courses back and forth given the outcomes are very different.

Friendly Amendment from Senator Timney – The Senate suspends normal SCC procedures and have course numbering automatically be approved by the Senate. The information would then be forwarded to the SCC to go to the catalog editor

Senator Stroup doesn't understand the friendly amendment because departments have reasons for numbering courses not only at the 100 level but also in the 10ths. He questions a blanket of sending things right to the catalog and not taking into account each unique case, departments number their courses.

Senator Timney explained departments would be free to change their course numbers and just inform the SCC of that change. It would not have to go through any review other than notification

Senator Warner asked what the expectations would be about changing course numbers, and would departments be guided with that or would it be left up to them.

Professor Nielsen explained we do not want to dictate to any department what course numbers they have to use. It is not up to the Integrative Studies Committee requesting this conceptual change or the role of the Senate to dictate a particular course number. It

should go back to the department for their decision. Senator Timney's friendly amendment is trying to facilitate the process so that these changes can go into the 2009/10 catalog.

Senator Timney requested the friendly amendment pulled and will put forward a motion as a separate piece.

Senator Denehy asked when this would take effect, spring 09. or fall 09?

Senator Stroup advised any actions taken this fall would take effect next fall.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion as stated in the Senate packet

Discussion:

Senator Timney moved that departments be allowed to make these changes with direct submission to the SCC suspending normal review. He wanted to know what the deadline is.

Senator Dunn replied October 22, if changes were sent to her by December 1 that would be sufficient time for those changes to be communicated to the editor of the catalog.

New Motion: By Senator Timney, in regard to the required course re-numbering just passed by the Senate, normal rules of curriculum approval be suspended in regard to number changes with exceptions of obvious mistakes caught by the SCC. These changes would be submitted directly to the SCC by December 1st.

Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson reported she does not see how this motion separate and apart from motions brought forward by the Executive Committee can fall outside the 48-hour rule. With regard to motions, you can send information to a particular committee and have it come back at the next meeting through that committee. She does not see anything in the bylaws that allows this motion to fall outside the 48 hour rule.

Motion: By Senator Stroup to approve the IQL Course Alternatives. New catalog copy and Advising Statement.

Discussion:

Senator Timney asked about a time limit. Objectives may be similar, but are not accomplishing the same things we want in an IQL course. This is being done primarily because we do not have enough IQL courses.

Professor Nielsen explained:

The rationale states this alternative would be re-examined prior to 2010-2011. In conversations with people that are teaching these courses that would be alternatives, by the time next year roles around, we may actually be dealing with several courses that all have IQL as the prefix. Professors teaching Math141 or Math120 would be more than happy to change them to IQL120 or IQL141 so that all students would meet the requirement that they take an IQL course.

We cannot offer enough sections of IQL101

Senator Pages wanted to know if IQL courses are being developed in the meantime.

Professor Nielsen explained it is strictly resources. Faculty was invited to participate in IQL. It comes down to how many faculty are willing to participate in this particular aspect and if departments have the resources to reallocate faculty time away from the course of their majors.

Senator Antonucci stated not all alternative courses have an "I" prefix.

Professor Nielson informed that the only solution at this time, is to take a sub set of courses that have at least common content outcomes to the IQL, hoping that within the next 12 months, we will be in a position to offer everyone some type of IQL with the "I" prefix

Senator Pages questioned if we should form a committee or design incentives to have faculty teach an IQL course.

Professor Nielson advised there is an ITW subcommittee that encourages faculty to apply to teach an IQL course and they have regular meetings with cohort faculty that are. What makes IQL different from other components of the Integrative study program, is that we hope we can put them into context of the integrative studies program meeting the integrative studies outcomes, as well as, the content of quantitative reasoning and quantitative literacy. Students would be able to choose different skill levels of IQL based courses

Senator Gianni asked why this is not going through the regular curriculum process or to the SCC.

Senator Timney explained the Integrative studies program and the council committee that it came from, was directed from the SEC and approved by the Senate.

Senator Dunn stated the SCC has looked at ISPC policies in the past.

Senator McDonald replied the SEC did not look at this from the ISPC as a curriculum change. This is a statement reflecting what is currently being done with how the Elliot Center has handled IQL substitutions and alternatives for the past two years, recognizing this has been done based on consultation in terms of content. In the short term, students need to know what options are available to them.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: From the ISPC to approve restructure of the Integrative Studies

Professor Nielsen advised corrections to the chart in the Proposed Composition column are as follows:

6th row down should read – 2 Professional Studies Faculty (1 from EDUC; 1 from TDS, PE, or HLSC)

8th row down should read – Interdisciplinary Subcommittee Coordinator

- The current 3 chairs of the assessment committee are faculty members.
- We are reducing the number of elected faculty to run more efficient.
- All courses across the areas of foundations, perspectives and interdisciplinary must have at least one of the integrative outcomes.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Academic Overview Committee:

Senator Smith reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

Academic Standards Committee:

Senator Jean reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

Motion: By Senator Jean to recommend no mandatory campus-wide or departmental meetings to be scheduled for PAT, Operating, and Complementary Staff. Supervisors are to make this a non-critical Day, avoiding the scheduling of sensitive or mandatory meetings.

Friendly amendment from Senator Dunn that on Fall Break Day be added to the end of the first sentence in the motion.

Provost Netzhammer wanted to make clear that this is a recommendation to the President.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion as amended.

Senator Jean advised changing Fall Break day to Fall Reading day needs further discussions.

Motion: By Senator Jean to recommend that College Relations create, post and maintain a Campus Wide Holiday and Social Event Calendar to assist with program planning (As recommended by the Calendar Ad Hoc committee in their October 2007 report). There is to be a link from the Academic calendar to both the Holiday and Social Event Calendars and vice versa.

Discussion: Senator Dunn wanted to know what happens to the recommendations.

Provost Netzhammer explained Ann Miller's office maintains the Academic Calendar and brings it to the Academic Standards Committee.

Senator Jean explained there would be 3 separate calendars with links between them.

Vote: The Senate voted to recommend to College Relations.

Motion: By Senator Jean to recommend that "Classes and Schedule Adjustment begin at 8:00 a.m." be changed to "Classes and Schedule Adjustment begin at 8:00 a.m. (1st quarter begins)", "Semester Mid-Point" be changed to "Semester Mid-Point (2nd quarter begins)", in January, "Classes and Schedule Adjustment begin at 8:00 a.m." be changed to "Classes and Schedule begin at 8:00 a.m. (3rd quarter begins)", and in March, "Semester Mid-Point" be changed to "Semester Mid-Point (4th quarter begins)".

Discussion: Senator Denehy explained students who looked at the calendar acknowledged Fall Break Day and ignored the word day, but noticed 2nd quarter begins a week later and thought they had a week off.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Jean reported the following:

Further discussions are taking place concerning the Academic Honesty Policy and motions should be forthcoming.

Do the sanctions meet the violation?

Discussion of the computer program students are required to complete if they accept sanction

What are the consequences if they do not comply?

What is the Chairs role in the process?

Maximum credits for majors have been put on hold.

Motion: By Senator Jean, the ACS makes the motion that students be required to complete 25% of their courses in their major in order to receive a Keene State College degree.

Friendly amendment from Senator Abernethy - motion should say 25% of their courses in their major at Keene State in order to receive a Keene State College degree.

Senator Rust mentioned it states 30 credits are required to be taken at Keene State College but some of our programs are now more than 120 credits. Do we need to change that number as well?

Discussion: Provost Netzhammer explained that in Datatel we use credits instead of percents. Implementation of this will not be a simple task but will be a task that will be accomplished.

Amendment: Senator Timney requested that the wording be changed to 25% or 12 credits, whichever is greater.

Vote on Amendment: The Senate voted the amendment does not hold.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion as amended in the friendly amendment.

Curriculum Committee:

Senator Dunn reviewed the minutes included in the packet. For the record, the SCC reviewed and discussed all of the course proposals and program proposals that are being put forward this evening.

Motion: By Senator Dunn, the SCC moves that the II 321 Course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Writing Minor be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the English Major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the American Studies Major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Senator Dunn reported SCC members discussed the updates of the Honors Program Proposal with regards to the extension for departments to submit advisory opinions. The SCC has concerns that they were not consulted about the proposed deadline and it did not come through the SCC. Departments would not have ample time to provide an advisory opinion with the traditional 2 weeks that is outlined in the curriculum guidelines. It is just short of 2 weeks, but also shortchanges the work of the School Curriculum committee. For this particular proposal they have about a week and a half.

Senator Gianni stated concerns that the SCC was not the primary subcommittee in terms of changing the time.

Senator Stroup explained the proposal received by the new the director of the Honors program, Professor Frink, was sent to dept chairs and coordinators the afternoon of the 30th. Posted Senate Guidelines are for October 1st. Senator Stroup sent a recommendation of when materials should go to the schools, along with an October 22 deadline of when materials should go to the curriculum committee. This would fall within parameters of not changing all the other steps of the process. One possible solution, if

we had a couple more weeks, materials the School curriculum committee would be looking at, would be the same as the contextual materials for the full senate.

Senator Stroup stated this is a complex matter and hopes that the Senate can think of ways to facilitate discussion over the coming months that fall within the parameters of the work of the School Curriculum Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee in a way that adheres to the process.

Senator Gianni wanted to know why the proposal was sent to Senator Stroup.

Senator Stroup replied he did not receive it as Chair of the Senate, but as Chair of the English department. The proposal was to be shared with colleagues within the English department and have an advisory discussion and vote.

Senator Dunn voiced in terms of a procedural point, the School Curriculum committee Chairs should be part of conversations because they are on the timeline. If advisory opinions go back to Dr. Frink on Monday October 13th and revisions are needed, it will give them even a shorter time frame.

Senator Timney stated there needs to be reconsideration as to the criteria and how this is going to be handled.

Senator Dunn reported they have proposals coming in October 22 and the SCC may not have the proposal reviewed for the Senate by November 12.

Provost Netzhammer stated there is no issue of meeting a system deadline because the proposal does not have to go to system. He didn't want to disregard or disrespect the important work done by the Honors committee. Helen Frink and the Honors council were responding to a report they were asked to revise curriculum to. It was delivered to them at the last senate meeting in the spring. They had two weeks in the spring and one month in the fall to get the proposal ready to go to the School Curriculum Committees and get advisory opinions. It is more important to have deliberation completed and go to the Senate. We have plenty of time this semester to get it done for when the catalog copy is due.

Motion: By Provost Netzhammer Refer this back to Senate Curriculum Committee and give Senator Dunn the flexibility to extend deadlines for the School Curriculum Committees if she determines they are not able to make the deadlines that have been posted.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Senator Stroup moves to charge the SEC to look at the process of connections between the various groups that provide the oversight for programs that are complex in this manner, such as, the ISP as well as the Honors Program.

VI. New Business:

Senator Timney would like to see all courses in same category (ex: all IA & IH courses) listed together online.

VII. Adjournment: The Senate voted to adjourn at 6:14 p.m.

Resubmitted by Cheryl Martin 11/16/08

**Minutes of the 387th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF
KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, November 12th, 2008**

I. Call To Order: 4:10pm

II. Roll Call:

Absent – Lynn Rust

Excused – Karen Stanish

III. Secretary Report:

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 386th meeting of the Senate of Keene State College

Discussion:

Senator Gianni stated she is concerned with a variety of discussions being omitted from the 386th Senate Meeting Minutes regarding the Honors and ISP programs.

Senator Stroup explained as it is currently written, at bottom of page 7 before new business, Senator Stroup moves to charge the SEC to look at the process of connections between the various groups that provide the oversight for programs that are complex in this manner, such as, the ISP as well as the Honors program. It is something that is on going but amendments to the minutes, to accurately reflect what was discussed would be helpful.

Senator Dunn mentioned specifics regarding the ISP and Non ISP course numbering, in terms of who would be responsible for identifying those courses in the current catalog and what kind of time line departments would have to submit those changes to the chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee. As she recalled from the last meeting the intention was to have the fall 2009 catalog updated with the policy of ISP and Non ISP courses not sharing the same course number in departments.

Senator Stroup stated it is in section 5 on page 2 of the minutes. What is not clear in the minutes is the timeline of departments being notified and to make adjustments with a new number.

Senator Stroup moved to go back to relevant sections of the recording to clarify and bring back to the December 3rd Senate Meeting along with the minutes from this meeting.

Motion: Senator Stroup moved to table the approval of minutes until the two sections have been reviewed from the tape and amended to the minutes.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Related to the Secretary's report Senator Stroup reported election results for the vacant seats.

Stephen Lucy - 3-year position

Lynn Richardson - at-large position.

Karen Stanish - one-year position from the Sciences

Jeff Ness will be filling the fourth student position until the end of the semester.

IV. Courtesy Period:

Senator Saucier - December 3rd, the KSC Jazz Ensemble will be having their annual concert at 7:30 p.m. at the Redfern Arts Center.

Senator Anna Cerilli – November 19th - 22nd, Presentation of Matchmaker will be at the Redfern Arts Center.

V. Subcommittee Reports:

Executive Committee:

Senator Stroup reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson was invited to verify floor procedures including introduction of new motions and needing the 48-hour rule, redirecting debate to committees, friendly amendments, ISP proposals and catalog deadlines.

ISP proposals – November 24th there will be a discussion about the relation of the Integrative Studies Program to the Curriculum Committee based on what the SEC talked about in their guidelines and overview with SCC Chair Becky Dunn and with ISP co-chair Peter Nielsen.

Catalog deadlines - as long as program proposals do not have to go to systems – it is not too late to have matters come back to the Senate February meeting and be incorporated into the print version for the fall.

Senator Stroup – The understanding is to have a curriculum proposal timeline that the SCC has shared with the campus to be in place. This will allow the schools, SCC and the full Senate to have the time necessary for deliberation. If that means we are not done in December, then nothing is wrong. The SCC will not be getting a new proposal in January.

Upcoming Senate meetings will take place December 3rd in Rhodes 210 and December 10th in the Mountain View Room.

Academic Overview Committee:

Senator Smith reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

The AOC discussed the Chemistry Self-study and AOC Chemistry report 1999- 2000. Tom O'Brien agreed to Chair the subcommittee for that report. Margaret Smith has contacted outside reviewers and is coordinating that visit.

The upcoming self-study for 2009-2010 is for English and Biology. Both departments have been notified and provided names of liaisons for the AOC.

The AOC's next meeting is in January and the subcommittee will be December 1st.

Academic Standards Committee:

Senator Jean reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

The committee again discussed the Academic calendar and it was decided not to pursue changing the name of Fall Break Day to Fall Reading Day.

The committee is asking the SEC for an update on motions from the October 8th, 2008 Senate meeting. They would like to know how those motions were followed up regarding the Academic Calendar.

Academic Honesty Policy - The Ad hoc committee is still meeting. Senator Schmidl-Gagne has been forwarding their notes to Senator Jean, but until they are finished with their work, we cannot proceed.

October 15th, 2008 meeting - Maximum credits for majors is still under discussion.

October 29th 2008 meeting - Proceeding with maximum credits for majors. Department representatives are invited to subcommittee meetings to explain their program and need to have over 40 credits. We understand that for many of these majors there are accreditation issues.

Motion: The ASC makes the motion that the History Honors admission policy be accepted by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Stroup stated this motion is a program proposal and involves an admission issue. The SCC is also making a motion directly to this.

Senator Dunn wanted clarification of putting both motions together.

Senator Jean explained for the ASC committee, the motion pertained to HIST 498 Honors Thesis Research and Honors Thesis Writing courses. They are Independent Studies courses and the admission policy was not clear. The Honors program is a pass/fail but these courses are 498 and have to be giving grades.

Senator Stroup informed the motion is for acceptance of the History Honors Program including its admission criteria.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Questions for the Standards Committee from Senator Timney;

~Will a decision be made when you have your meetings with department representatives?

~What is going to be the process for this?

~Is this an initial information gathering?

Senator Jean stated this is strictly an informational gathering to a very large issue. We need more background, detail and faculty discussion about the majors that have 40 or more credits.

President Giles-Gee wanted to know the rationale behind Fall Break Day not being changed to Fall Reading Day.

Senator Jean explained that Fall Reading Day faculty has to be on campus where they do not for Fall Break Day.

President Giles-Gee informed this was a parting gift by the last President for OS and PAT's. By saying Fall Break Day, it is a day faculty do not have to be here where as staff does.

Senator Jean stated part of the discussion was even though it was not a day off for OS and PAT's, it was not mandated faculty had to be here.

Provost Netzhammer wanted to clarify that it is not accurate to say the Chancellor requested each institution set a maximum number of credits. He expressed concerns that across all USNH campuses we have some majors with high credits and that we would look into this and take it seriously, so systems would not have to.

Curriculum Committee:

Senator Dunn reviewed the minutes included in the packet.

On the October 29 meeting, we reviewed and discussed for 2 hours with Dr. Vincent the Holocaust and Genocide Studies curriculum package. Suggestions were provided to Dr. Vincent on the program and course proposals, mostly for clarity and editorial because a number of the course proposals cross-listed with other departments.

Motion: The SCC moves that the Holocaust and Genocide Studies curriculum package be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Correction to the top of page 14 - October 29 meeting should read November 5, 2008.

For the record, the SCC has reviewed and discussed all of the proposals that have come forward over the last few meetings and included the votes in each of the committee reports.

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the Communication major be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Journalism major be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the IH FR 100 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Senator Stroup stated in terms students from Sciences or Professional Graduate Studies taking this class as one of their IH courses as apposed to a language course but higher than a 100 level, what kind of impact could this have to the Integrative Studies program?. Arts and Humanities have a foreign language requirement. How much discussion was there about this class? Will this class be offered frequently?

Senator Dunn - It did not come up as part of the discussion.

Senator Timney – Would this fulfill the language requirement from Humanities?

Senator Stroup - It would not, but would fulfill the IH requirement.

Senator Dunn - Believes the Arts and Humanities requirement is at the 200 level.

Senator Timney - It is a language course at the appropriate level.

Senator Stroup acknowledged that the proposal description states, it does not fulfill the Arts and Humanities requirement, which is what the catalog copy says now. It is not listed as an IS course.

Senator Timney - Does this pull faculty members away from teaching a language course? Do we no longer need that many language courses?

Senator Lucy stated this was a way that languages could be added to the IS program.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the IH SP 100 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Timney – Is the availability process sufficient to free up a professor to offer this section in the IH.

Senator Stroup explained that the 101,102 and 200 language courses are already part of the Integrative Humanities program.

Senator Hartz – It is question about resources. We do not have a means to measure what the course load is. Is it a credit hour? What is the table that shows faculty, courses and workload to know what the resource demand is?

Senator Timney mentioned in the past things have been approved, resources would be sufficient and provided but that was not the case. Students suffered and could not get into the course they needed. It happened substantially with the language program until the change over to require one course at appropriate level. We really should know if the courses are being filled and if enough are being offered.

Senator Dunn reviewed the rationale - course level and context means to more accurately have the new design with the course and with the Integrative Studies program. The intent was to provide an Integrative Studies option for students in a modern language.

Senator Antonucci stated this is not a specific course that is required; it is one more IH option. This is not as vital as an IQL or ITW.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Health Science major be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the HLSC 200 course be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Senator Stroup clarified the information lines in the SCC report. They are motions that do not cross school lines, have a course proposal and can be voted by the SCC.

Senator Dunn stated the SCC does examine and review them before they become part of the SCC report.

Motion: The SCC moves that the II HLSC 350 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the II WS 300 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the IN GEOL 320 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the IH FILM 260 course be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the IH FILM 261 course be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the FILM 270 course be approved by the Senate

Senator Dunn informed both IH Film 270 and 271 are being taken out of Integrative Studies. This is being done because they do not have enough sections for their majors and have re-numbered their film courses (ex; IH Film 260 use to be IH Film 270)

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the FILM 271 course be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the II 375 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Senator Stroup inquired about the II without the discipline. What is the current policy?

Senator Dunn explained a department could specify their particular discipline. Departments also have the option not to include a discipline or department, particularly if it is an Inter-disciplinary or Multi disciplinary course. For example, the II 375 is collaboration between Education and Sociology.

Senator Timney - Who would own the course concerning curriculum change?

Senator Antonucci – It would be a significant change to switch bodies. It should go back the II subcommittee for re-approval.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Anthropology minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Senator Dunn went back to the October 22 report. Proposals came forward from the Art Department to change the course description and course title to IA ART 111 and ART 111. They want to preserve the ART 111 course number and have already changed the IA ART 111 number. In addition, the Art department would like not having ART 111 open to students who have taken IA ART 110 and including that in the course description. The course descriptions are the same and have similar content. There is nothing in place that would prevent students from taking the same course. This proposal will come forward at the December 3 meeting.

October 29th meeting, Curriculum Proposals from Biology, Geology, and an Interdisciplinary course are pending due to revisions and additional information. They should be ready for the December 3rd meeting.

The SCC received a proposal for a change to the Experimental Course number policy on page 94 of the current catalog. This proposal was received from the SEC, which originally came from the ISPC. The SCC decided this is a campus wide curriculum change. Departments for an advisory opinion and then the School Curriculum Committees should review it. Update at the December 3rd meeting.

The SCC met with Dr. Helen Frink at the November 5 meeting to discuss the Honors Proposal. She has also attended several department and School Curriculum meetings over the past several weeks.

After Dr. Frink left the meeting, the SCC continued to discuss the Honors Program and re-reviewed the proposal itself, the advisory opinions from departments and the School Curriculum Committee, including all votes. We decided to look at the strengths and weaknesses. There were three fundamental issues identified which the SCC drafted to Dr. Frink, and are included in the committee report. There were large overarching areas that need to be addressed before this proposal can move forward.

1. Program development and implementation
2. Academic standard for admission and retention of students
3. Recruitment of honors students.

Based upon these concerns and careful discussions, the SCC did not vote in favor to support the current Honors Program curriculum proposal as is put forward.

Senator Timney asked if this would go back to Dr. Frink and the Honors Committee to make changes and resubmit.

Senator Dunn explained if it has to come back, it would come back to the SCC. In her opinion looking at all of the concerns posed by all departments, it should not come back just to the SCC.

Senator Timney stated the bylaws would allow someone who disagreed with the SCC, present to the Senate as a whole or it could be resubmitted to the SCC.

Senator Stroup extended courtesy of the floor over to Dr. Frink to give some background and where the Honors Program stands. She handed out a revised Signature page and an Honors Program Proposal Summary.

She gave the following web site www.nchchonors.org to National Collegiate Honors Council in which we are an institution member. You will find what constitutes an Honors Program and appropriate criteria for Honors courses, along with a list of member institutions. The web site will show what our comparative institutions, such as, Fitchburg State and The University of Southern Maine have for honors programs and what their standards are. You will also find how our Honors Program fits the model of what has been proposed at similar institutions. These programs are generally housed in core curriculum or the General Education Program.

The Strategic Plan Working Draft on our web states, "The College will study and consider initiatives that generate new intellectual interest and enthusiasm of faculty and students, among them a new Honors Program".

One-half of the ISP courses would be taken as Honors courses. The travel study course, Honors 301 Global Engagement and Action is not part of the Integrative Studies Program.

This spans the student's career for taking courses the first year in Thinking and Writing and Perspectives courses. The Global Engagement and Action course is intended for the end of the sophomore year and the Capstone Seminar their senior year. It is a four-year program leaving their junior year generally free of Honors courses for students to pursue their major.

Admission to the Honors Program would require a high school GPA of 3.25 or above; SAT scores of 1050 or higher; portfolio of 3 works and a letter of application. One concern is the SAT score is too low. Information from Christy Carson in Institutional Research showed the number of students who qualify based on our SAT scores from these years incoming class was 357 students. If we raise the required SAT scores to 1200, we would have only 74 students. Making a significant increase in the SAT scores is going to shrink the pool of applicants too small to net the number of students. We have been working with the assumption that we would like to have 20 students in a cohort a year. If we raise the SAT scores given the type of students we currently attract, it does not seem like that would work.

Should we raise the GPA for admission? Some advisory opinions said the GPA is too low and some say it should be based on the GPA students earn here and not in high school. We could raise the entry level GPA to 3.5 and still net about the same number of students. The high school GPA goes from 3.5 to 4.293. Honors and AP courses in high school are rated higher.

Christy Carson's data also shows the GPA rises at Keene State College as compared to the high school GPA. 161 students with a high school GPA this fall of 3.5 or higher, 211 sophomores at Keene State College (students that have completed 2 semesters here) have a GPA of 3.5 and 279 graduates last may had a GPA above 3.5. The longer students stay at Keene State College the higher their grades go up. Other institutions have 3.2 and 3.3 for a GPA. Some give lower GPA for students coming in and then raise the GPA expectations as student move up.

Why can't students enter later to the Honors Program? One modification made based on the recommendation on the Ad hoc committee report, can students enter after they have finished a semester or as sophomores. Mechanics are a problem. As students work their way through their first semester, they take Integrative Studies Program courses. They will need to take these courses inside the honors program. The ruling in the perspective courses, students cannot take two courses in the same discipline. For example, this spring we are offering a course in Geology as an IN course, sophomores eligible to take that course have already taken a Geology course in one of their first three semesters. They cannot count the second course as part of their integrative study credits. The reason students cannot enter after the first semester, there are too many ISP courses, and they cannot count the same discipline twice.

For enrollment and attrition, fall 2007 36 Honors students began we now have 22. Three discontinued due to low GPA (maximum of two non-consecutive semester of probation below 3.25 cumulative GPA). The likely reason students drop out of the Honors program is this glitch with the Integrative Studies Program that perspectives courses cannot count the same discipline twice. There is no space in the major program plus ISP requirements to have any credits left over. There is a concern where the Integrative Studies Program cannot count the same discipline twice inside any of the IA, IH, IN, IS categories. How do we structure an Honors Program inside the Integrative Studies Program?

Advisory opinions received concerning opportunities for faculty input for the Honors Program, show there has not been adequate on campus discussion. Honors committee meetings started in 2007. An Ad hoc Honors Committee was created last spring. They did not meet its charge of creating a revised proposal. There was not a new draft for us to begin working with in August. May 27, 2008 - three tenure track faculty attended a workshop for faculty interested in teaching in the Honors Program. Preliminary Program outcomes and course criteria were debated. All faculties were invited to attend the initial Honors Program Advisory Council meeting August 20, 2008 and 8 faculty attended. After meeting with the SCC, it was voiced that faculty are feeling strapped by meeting the demands of the 4 credit proposal, scheduling, and the Integrative Studies program,

Faculty input into the program proposal approval process are as follows, 7 departments voted in favor - total 38 faculty, 8 departments voted against - total 52 faculty, 8 departments didn't vote. Of the departments who voted 26 faculty abstained.

Corrections – Computer Science voted in support but paperwork was not received. The English department's abstained number should be 0 instead of 9. It should read above – Of the departments who voted 17 faculty abstained.

There is no campus consensus in support of an Honors Program. Both Psychology and History voted against the Honors Program but will have or want to have Honors options. History, who voted against it in its entirety, is now bringing an Honors Program proposal forward to the Senate. School Curriculum committees Arts & Humanities voted against; Professional and Graduate Studies sent a list of concerns but did not vote; Science Curriculum Committee abstained.

Issues have to be resolved before the Honors Program can move forward.

- No consensus among the faculty

- Mechanics
- Structure of the program
- Large number of high credit majors
- Students cannot fit the Honors Program courses into the Integrative Studies Program.
- Curriculum approval process is too complex to be feasible.
- The Senate is the seventh body to consider the proposal.

At what stage can proposals be changed?

What weight is giving to each step in the process?

Who has the final word?

Where do we go from here?

Questions and discussions;

Senator Daniel Saucier - The SCC was not against the Honors program only against the program as it is written in the document.

Provost Netzhammer spoke about the issue of consensus. We have tried for 2 years to get consensus around the Honors Program. There is a significant group of people philosophically opposed to the idea of an Honors Program and are going to remain vocal. It is the responsibility of this body to say, you have done the work we asked of you and we are now going to approve that. It seems problematic that we put together a task force last year and said come up with ideas to revise the program and then revise it. The committee came up with ideas to revise program but left it to the Honors Council to revise it. The SCC should be credited for saying clearly our college should have an Honors Program and working towards it. This is a difficult issue and the curriculum for this program is a work in process. What they have proposed is a significant revision that has addressed many things that we have asked for. It would serve our institution well to move forward with the proposal that has come forward and say, there is still work to be done. It is time for this body to say you have done good work and we are ready to support the work of the Honors Council.

Senator Timney mentioned we have procedures for curriculum change. If changes are made, when does it have to go back and start over again? What are the formal rules? Does it have to go all the way back or is it a matter of submitting revisions? Is it possible for the Honors Committee to present that proposal to the senate without approval by the SCC?

Senator Dunn stated the SCC voted against the proposal as it stands right now.

Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson stated there are issues with regard to the ISPC that need to be resolved and would be helpful to this proposal but needs to begin at the Executive Council.

President Giles-Gee stated the time had come for an Honors Program and asked the faculty to develop one. The capacity of this college has always been to develop the potential of students. The challenge to this college is to admit students across the board but we were not admitting the top 10% of students who were coming out of high schools. The idea was how to challenge this college to bring those students in and this provided that opportunity. Honors courses tend to be more challenging and rigorous because students, who have been selected to be in top of their classes, demand and need to be challenged more. Allot of these courses are pass/fail because the rigor is

too high. It is interesting that the expectation of courses become more rigorous, expecting more of the students and now have a 3.5 GPA.

Resources have been thinned because we had to offer more than just the ISP. There had to be a substitution of courses to make sure students could graduate. This is a transitional period. The issue of resources will change over time leaving more of the ISP available.

President Giles-Gee stated she does not feel the college is saying no to an Honors Program and hopes faculty will continue to work on this. The years ahead for this college to remain competitive, having the quality of the curriculum pushed forth that is

demonstrated through Honors Programs and the courses that have been designed for the ISP, must be available in perceptive ways to the public. Nothing says more about quality than having an Honors Program here with dedicated faculty.

Senator Stroup informed some of the reasons given for those of who have expressed concerns about an Honors Program have led to narratives of a deep commitment to what it means to be a faculty member at Keene State. This shows in the opportunities for students at various levels of preparation. The questions then become issues of revision and how this should continue. We do need a sense of where the Honors Council and advising are going.

Senator Pages mentioned some departments want an Honors Program, yet they voted against this honors program. What are Honor students graduating from Keene State taking with them from this Honors Program that is based in Integrative Studies with General Education? Would it be better that they take an Honors Program in their chosen course of studies?

Dr. Frink informed that most departments do not offer an Honors Program due to resources. A good Honors Program should be a crucible where we develop exciting initiatives that all faculties can participate. We had discussed the Capstone Course inside the Honors Program. We talked about an Interdisciplinary topic such as hunger, childhood, how is that depicted in Literature, what are the economic impacts, how has that been viewed throughout history, psychology of childhood and the effects of hunger on brain development. Every discipline on this campus could look at a topic like this inside the Senior Capstone Course. This would be an integrative experience that could not be matched by any single major program in Honors. We do not have the resources to mount these programs for Honors in the various majors. This program is intended to serve those students who would not have a chance otherwise. It is really suppose to be a showcase and a draw for academically talented students.

Senator Hanrahan stated students are coming in with an expectation. If we do not pass an Honors Program before they graduate, what happens to their degree?

Dr. Frink stated the college is committed to the students already admitted. The degree would state College Honors Program. She is uncomfortable proceeding with any recruitment until we have a real consensus on campus.

Dr. Rancourt acknowledged issues around the Honors Program to the extent that we value intellectual diversity. Students are not equally intellectually committed when they come into college nor while they are here. We are not providing a format for those students. We are not fulfilling our diversity mission and our commitment to diversity at Keene State. We are leaving out a group of students who are highly intellectually committed coming in. Including what the Ad hoc committee has done, there have been no real issues with the curriculum that have been proposed. Let us take the Integrative Studies courses designated as Honors and just have them be Honors. If this will satisfy the hesitancy around being housed in Integrative Study, that is an easy fix.

The second issue the SCC raises concerns the GPA. If people think the GPA should be 3.5, again, that is easy to do. The issue of students coming into the program once they are here from the implementation perspective is almost impossible. You would have to have a separate Honors Program. There is no consistency with regard to what it is we are being asked to do in revising the Honors Program. The SCC should come back to the council with concrete revisions for the program. No real revisions have been put forth.

Senator Antonucci asked Dr. Frink to speak to the revisions that the II subcommittee passed on about the 400 level Capstone class last week.

Senator Clemenson - In terms of the SCC and what we did with the Holocaust program, they came back and gave us revisions that we helped with. Is it possible for this? Could we have several members of the Honors Advisory Committee help us come up with revisions?

Senator Dunn asked if it was the role of the SCC to revise proposals. We provided suggestions but did not revise the proposal for the Holocaust. For the Honors Proposal, we addressed the fundamental concerns. We looked at comments from faculty, the School Curriculum Committee and the major over arching concerns. This has to be done before we can go into the proposal itself.

Senator Hartz stated the SCC was challenged to accepting the Honors Proposal as it was written. There was a lot of conversation as to the value of the Honors Program at Keene State College. There is a process question on the table.

Motion The charge goes back to the SEC to help us understand how to move forward at reconciling this proposal

President Netzhammer added last year we gave the Honors Council a road map and that was the Ad hoc Committee. The role of the Senate should be to continue to give direction and not ignore the work done last year.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Senator Dunn went back to the report from the meeting on November 5th. Once reviewed by standards, the Film Studies major Program proposal will be coming forward to the SCC. They are putting in a request for revisions to their admission criteria and changes to their curriculum.

We meet on November 19th and proposals that will be in front of the SCC include Sociology Education, Computer Science, Music and Geology. The BA in Geology Program Proposal will be the first that we look at to put forward motions in February that will become active for the fall 2009 catalog

VI. New Business:

VII. Adjournment: The Senate voted to adjourn at 6:30 p.m.

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 11/29/08

**Minutes of the 388th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF
KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, December 3rd, 2008**

I. Call to Order: 4:06pm

II. Roll Call:

Excused: Senator Pages, Senator Schmidl-Gagne, Provost Netzhammer and President Giles-Gee

Absent: Senator Singh, Senator Merry, Senator Rust, Senator Abernethy

III. Secretary Report:

Motion: To accept the minutes for the revised 386th meeting of the Senate of Keene State College.

Discussion: Senator Dunn wondered what had been decided from the new motion made by Senator Timney on page 5.

Senator Stroup stated the motion was recorded as part of our deliberation but the motion had been withdrawn. Concerning the December 1st deadline with ISP and Non ISP courses that have the same numbering system, we can follow up with departments and see how many there are.

Senator Dunn stated it is worth noting that when Professor Neilson was here, a document went out to the ISPC committee in October with regard to the senate vote. *The ISPC needs to come up with a list of all ISP and Non-ISP courses using the same discipline and number.* It should be reported to the Senate and we are responsible for notifying those departments. Until that list is available,

we cannot move forward to notify the departments. The due date can be decided once the ISPC provides the Senate with a list of departments that have courses with the same course number for ISP and Non ISPC courses.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the minutes as amended.

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 387th meeting of the Senate of Keene State College.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the minutes.

IV. Courtesy Period:

Senator Stroup opened the courtesy period with a thank you to Cheryl Martin for her work this year with the Thanksgiving Basket Drive.

Senator Timney – An event tonight at 8:00pm in the Owls Nest called *Off the Record Comedy*. This is the final exam for a course he is teaching called Humor Writing.

V. Subcommittee Reports:

Executive Committee:

Senator Stroup reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

Around questions of catalog and implementation, items that we work on at our February meeting would be still be eligible to be included in next years catalog as long as it does not have to go to SAPC.

The SEC has met twice since the last Senate meeting. Part of the last Senate meeting was sending the discussion of the Honors Program back to the SEC. We had discussions on this and a number of issues came up. One was revisions to program proposals once they are into the curriculum process. Senator Timney made a distinction at one of the meetings that we have a common law approach as opposed to legislative law approach, which means any change goes back to the beginning for departmental advisory opinions and back to the Schools. The SEC will look at how complex programs might be brought back to the SCC if the need warrants.

Faculty has seen a survey that has gone out and a draft that includes revisions based on advisory opinions and discussions in the SCC of the Honors Proposal for possible resubmission to the Senate. This will be based on Faculty responses from the surveys.

November 24th Senator Dunn, Professor Pete Nielsen and Dr. Helen Frink attended a meeting to discuss the following:

~What happens when we a have curriculum process that does not necessary start with an individual faculty member or department?

~How do we make changes to the ISP?

~What the relation might be between the SCC and the Integrative Studies Program that could avoid redundancy?

They did not come to any conclusions but identified there is no point at which you can make a change to a proposal once the process has begun. The Senate body is where debate can happen about proposed changes and decide if items should go back to departments for advisory opinions again or not. The Senate may possibly see a resubmitted proposal for debate.

Senator Gianni informed that the SCC and the School Curriculum Committee do make changes. It is usually for corrections and depends upon of the approval of the original proposal. For the record we should make sure, it is clear how the SCC and the School Curriculum Committees can make changes.

Senator Timney explained the Common law practice of the School Curriculum Committees has been to modify proposals without sending them back as long as it is agreeable.

Senator Dunn - Another item that came out of the meeting was to develop a curriculum flow chart. It would show where proposals go, the timelines for them and make the process more accessible

Senator Stoup mentioned a concern that graduation requirements and the advising students are receiving are not reflected in this years catalog. It is not how our curriculum works.

We still have an open position in the Sciences. There is one interested party for the three-year position and we should have full Senate membership beginning in the spring.

A proposal to revise the grading system from AB, BC to +/- was received from Professor Charry and Professor Germana. The SEC forwarded the proposal to the ASC for discussion at their regular meeting in January and may come to the Senate in the spring.

The SEC will continue to follow up with ASC recommendations for the Calendar Committee.

Academic Overview Committee:

The Academic Overview Committee had nothing to report.

Academic Standards Committee:

Senator Jean reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

The following issues were discussed:

1. The proposal to amend the Course Withdrawal policy.

Rationale: Adjustment period and schedule was not reflected in the old policy and needed to be updated. Information is up to date and posted on WEB Advisor.

Motion: The ASC would like to make the motion that the Senate accept the amendment to the withdrawal proposal.

Discussion: Courtesy of the floor extended to Registrar and sponsor of the proposal Tom Richard.

Senator Stanish – Hypothetically, if a student were to withdraw from a course, didn't receive the Professors signature under this new policy, then later realized he was getting for example a B in the course then the student would wanted to be back in the course...what would happen in this situation?

Registrar Tom Richard replied that we operate by exception. If the faculty member supported re-registration of that student, the student would then be allowed back in the class.

Senator Stroup mentioned mandatory advising was the intention that came up in the rationale.

Senator Lucey thought a notification email should go out to the faculty member if in fact the W was removed for that student.

Registrar Tom Richard replied WEB Advisor works well. Students will be able to withdraw from a course using WEB Advisor. The minute students withdraw; it will be visible to faculty. In addition, at time of grading, students names will not show up on the grading roster.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Registrar Tom Richard asked the Senate for immediate implementation for the spring 2009 semester.

Senator Stroup explained the Senate bylaws state *Senate legislation passed during an academic year takes effect on the first day of classes of the following fall semester. Immediate implementation of a motion may be achieved and shall require a separate vote passed by a two-thirds majority of those present at the next Senate meeting.*

Senator Jean stated a motion from the ASC for immediate implementation will come forward to the Senate at the December 10th Senate meeting.

2. Advanced Placement credit for ITW came from the ISP Committee.

They are asking that the AP English Comprehension and the AP Literature and Comprehension exams not be transferred as an ITW equivalent but instead as an IH English equivalent. The committee thought it should go back to the English department for discussion. A motion will be coming forth to the Senate next week.

Senator Stroup appreciated the fact that this is an issue of departmental independence and control over the curricular aspect. This involves English because of the proposed IH with no number attached to a designation and ITW is not an English course. It is on the Agenda to discuss and vote at tomorrow's English Department meeting. Follow up on the vote will be available after the meeting.

Senator Timney - Will this motion address how transfers of English 101 come in?

Senator Stroup mentioned the College Level Writing Course from an accredited college is a separate part of the proposal policy. The point of the motion is AP exams are not equivalent to the outcomes of the foundations course for the Integrative Studies Thinking & Writing Course.

Senator Timney - Should we consider how we handle transfers?

Senator Antonucci - While there is an equivalency there is a different set of outcomes and values.

Senator Clemenson – Do we substitute English 101 for the ITW 101 for transfer students? For example, students take the AP exam and go to a different institution, that institution counts the AP exam as an English 101 credit. The student then transfers to Keene State College and we accept the English 101 credit from that institution when in reality the student received that credit from an AP Exam.

Senator Lucey informed in terms of the rationale, the ISP is a program that builds upon itself, and ITW gives the beginning to that.

Senator Stroup stated he will bring the point up tomorrow with Directive Writing. Students would still be getting four credits if they earn a three on the exam it would just be in a different area.

3. The FILM portfolio admission policy is still in discussion. They will be coming to our January 21st meeting.

4. Maximum credit discussions are still on hold.

Mid level review for the Music Program Proposal will also be discussed at our January 21st meeting. Suggestions were sent to the Music department for a revision to the mid level review policy and will be incorporation into the music curriculum.

A mid level review is during the program. There are three music degrees, BA, Music Performance and Music Education. If students do not meet the requirements in Music Performance or Music Education, they can still get a BA but cannot continue in the other two programs.

Curriculum Committee:

Senator Dunn reviewed the minutes included in the packet.

For the record, the SCC has reviewed and discussed all of the proposals and the votes for each of the proposals are included in the committee report.

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the IA ART 110 course be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Stroup mentioned the description emphasizes Art History but still being offered as an IA instead of an IH. Did the Art Department discuss this?

Senator Lucy stated it is just a choice and are in need of IA courses.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IS SOC 125 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Sociology minor be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Sociology major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Women's Studies Minor be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Stroup asked if there was any interest in proposing a major or was this just the restructuring.

Senator Dunn stated it was just the restructuring - mostly updating Interdisciplinary Courses.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the II 330 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Master of Education: Educational Leadership Option be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Stroup – Is this the same program that we looked at last year?

Senator Dunn explained this is a different program. The one from last year was for curriculum and instruction on the WELL program.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Post Masters Educational Leadership Certification be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Master of Education: Special Education Option be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Applied Computer Science major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revisions to the Applied Computer Science minor be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Stroup – Is this a concern that someone would have a false sense of being an IT professional if they had an Associate whereas the minor has a separate value in terms of supplementing other major programs.

Senator Hanrahan explained there is a Community College in town that offers a 2-year degree. There was not a need to support an Associate program anymore and we would rather collaborate with the Community College.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the deletion of the Associate of Science, Computer Science Program be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that IA MU 417 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Timney – Is this a movement of what was a regular course offered by music other than just adding the music title to an Integrative Studies course or is this a new course?

Senator Dunn explained they changed course number and moved into an IA course. None of these are new courses.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IA MU 216 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IA MU 112 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the BA in Biology program proposal be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Dunn explained they added their seminar course as a requirement for their BS in Biology - total credits are still 52.

Senator Stroup voiced that it is interesting in terms of on going discussions with the ASC and Senate about how we define questions regarding high credit majors and other revisions. We have a 76 credit Bachelor of Science in Biology and a 52 credit Bachelor of Arts with the idea of someone wanting to do a second major. The other two major revisions the Senate just approved involved either the same number or reduction in credits.

Senator Jean explained the BA for Biology as of last year and with this program, is used for the secondary certification. It used to be just elementary but all the requirements in this BA Program also cover for secondary Biology certification 7-12. It can be done in four years but there are no electives. All of the content is state or nationally required. Our hands are tied to lowering credits due to accreditation requirements.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Dunn discussed the following from the SCC report:

Experimental Course Policy Change proposal was put forward by the ISPC. This went to the SEC and then forwarded to the SCC to look at a 299 designation. The SCC voted against the proposal for the following reasons:

1. Excessive use of experimental courses allows students to take multiple Integrative Studies experimental courses where there is limited oversight on outcomes (integrative, perspectives, interdisciplinary, and/or skill).
2. Experimental courses only offer a short-term solution and do not address enrollment demands and the ISPC's long-term goal of progressive sequencing.
3. Use of the experimental course number does not require the standard curriculum review process.
4. Currently there is no ISP requirement for 200-level integrative studies courses.

They understand the nature of the proposal concerning the progressing sequencing. We have offered a focused alternative to allow departments to submit proposals that have more of permanence. Departments would be allowed to submit 200-level ISP course proposals through the standard curriculum process to the School Curriculum Committees *or* the Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee until February 4, 2009. The Committees would have until February 18th to review the proposals, which would then be forwarded to the SCC. The SCC will review the proposals and put forward motions to approve course proposals to the Senate at the March 2009 meeting. Approved courses would then be ready for immediate implementation in the fall 2009 schedule prior to course registration, which begins on March 30, 2009.

This is coming to the Senate as information because it was only a change in guidelines

Senator Lucey – Is this a time extension to encourage permanent 200 level courses?

Senator Dunn explained this is a focused alternative with specific timelines. The request from the ISPC proposal was that they are looking for 299 courses and look at the progressive sequencing.

Senator Jean mentioned this information should go out quickly to faculty and adjunct. There is also need for 300 and 400 level courses should we add these to the timeline?

Senator Dunn explained that the focus was on the nature of this proposal.

Senator Hanrahan – What would the recommendation be for scheduling simulation purposes that we put in other than a 299. The schedules for the fall are due next Monday.

Senator Dunn expressed that courses must be approved first in order to put it in for immediate implementation.

Senator Lucy stated for scheduling purposes, if it is a pre-existing course use the regular number without the I.

Senator Dunn mentioned the School Curriculum Committees and Interdisciplinary Subcommittee coordinated to review this proposal and recommendation. They are aware that proposals may be coming to them as early as January.

Senator Timney – Is it possible to move the deadline for the course schedules back?

Senator Denehy stated the plan is to run the mechanics of schedule 25 in late January. It is what the schools, departments and divisions need to do on their own to prepare that is causing the earlier deadline.

Senator Dunn confirmed that in terms of having the scheduling in, it is more for the Dean to review. As to the logistical piece, it will happen in late January early February.

Senator Dunn will check with the Registrar's office for clarification on what the message should like that goes out to GAL as departments begin to bring their schedule to their Dean. If they are thinking of taking one of their 100 level courses and making it into a 200 level, they should know what to plan for and how it should look

Senator Dunn stated she will meet with Professor Pete Nielsen and a joint email from the SCC and Integrative Studies Committee will go out to GAL.

Senator Stanish felt a tinge of discomfort with experimental courses all around and we have experimental courses. We may need to be careful with faculty doing things that are unfair. They could propose a 300 level course and not have to go through the curriculum process where as a 200 level course they would.

Senator Dunn closed out her report with proposals presented as information from Sociology, Education, Computer Science, Music and Art. Proposals that are awaiting action (will be covered at the January 28th, 2009 SCC meeting) include the Film Program Proposal – SCC approved curriculum and will put forward a motion with ASC, revisions to the General Science Major Program Proposal and the Music Program Proposal.

VI. New Business:

Senator Timney mentioned the Senate should look at the Integrative Studies Program. The Program is short of 200 level courses, also 300, and 400 level courses. If we do not look at in advance, we are going to have students who cannot graduate. We will have to start core substitutions and that is no way to run the curriculum.

Senator Hartz - This group does not see the actual measures/metrics/numbers. What is the number of courses offered in each level by each type? How does that change by semester?

Senator Stroup stated at the last Chairs and Coordinators meeting, a chart was shared as to what is needed and what is offered for courses. It would be helpful to share the chart with Senators to give a concrete sense of what is working and what is not in terms of administering the program.

Senator Hartz mentioned we should be able to look back and answer some questions with regard to quantitative and quality. How many programs have been reviewed, modified, approved or added. There should be some sort of overall measure of what the Senate has accomplished.

Senator Stanish informed that the Vice Chair of the Senate together with the Chairs of the other committees complete a report that is sent to the President and Provost.

Senator Gianni reported the SCC sees the same courses being offered at different levels. There is not a lot of direction on how to calibrate the difference between a 100 level and 200 level course of the same course. Students are taking the same course two and three times.

Senator Dunn stated Geology is struggling with the description of a 100 level and 200 level course because the description is the same.

Senator Lucey - An issue not being addressed is workload. One would think the IA course should have different outcomes and skills then the regular Art 111 course. What does that mean? You do not getting credit for teaching a different prep course. The duplication is the result of this.

Senator Antonucci - The difference between proposing a course and the 50-word limit for the catalog, is the rationale and justification extends beyond that. People are caught up between the 50-word limit and fully articulating the differences between what is happening in II and IH courses versus a disciplinary course.

Senator Clemenson stated that with Geology the only difference in the course description is lab requirement. Something needs to change because in some cases students have used the same essay for multiple courses into their major that are higher-level courses. The Senate should take action on how classes are taught.

Senator Stroup reported the Senate would be meeting next Wednesday December 10th, in the Mountain View room. Two motions will be on the floor.

VII. Adjournment: The Senate voted to adjourn at 6:00 p.m.

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 12/08/08

**Minutes of the 389th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF
KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, December 10th, 2008**

I. Call to Order: 4:00pm

II. Roll Call:

Excused: Senator Ness, Senator Saucier, Senator Cerilli, Senator Clemenson and Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson

Absent: Senator Lucey, Senator Hartz, Senator Pages, Senator Smith, Provost Netzhammer and President Giles-Gee

III. Secretary Report:

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 388th meeting of the Senate of Keene State College.

Discussion: Senator Timney – Page 9 under new business, the last sentence of the first paragraph should read course substitutions.

Senator Stanish requested to change her statement on page 9 to read, Senator Stanish felt the Senate had a tinge of discomfort with experimental courses and yet we have many experimental courses.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the minutes as amended.

IV. Courtesy Period:

Senator Stroup stated the Executive Committee had not met since the last Senate meeting. The report on page 10 [SD08/09-19] was prepared by him because of recommendation and online voting that had been done by the Academic Standards Committee. Both the Integrative Studies Program Committee and Academic Standards Committee expressed in their meeting minutes the desire to ask for a recommendation from the English department as to the credits being granted to students entering with a qualifying grade on the AP exams in English Language and Composition and English Literature. The English department met December 4th - a resolution and recommendation was discussed and voted on. They are included in these minutes.

Senator Stroup spoke with Senator Jean about upcoming discussions of the Standards Committee concerning the grading change. The Campus was informed of this by using GAL. Student Senators were also copied so they can share this through student assembly and MYKSC. Responses will be shared with the Senate

The Standards Committee will be looking at possible changes to the admissions policy and a revised version of the Honors Program Proposal at their January 28th meeting. These items may be sent to the Senate for further deliberation at the February 11th meeting.

Senator Dunn questioned if the revised proposal from the Honors program will be available for public view by the time we return to campus.

Senator Stroup replied yes. The deadline for the survey and other comments needed to be back to Professor Frink by December 13th.

V. Subcommittee Reports:

Executive Committee:

Motion: Keene State College students must meet the Thinking and Writing Requirement of the Integrative Studies Program. Students will meet this requirement by completing an ITW 101 course in their first year at Keene State or by transfer of a college level writing course from an accredited college.

Entering Students who have successfully completed (a score of 3, 4, or 5) on the following Advanced Placement tests will receive credits at KSC in ENG for 4 credits.

Those tests are:

English: Language and Composition

English: Literature and Composition

The gavel was passed to Senator Timney to facilitate discussion so that Senator Stroup could deliberate as Chair of English and not Chair of Senate.

Discussion: Senator Gianni referred back to earlier discussions where students could receive college credits from another institution based upon their AP exam. The student then transfers here and we accept the English credits when in reality the student received those credits from an AP Exam. Do transcripts indicate that college credits were received from AP Exams?

Senator Stroup reported transcripts do in fact show students received AP credits. Discussions within the English department are that we can control what the assignments of AP tests are when we do admissions to KSC. He does not believe a first year student would transfer a course, take a course or enroll at another college just to do something like this. For the most part we cannot control transfer issues as far as departmental policies are concerned.

Senator Hanrahan - Who decides how and where AP credits are assigned, it was his understanding that departments decided that. Has the Senate ever voted on AP credits being assigned to certain courses? Is this a Senate charge? Does this take place within the department?

Senator Stanish stated the issue had come up prior concerning Handwriting and Quantitative Literacy. The Senate certainly dealt with it in the area of Integrative Studies. It seems to her that the Senate could also vote on it in other areas. It definitely came up with IQL and IQL Statistics.

Senator Timney advised the Senate does have control over curriculum.

Senator Antonucci reminded everyone that we are talking about AP credits for students admitted as first year students and not for transfer.

Senator Hanrahan - It is part of the motion because it states - or by transfer of a college level writing course from an accredited college.

Senator Stanish - Maybe we should add who would approve that it is a college level-writing course. For example, Academic and Career Advising, English Department or the Thinking and Writing Coordinator could investigate this. This may also help solve the transfer problem.

Senator Merry – This happened for entering students when it was English 101. In addition, a comment from her Librarian colleagues, we have worked very hard to integrate information literacy into the ITW courses. We have been diligent in using that as a basis for the building blocks of instruction. It is not only generalized but it's specific to our situation. We cannot be sure that courses coming in have that level of information.

Senator McDonald pointed out the proposal states students will meet this requirement by completing an ITW 101 course in their first year. Is it conceivable that students could not complete this in their first year? If they do not what are their options?

Senator Stroup explained this is an echo of the thinking and writing requirement that is described in the ISP overall. We now have a designation that students are expected to complete the IQL requirement in their first three semesters. We have found that more than 50% of students take it in the fall.

This policy would not affect students already here; it is a policy about admission in terms of the assignment of those AP classes. The expectations to take the ITW as a foundational course will be part of a larger ISP discussion. Faculty can include as the course description or requirement either an IQL or ITW for a 200 level course. Courses at the 300 and 400 levels require both foundations. Many IH classes require ITW.

Senator McDonald - What happens if they do not complete it within their first year? Where does that leave the student?

Senator Antonucci stated the student would not be able to take any IH, II and some IA courses where ITW is required. What this motion is trying to do; is bring incoming first year students with AP credits and require them to take an ITW.

Senator Stroup explained the reason for the word *will* instead of *should* in the first paragraph of the motion, is to clarify that the application in the opinion of the Integrative Studies Program Committee in their rationale for the way ITW's description in the overall program. If they say *should*, students could get behind and hold off until their junior year. We saw this situation with 101 and it was counter productive. For that reason, the word *will* is there to communicate to students if they are not in it in the fall, they can take it in the spring but beyond that it becomes an issue. It is the expectation that this is part of the first year experience. It is foundational for the ITW program. This course is more complete in terms of number of seats available than the IQL has been.

Amendment from Senator Stanish - The last sentence of the first paragraph in the motion should read – or by transfer of a college level writing course from an accredited college as approved by the Thinking and Writing Coordinator.

Senator Timney - An amendment of that type can be made. A vote at this time would be to accept the amendment. If we accept the amendment then we will not actually vote on this overall piece until the next meeting.

Senator Dunn mentioned that it would be helpful to know if the ITW Coordinator would approve of this or if it trumps existing policy. Are there academic councilors in Academic and Career services that currently do this? It should be clarified first.

Senator Schmid-Gagne reviewed the Petition for Credit Acceptance Form. Students need to obtain signatures from the Discipline Coordinator, Divisional Dean and the Director of Academic Advising.

Senator Stanish withdrew the amendment.

Senator Gianni is trying to understand Senator Antonucci's position with the idea of an ITW as a gateway course into college. We have a high percentage of transfer students in our population. To ignore transfer students seems to ignore a large population that is here.

Senator Antonucci stated his position is that he does not want to impede the progress of transfer students. By having a transfer student go back to what is perceived as a first year, first semester program is taking away the value of the work they completed at other institutions. In reality, it is just another class they are paying for and another place they have to be on an already derailed or displaced schedule.

Senator Denehy stated when the Academics Standards Committee looked at and approved this proposal; it was with the substitution of IH English. There is concern with the credits being English credits versus IH English credits. We have an ISP and a high credit major. These English credits will often come in as an elective. It ties up their limited remaining elective courses or these credits become useless to the students. They cannot fit it in anywhere.

With our Honors Program, we are trying to bring in motivated students and our AP students are motivated. After looking at the cohort of fall 2007, 24 students came in, took English and their combined GPA was 3.41. One reason for taking AP English is to get ahead and for most schools it is to get through that gateway course of English 101, which we do not have. We are saying to them, good job - we really like what you did; it does not really count for anything but keep going. That is not a good message to send students who are applying here. We need to provide IH English or come up with some sort of other IH AP that allows them to put these AP credits into their ISP and move forward with that program. We also need to make sure that when students are applying to KSC they know that these credits are not going to come with them.

Senator Dunn responded to Senator McDonald's earlier question with regard to transfer students. One thing that would prevent students from progressing if they were to transfer here and have AP English that was accepted by another institution; they wouldn't be allowed to take 300 level - courses without completing ITW 101, IQL 101- 24 credits total in ISP.

Senator Jean explained the ASC only approved it as IH English. The English department felt that the ISP outcomes were not the same as the AP results from the test.

Senator Hanrahan mentioned that the English department is the best place to decide if these AP credits are equivalent to IH English or English.

Senator Stroup stated experiences with the IS program is that you can only use a departmental prefix once in your program. Student who received IH English credits and did well with literature courses in High School are not able to take another English course here. It may be a larger issue for this body to discuss in terms of the shape and overlap of the program including disadvantages for the interdisciplinary program.

The issue of high credit majors is a complicated one and the Senate is looking at it. Students would still be earning 4 of 120 or 124 credits towards graduation. English majors would be able to use those English credits within their major and still have the opportunity either as an II IA or IH to take the offerings that the department has in the IS program.

Senator Hanrahan requested clarification as to when this would take effect.

Senator Stroup reported curriculum changes would take effect at the beginning of the fall semester following the catalog cycle in which they are approved.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion as written.

Academic Overview Committee:

The Academic Overview Committee had nothing to report.

Academic Standards Committee:

Motion: The ASC would like to make the motion that the Senate approve forgoing the normal time for period of implementation and that the Course Withdrawal policy go into effect for the Spring 2009 semester.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Jean reviewed the minutes that were included in the packet.

The Music Department Mid-level Review policy will be discussed at the January 21st meeting. It is posted on the SCC Blackboard site and changes are in bold. It has been clarified this would apply to the Music Education and Music Performance majors but not the Bachelor of Arts in the music program. The changes are going to both the ASC and SCC. A motion will be coming forth at the February meeting.

The Film Admission Policy discussion will also take place at the January 21st meeting. Members of the Film department will be there to answer any questions.

With faculty input, the maximum credits per major issue will be discussed.

Senator Stroup posted to GAL the grading system proposal to revise the grading policy. There has been overwhelming responses and information received will be coming back for discussion.

Senator Stanish asked if it is part of the ASC charge to look at what other institutions do with high credit majors.

Senator Stroup replied the directive from the Chancellor and communicated to the President and Provost was that all parts of the university system should be discussing implications of high credit majors and the balance based on NEASC standards between General Education, Integrative Studies Programs, Majors and Electives. We are looking for ideal numbers and there is ongoing campus wide discussions facilitated by the Senate. What do we mean by high in the context of four-year graduation rates and what are other implications with that?

Senator Jean responded that it is more of a discussion as to why there are that many credits in a major. In most of our high credit majors there are no electives.

Senator Timney stated it is certainly a point of discussion about how a program at one school could be accredited compared to our program that may have 20 fewer credits.

Senator Jean mentioned they are still in the beginning stages. They will definitely be looking at other areas and schools.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne would like to hear the perspective from the majors that are not high. Is it just an accreditation issue or are there other philosophical things that work as part of our own culture? We need a better understanding in terms of Liberal Arts education and student finances.

Senator Jean replied they are zeroing in on the high credits to get more background and understand where they are coming from.

Curriculum Committee:

Senator Dunn provided a quick update concerning the 299 proposal. A mass email went out today but wanted to provide clarification as to why the email went out so late. She had contacted Professor Neilson at the end of last week to provide an update on the outcome of the Senate discussion about the 299 proposal, focus alternative and that the Senate recommended a joint email go out from both of them. She had not heard from him after their initial conversation stating it was a good idea and she thought the email needed to get out to the campus. Senator Stroup approved that she send the email out herself.

Senator Stroup shared an updated chart of what we have and what we need for various parts of the Integrative Studies Program. It will be useful for curricular discussions to happen with the full Senate.

VI. New Business:

Senator Timney thought we should add an old business section to the agenda.

The Film department requested Senator Timney to bring to the Senate's attention that the new scheduling for final exams is problematic for disciplines that have 3 1/5 hour classes blocked out during the weekdays. Better than 50% of their classes can not mesh with the schedule. They have double booked in rooms and are clashing with other disciplines classes. The Film department discussed the problem with administration last year but there did not seem to be any resolution. Senator Timney was asked to check and see if this was a problem with other disciplines and if the Senate believes it needs to be addressed further. There seems to be a serious problem when you have to cancel classes, final exams or schedule them in different ways. It is not only bad for the students - it is bad for the discipline.

Senator Stroup stated it would be sent back to the Executive Committee for discussion.

VII. Adjournment: The Senate voted to adjourn at 5:20 p.m.

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 1/13/09

**Minutes of the 390th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF
KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, February 11th, 2009**

I. Call to Order: 4:05pm

II. Roll Call:

Excused: Senator Sally Jean, Senator Brendan Denehy, Senator Lynne Rust and Senator Donnie Clemmenson

III. Secretary Report:

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 389th meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Discussion: Senator Timney –Minor correction on page 6, 4th paragraph from bottom. Should read Senator Timney stated this is certainly a point of discussion...compared to our program that may have *20 additional credits*

Senator Stanish – Correction on page 3- halfway down. Should read Senator Stanish stated the issue had come up prior concerning *Thinking & Writing* and Quantitative Literacy. Also at the end of the same paragraph she would like it changed to read – It definitely came up with IQL and *AP Statistics*.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the minutes as amended.

IV. Courtesy Period:

Senator Cerilli wanted to congratulate the cast and crew of Matchmaker for being invited to go to the regional Kennedy Center American College Theatre Festival. The crew received the Golden Hammer Award.

President Giles-Gee reported the Governors Budget message would be this Thursday at 10:00am. Within that message, the budget should talk about state appropriation and may actually provide the appropriation level for the University System of New Hampshire.

The Trustees will be meeting at Keene State College on February 19 in the Mabel Brown Room. For the open periods, any members of the campus may come and see the board in operation. Some sessions are closed. At the beginning of the meeting, there will be a “Celebration of the Arts”. It will include a special presentation from one of the cast members of Matchmaker as well as other performances by our students.

On April 15, the Governor should sign a Proclamation recounting the beginning of Keene State College. Hopefully, the Athletic Department will have runners from Concord to Keene carrying that Proclamation.

Senator Antonucci mentioned the Keene State Film Department and Film Society would be presenting a Happy Birthday Film Screening on February 12, 7:00pm at The Putnam Lecture Hall in celebration of Abraham Lincoln and Charles Darwin. Films by: Helen Levitt, Robert Breer, Les Blank, Jane Geiser, Martin Arnold and Nathaniel Dorsky

Senator Stroup announced the Keene is Reading Program has an event tomorrow, February 12 at noon in the Mountain View Room. This is in connection to the book, *The Omnivore’s Dilemma*, Dr. Sam Smith from the University of New Hampshire will be speaking about Hunger in America: Why?

There will also be a book discussion facilitated by Senator Stroup featuring Bruce Bickford, a local organic farmer on March 10, at the Keene Public Library. There are a number of available copies of *The Omnivore’s Dilemma* at the front desk of the library.

V. Subcommittee Reports:

Executive Committee:

Senator Stroup reported the SEC met on February 4 and several matters came up for discussion. They welcomed Senator Stanish who is Chair of the committee for NEASC Standard 3: Organization and Governance.

Senator Stanish went over Senate document [SD08/09-22]. At the end of the document is a full standard for Standard 3. What is in bold is the overall objective they are trying to reach in terms of areas in organization and governance. The numbered points that come next are intended to spell out a little more explicitly in detail the types of things they want to look at, appraise how well they are doing and what they can do better. As you read this, you will see that many areas of the campus are involved. At the SEC

meeting, they went through and highlighted passages that they thought involved the Senate at least in part, and these are underlined.

She would like to ask the Senate to look through this document and answer the following questions.

1. Do you agree that the underlined passages apply, at least in part, to the College Senate?
2. Do you see any other passages that apply to the College Senate?
3. What is your appraisal of how well the College Senate fulfills the roles outlined in the underlined passages?

Email any answers, questions or comments to her at kstanish@keene.edu

She gave some background on the NEASC self study process. There are eleven standards and each standard has points that need to be looked at. The self-study is the campus talking about these things and eventually a report will be written. Part of the report will be the description, which will include what the Senate actually does. She is asking the Senate for information that pertains to the middle piece of the appraisal; how well do we what we do, what we could do better and what do we do very well. The last piece that will happen out of the appraisal is the projection, which is, what we can commit to do better.

Senator Stroup reported three of the four subcommittees of the Senate had aspects of the Honors discussion on their Agendas. The Curriculum Committee spent many hours talking about revised versions of the proposal. The Standards Committee is looking at admissions aspects. The Executive Committee has been thinking about what kind of process to continue to use to make it possible to consider an Honors Program this year based on revisions that respond to the concerns of the Curriculum Committee, the School Curriculum Committees, Faculty and other forays. It has been a complicated discussion. Our procedures for all curriculum matters that we have in place are very careful and involve input from faculty as well as from the whole campus at the level of the Senate and Senate Curriculum Committee throughout.

Dr. Helen Frink asked if she was needed here tonight. Senator Stroup advised her that nothing was coming up for vote or discussion at this time. As this discussion has gone along there have been a number of questions as to the work of the Honors Council and Honors Group. Senator Stroup praised their commitment, energy and stamina in keeping up with this and their willingness to meet with any group, faculty or committee that wants to meet with them. This does not mean that the campus has come to a consensus about how we feel about the Honors Program and how committed we are in following up on our November discussion. This will come up in more detail in the Senate Curriculum Committee report.

One thing that has become clear in conversations in the past couple of weeks is the discussion and the latest revisions that the Honors Council has done including changes to the Integrative Studies Program. The Integrative Studies Program Committee needs to look at those and weigh them in. The Senate also needs to consider whether some of these changes especially around disciplinary requirements for students and distribution of classes is something that might pertain to students other than Honors students. This is going to take time and we need take that time if there is going to be Faculty support for this program. Dr. Helen Frink and everyone on the Honors Council have been following the guidelines of the curriculum process and the instructions to following up with special case questions of the Executive Committee as thoroughly and carefully as possible.

It is in the course of subsequent conversations and complexities about this that we have come to realize how much is at stake in terms of faculty, work of the Senate and the work of the curriculum. As an Executive committee, they are trying to think about a process that involves all of the steps of the curriculum approval process but is still timely and efficient as possible.

Senator Dunn mentioned one thing established at the Senate meeting in December was proposals currently in the pipeline from the fall semester could come forward as motions at this meeting. There was also an exception that 200 level ISP course proposals could come forward as motions at the March meeting. Those proposals would be ready for the fall 2009 catalog. Where does that leave the Honors Proposal?

Senator Stroup replied that he could imagine discussions continuing after the March meeting. If discussions go beyond the catalog deadline then that is what it is. It could still mean that more of the specifics of a program could potentially be in place and communicated in other ways even though it is not in the catalog for next year. Especially given the ISP discussion, he does not believe how it could meet all of those aspects and be ready for the March meeting.

Senator Timney noted that Senator Dunn as Chair of the Curriculum Committee has the power to set that deadline.

Senator Dunn responded that is driven by the bylaws. In terms of curriculum deadlines, those have already been established and that is what they have been following and what has been modified as a full Senate. In terms of implementation, that is Senate bylaws.

Senator Stroup reported that at the October 8 Senate meeting, a motion was passed giving the Chair of that Curriculum Committee the flexibility to extend deadlines for the School Curriculum Committees if it is determined that they will not be able to make other posted deadlines. That relates both to things that are in the pipeline now and to the Honors discussion.

Senator Dunn stated February 11 has been established for this and the March 11 meeting will be for the 200 level ISP course Proposals.

Senator Stroup brought up two other matters from the February 4 meeting of the Executive Committee. The Standards Committee has continued to think about ways of facilitating discussions concerning high credit majors. The SCC feels the need to clarify their task a little more to work on a definition of high.

The other item was to clarify bylaws in terms of communication of Senate business especially that which is outside the reports of the Senate Curriculum Committee. Reinstated and develop new written forms so that passed motions would go to the Provost and President with a space for

comments or acceptance. Most communication has been fine but there are gaps and it is better for Senators to have approved motions in the minutes along with another means. Some of these forms and procedures are things we need to reestablish from earlier parts of the Senate. This is something they are working on now by going back to every passed motion and making sure it has been acted on.

Senator Dunn inquired about additional communication to offices that would be affected by this. We want to make sure pertinent information is communicated to the Registrars Office and the editor of the catalog.

Provost Netzhammer stated this was part of his job and not the Senate. It would happen upon approval or acceptance of the motion by the President and Provost. It gives them the opportunity to say the Senate passed this motion, we have accepted it and now you need to change your processes to accommodate it.

Senator Dunn mentioned item 2 and that the SCC still has an open slot and did not know if people realized it.

Senator Stroup requested that Sub Committee Chairs stay briefly after the meeting to go over the committee lists.

Senator Dunn reported they have seven Senators as of now including their student representative and they need eight.

Senator Stroup reported the Senate membership is fully accounted for.

Academic Overview Committee:

Senator Smith reported they are currently awaiting the external reviewer's one visit and final report. They are also waiting for the AOC subcommittee to write their final report regarding Chemistry review. Some of their meeting was discussing the process and procedure of completing the Chemistry report so that it would be ready for the Senate.

Provost Netzhammer wanted to check and see if the new AOC's policies were ready to go for departments next year.

Senator Smith responded it was her understanding they were revised in the spring of last year and implemented 08/09.

Provost Netzhammer informed they were revised last year to be implemented for 09/10.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne reported Chemistry was grandfathered in with the old guidelines. English and Biology should be with the new guidelines.

Senator Smith stated both English and Biology have been notified of their upcoming review. The AOC has been helping them along and letting them know they have contacts and support systems in place.

Academic Standards Committee:

Senator Hanrahan reported they have had two meetings since the last meeting. The First item on the Agenda was the Film Program Admission Policy on procedures of how new students would be notified and the various timelines. The film faculty has agreed to draft a letter to prospective students. They will review the portfolios without require release time. In addition, Dr. Cook's personal e-mail address in the original proposal has been changed to a Film Department e-mail account.

Senator Robinson mentioned there would be a meeting February 18 for a vote if the committee were in favor of accepting.

Senator Hanrahan reported the second item that came up for discussion was the Grading System Proposal. Senator Denehy had done thorough research on this and it was evident that we have a unique grading system but did not see any real evidence as to why this should be changed. They felt more evidence was needed along with faculty and student input. Is the cost of changing justify the benefits? Many changes would need to occur. One thing faculty mentioned was that this could depress GPAs. Do employers and Graduate Schools look at the actual grade or just the GPA? They are open to hearing evidence that the grading system is causing confusion to Graduate Schools and employers. This will be presented to the Student Assembly for further discussion.

Senator Duggan inquired if they had looked into whether there might be studies of other schools that have made the change and what happened there.

Senator Smith - If there was depression in grades would there also be grade inflation?

Senator Warder questioned the cost of this to the institution. He felt it would be a simple technological fix for the Registrar in terms of changing a 3.5 to 3.333

Senator Hanrahan acknowledged it was more a question of what the benefits are for changing this.

Senator Smith - How will we formalize discussions?

Senator Stroup explained because it seems to be a much wider discussion than just a curricular matter, he sent a message with an attachment to the global address list and added the Student Body Presidents. He shared earlier messages he received from the Standards Committee. There have been concerns with 3.3 as opposed to 3.25 etc. He was curious about using references to rationales offered when we went to the switch. There was a concern raised from a staff member in the Registrar's Office regarding

questions that came up with grading discussions in the 1970's. It seems to be old evidence in this regard. He questioned Senator Hanrahan about the evidence they looked at in terms of the rationale.

Senator Robinson responded that Senator Denehy did look at what other schools do and had information with some of the same kind of comments. It did seem that the proposal needed more information, student feedback and faculty discussion. There is such a difference in grading among the disciplines that it would be a major transition.

Senator Stanish – So far the ASC has been charged with looking at the proposal from the standards. They have done this and given feedback that they do not see a change warranted based on that proposal. It seemed to her that the SEC should charge the ASC with investigating this further or it goes back to the group that proposed this to investigate.

Senator Stroup mentioned the Proposal Sponsors communicated to him that they would be glad to talk with anyone about this. He also wanted to add that our transcripts are “wacky” enough. We are the only people with ITW, and IH ENG. The research that the Standards Committee is doing and the two-Proposal Sponsor's willingness to meet with the Standards Committee are wonderful. They wrote a rationale imagining that such an attachment to their proposal could be a lot longer but it seemed a simple thing. Clearly, the implementation and administration of it presents challenges as any transition does. The Standards Committee continues to meet with the Proposal Sponsors and if the recommendation moves forward, they will bring this to the full Senate for a vote.

Senator Timney stated he fails to see how this could result in a lower GPA. Statistically speaking students would break even. The overall change in the GPA would be minimal.

Senator Cerilli advised one paper could get an A- and yet another could receive a B+, which would change the GPA. If we have an AB then it would be in the middle.

Senator Abernethy explained the precise measure is difficult to standardize. Sometimes it is difficult to assign exactly the correct grade. A broader scale would be fairer.

Senator Timney acknowledges it could be true but where it may hurt one student, it would help another student. The overall GPA would not change.

Senator Pages stated in her classes, she does give students B+ and A-'s because she believes the distinction is very clear and that precision is needed. With that sort of grading system, it does not reflect the true picture.

Senator Duggan responded that if we want to make a change, more research is needed in order to make a case. Other schools have done this, this was the reasons they put forward and this is what they actually found. We would have more chances of building consensus.

President Giles-Gee sought clarification. These grades relate to something and she has heard issues of inconsistency of standards. Are there rubrics of standards associated with these grades that establish what you are looking for?

Senator Stroup replied that it should retain to both the freedom of the individual faculty member as well as a chance for departments to talk about their programs related to this. In a sense, it overlaps with assessment but as far as college wide, he did not believe so.

Senator Timney explained because of our move toward assessment, particularly ISP, the faculty are starting to use different types of rubrics but they are primitive right now and not as detailed as they could be. Based on research he is has done some experts are saying no matter how we grade it or create the rubrics it is still far more subjective then we ever thought. Right now, it is his understanding that it is generally a whole grade +/-depending on the faculty member applying the same standards.

Senator Dunn questioned if the Registrar's office was consulted with the implementation piece of this. That component could possibly be addressed and be part of the discussion.

Senator Cerilli read a brief response from Registrar Tom Richard stating that he saw no compelling reason to adopt the University of Massachusetts grading scheme particularly in light of the implications of transition for all the affected students. It is not clear if Keene State College students would benefit from the transition.

Senator Lucey wanted clarification of when the last switch took place.

It was believed to be 1973.

Senator Andy Robinson stated the committee is willing to do more research.

Senator Stroup advised to continue to do more research. He will be in communication with the Proposal Sponsors to invite them to the next Standards Committee meeting.

Senator Hanrahan reported on the Honors Admission Policy. There was a lot of discussion and Dr. Helen Frink was present at the February 4 meeting. The new policy addressed allowing existing KSC students to join the pool of Honors students if they received a 3.5 in their first semester along with

meeting other criteria. They have the option of applying after their first semester and coming in with the sophomore class. There was some inconsistency though because High School students require a 3.25 and KSC students require a 3.5. It was recommended to the Honors Committee to increase the GPA to a 3.5 for incoming High School students.

The Rationale for that was with the current 3.25 cut off they only had 60 people apply to the program. If they increased it to a 3.5, it would decrease the pool too much to have adequate representation. Where they are taking away the SAT's as one of the admissions criteria, if the pool goes up to 150 – 200 applicants, is the committee willing to go through all of the portfolios? The reply was yes. They are asking that the pools stay large enough so they have good samples to choose from. That is why it is at 3.25. The wording was not clear on what a freshman had to maintain to stay in the program. It has been changed to a 3.5 at the end of the freshman year to remain in the program. Vote 6 for, one against, and 1 absent in favor of the Revised Honors Admissions Proposal.

Senator Timney explained because it is also in front of the SCC, the SAC approved those changes that go to the SCC. Does the SCC reject it or bring it forward to the Senate?

Senator Stroup advised the SAC approval is necessary as a step for the SCC to bring the whole proposal forward. This would also happen with the Film Admission Policy and major revisions. It has to happen in the Standards first

Senator Dunn stated they are putting forward a motion for the Film Studies Curriculum changes but their admission criteria is not completed as of yet. Can they still put that motion forward? They are waiting on that curriculum as the SCC approved that proposal in fall but they knew that the SSC was not ready. Standards still is not ready to vote on it but the curriculum work has been done. Will we be able to vote on it? Those would be curriculum changes they are asking to have implemented for fall 2009.

Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson asked if it was hinged to the proposal that is in the Academic Standards Committee that needs to come out to be a motion to the Senate. Could you disagree with each other?

Senator Dunn informed they looked at curriculum and Standards looked at admission criteria. What they voted on was curriculum.

Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson declared it could be brought forward

Senator Hanrahan explained they are still discussing High Credit Majors. They started looking at various reasons why the General Science Major has so many credits. There is a distinction between degrees that require a double major and degrees that do not. In the General Science Major, each major is within guidelines, but when you combine it; it brings it over the guidelines. Cases such as this that require a double major to get their degree might be looked at differently than some majors that just have high credits. It is still under discussion.

Senator Timney – When you say require a double major are you meaning required here or by some external standards. He does not believe the state requires a double major.

Senator Richard advised that you are required for certification. They do have to have another area of concentration and there is a certain credit limit.

Senator Timney - There are programs that do not require a double major.

Senator Hanrahan reported there are certain cases where we have accreditation issues that require a different concentration. The amount of courses is higher but as you look at each piece, they are smaller. Education and the Bachelor of Arts in Biology each would fall within the agreed upon - what is high. They are lower than other majors that have 75-80 just for the major itself and there are no accreditation issues involved. We might have to look at different scenarios and standards.

Senator Pages added that we should not just look at double majors that are required but also leaving the option to our students to be able to do double majors if they want to. We should not force them to do just one major because there are so many credits.

Senator Robinson stated Sally Jean volunteered General Science as a good example for them. She talked not only about a double major but also about different certification requirements not necessarily being compatible with NH state requirements and the consequences of trying to satisfy either instead of just one or instead of the other. It was helpful to the committee to look at General Science as an example and go forward from there.

Senator Hanrahan reported there are only two states in the Union; New Hampshire is one of them, which do not have NCATE standards as the state standard. It is a different state standard.

Senator Hanrahan advised the Academic Honesty Policy has not been finalized.

Curriculum Committee:

Senator Dunn reported they had met on February 4 and finished business from last fall. They reviewed and discussed a couple of proposals and are bringing them forward as motions. These are not new proposals but have been in the pipeline including a Program Proposal from the Music Department, one from General Science and also the Film Studies Program Proposal. We are only going to be voting on the curriculum changes for the Film Studies Major.

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the Music majors be approved by the Senate.

Discussion: Senator Stroup extended courtesy to the floor to Dr. Darby as Chair of the department to answer any questions.

Senator Stroup questioned if there was a grading aspect to the mid-term review. If a student is not at satisfactory standard are they removed from the program.

Dr. Darby explained if a student were not meeting the standards of a Bachelor of Music degree then they would be able to choose one of the specialties with the Bachelor of Arts in music degree. No one is removed from the program.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the General Science major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the Film Studies major be approved by the Senate. *Note* this motion is for curriculum changes only.*

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion

Senator Dunn reported the SCC had the opportunity to review and discussed the revised Honors Program proposals with Dr. Helen Frink. One component they came across as noted in their committee report was how the revised program has different ISP requirements for Honors students than for non-Honors students. HTW Honors Thinking and Writing, Honors Art, Honors Humanities, and Honors Natural Science is not currently recognized as meeting ISP requirements. There is no approval in place from the ISP Advisory Council (nor the campus) that these courses equate to meeting ISP requirements. It is also noted in the revised proposal that there is a change in ISP policy for Honors students. The ISP policy states “courses must be taken in four different disciplines” (page 15, 2008-2009 catalog); however, the revised Honors Program proposal is suggesting eliminating that barrier for Honors students. The proposed changes in requirements and policy need to be reviewed by the ISP Advisory Council, and if approved, the ISP would need to put through the curriculum process a proposal to change requirements and policy.

The next component they came across was that there is currently a policy in place for all students with regard to ISP. Courses must be taken in four different disciplines. If a student takes a course in IH English and they take another course in IH English that would not count as their ISP requirement. The Honors Program Proposal was suggesting eliminating that barrier for Honors students because of the timing of courses, course availability and not having a clear sense as to when some courses would be offered. That would be a change in policy. One program cannot change the policy of another program. In order for this proposal to move forward, the ISPC would need to put forward a proposal to change policy and they would also need to approve whether or not those courses equate. Since they met with Dr. Helen Frink last week, they believe the Honors Program is going to go back to sections of ISP courses rather than new designations. They are going to go back to regular ISP courses and designating certain sections as being Honors. The piece that will need to go back to the ISPC will be a change in policy.

Some additional concerns with the proposal were a clear staffing plan. Who is going to be teaching courses? Senator Gianni brought up that when you submit program proposals for a new minor, new major or new program there is some clear sense as to who would be responsible for delivering these courses and that was not available. At this time there is not any evidence available in terms of who will teach when for the next three years out for a staffing plan.

Senator Duggan stated it seemed the most important thing is who is going to be the faculty in it; there is a concern on campus that the Honors program creates inequality. It certainly creates hierarchy. It awards academic achievement and that can be a stimulus for everyone to raise his or her standards. It is crucial that everyone feel that they have the opportunity to not only be a student in it but to teach it. There is a perception that only the hand picked will get to teach these brilliant students. It will create hierarchy among the professors too. In order for that hierarchy to be a good thing, every professor should feel they have the opportunity to teach in it or the people who have the opportunity got there through some process that there is a consensus.

Senator Antonucci mentioned contingent faculty teaches the majority of ISP courses. If we are locating the Honors program in the ISP, we are effectively turning over the Honors program to contingent faculty. That is in no way, shape or form a slap to contingent faculty. It is a question about regular delivery of this program.

Senator Lucey stated the stipulations to teach honors courses are that it needs to be taught by tenure or full time faculty.

Senator Stroup replied that is in the proposal. Along these lines, it does not address all aspects of the query in terms of resource issues.

Senator Timney stated the only way he or any member of his department would ever get to teach an Honors class is if the Dean OK's an adjunct to be hired and teach something that they have to teach. He also mentioned that this year they are only offering four ISP classes at the 200 level and one at the 100 level. That is all they can do. They can never offer 300 or 400 level unless the Dean allows other faculty to come in. They are facing budget problems and he believes this is pointing to a greater problem not only with Honors but also with ISP. This may not have been thought out as far as it should be.

Senator Duggan - We are talking about offering a certain number Honors courses every semester. If a department wants to teach an Honors course, could they get funds to hire someone to teach a course in their department's curriculum?

Provost Netzhammer advised it has always been so up to this point and he believes it will always remain so. They understand that a full time faculty member who teaches three courses and is moving out of one of those courses to move into an Honors course that it would require the resources generally of an adjunct. The resources are available and that is what the Deans' adjuncts budgets were designed to accommodate.

Senator Stroup reported Dr. Frink would be meeting with the ISPC as soon as next Monday to talk about the implications of this and what might follow. A change to the ISP policy would again come back to the Senate. This is where we address the complicated questions about time and anticipation of when certain motions will be up for debate/discussion. This necessary step identified by the Curriculum Committee itself will come back to the Senate. It might even be connected to revisiting other discussion about those disciplinary distributions which we had at great length when the whole IS proposal went through the curriculum approval process. Having real evidence of a few years of teaching in this may be open for discussion of how that is working.

Senator Dunn reported they had set four meeting dates for this semester and they are as follows, one at the end of this month, one in early March and two in April. The meeting at the end of February and possibly early March's meeting will be to review 200 level ISP Course Proposals. They are currently at the level of the School Curriculum Committee.

They also discussed nominations for the 09/10 SCC Chair as outlined in the Senate bylaws that were revised last year. The SCC should elect the Chair for the following academic year before the end of February. They had put that in place because the SCC Chair receives eight credits of reassigned time for the fall semester. It is very important that the department for whoever the incoming SCC Chair will be is aware that this is going to be part of that faculty members teaching load. Nominations and election will happen at the end of the February meeting.

They will be looking at some updates to the curriculum guidelines and forms. There are no major changes. Many of the major changes to the curriculum guidelines happened last year.

Senator Lucey questioned the availability of forms online.

Senator Dunn responded all Curriculum forms: Course Proposal form, Program Proposal forms and Signature Page are available on the SCC Blackboard site.

VI. New Business:

There was no new business to report.

VII. Adjournment: The Senate voted to adjourn at 5:30 p.m.

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 3/9/09

**Minutes of the 391st Meeting
of the
SENATE OF
KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2009**

I. Call to Order 4:05

II. Roll Call:

Absent: Senator Lynn Richardson, Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson

Excused: Senator Karen Stanish, Senator Marie Duggan, Senator Lois Merry and Senator Lynne Rust

III. Secretary's Report:

Motion: To accept minutes of the 390th Senate meeting of Keene State College

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the minutes as written.

IV. Courtesy Period

Senator Schmid-Gagne invited all faculty, staff and students to a Diversity training next week on the 18th starting at 9:30am. Sessions will include Communication, Transgender issues, International students and a documentary showing *Tough Guys*.

On March 25, Tim Wise will be on campus at 3:00 pm in the Mable Brown Room. Everyone including the public is invited to attend.

Senator Stroup mentioned as part of the Keene is Reading Program, journalist and author Dr. Raj Patel will speak on the growing international food crisis and what can be done to stop it. This evening event is open to the public and will be held on March 25 at 7:00pm in the Mabel Brown Room.

Senator Saucier informed that the KSC Concert Band would be performing "Happy Birthday Keene State!" this evening at 7:30pm in the Main Theatre of the Redfern Arts Center on Brickyard Pond.

V. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator Stroup reported the major portion of the SEC meeting was reviewing ongoing conversations and important matters before the Senate. These included revisions to the Academic Honesty Policy, the proposed change to the grading system and the revised version of the Honors Program Proposal's progress. There is still a lot of work for the Senate to do this year and many of these initiatives including the Chemistry review will have to come up at our April 15 and April 22 meetings.

The SEC is anticipating next year's elections for those rotating off the Senate. Many committees including the SCC and AOC have tried to make extensive plans for continuity so it is not a completely different group of people year after year. If you have questions whether your term is over or not, please see the Senate's Secretary at the end of the meeting. Encourage colleagues in your departments and offices to consider this important service.

~The Executive committee is continuing to look at the finals block scheduling concern.

~There is nothing new to report regarding conversations within the University System on the possible Nursing program.

~There are no motions from the Executive Committee at this time.

Senator Dunn wanted clarification that motions can come forward at the April meeting

Senator Stroup advised yes.

Senator Clemmenson - Motions that come through the April 15 meeting will be for the next academic year.

Senator Stroup confirmed it would not be for next year but the following year due to catalog deadlines. For something to be included in next year's version of the catalog, it would need to be voted on tonight.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Smith stated the AOC met on March 4 and discussed the Chemistry AOC review. They did get confirmation that they can present on April 22 a presentation of the AOC Chemistry Report to the Senate.

The AOC Subcommittee talked about their progress regarding their report and they are going to be able to meet timelines.

They also designed a checklist they believe will be helpful for future AOC reviews. This will provide people involved an extra resource as to what their responsibilities are. It is an addendum to the handbook.

Senator Stroup questioned if it was different from the flowchart the AOC shared last year.

Senator Smith explained it was different. The flow chart gives an overview of where things go. The checklist gives more detail in terms of specific responsibilities for each member.

Senator Stroup wondered when members of the Senate would have the opportunity to read the report.

Senator Smith reported a full week ahead of time.

Senator Stroup explained the SEC discussed the request and clarified there would be no way to get the report to the Senate any sooner.

Senator Smith advised they are attempting but prefer to keep it to April 22.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Jean reported the Film program was revised to address all earlier concerns.

Motion: The ASC moves that the Admission Policy set forth in the Film Proposal be approved by the Senate.

Senator Timney requested a quick review of the policy.

Senator Smith explained the following:

1. They changed the email address to apply2film@keene.edu .
2. Faculty would not require release time to review the portfolios.
3. This would take effect with students applying for fall 2010.

Senator Dunn inquired if this would go into the fall 2010 catalog.

Senator Jean advised for the admissions part - yes. The curriculum part had already been passed.

Senator Dunn questioned how specific language appearing in the catalog would get to the editor.

Senator Jean explained in one of the previous packets the entire Film Proposal was attached. The dates were not specified. This was just the admissions policy that they wanted to carry out. For the 2010 Catalog the wording will be updated.

Senator Stroup explained that film came forward with this idea based on recognition of their needs. They were hoping it would be for next year and that led to discussions with Admissions. They would have to put something through this year for 2010. It needs to be another cycle ahead to institute something before students are applying for college.

Senator Dunn wanted to make sure there was enough time for information to get to the Registrar's Office for fall 2010.

Provost Netzhammer informed things that rise out of the Senate will go to one place and that will be his office. It should go through the Chair of the Senate as part of the recommendation of the motion to his office. He will make sure it gets to the correct person.

Senator Lucey questioned when it takes effect. Is it going into the catalog so students applying next fall will be able to send portfolios next year for admittance of the following year?

Provost Netzhammer advised it goes into the admissions materials for next year that they are putting together now. It will be reflected in the catalog a year from now.

Senator Lucey confirmed the first class would be the students coming in 2010.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Jean reported the ASC invited Brinda Charry, Nick Germana and Tom Richards to discuss the grading system. The results of the discussion were put in a survey to faculty and students. She reported 184 flyers were distributed to full time faculty and need to be returned to her by March 13. She stated of 24% has been returned. 68% voted yes and 32% voted no. She will tally the results again after Friday March 13 and send out an email to all faculties with the results.

Senator Cerilli reported on the students results of the survey. This was endorsing to keep the same grading system that is in place now. The Student Assembly Representatives votes are as follows: 12 yes 5 no 2 abstained

Senator Stroup mentioned if this goes to the full Senate for a vote in April, it would be useful for members to see a brief rationale to go along with this information,

Senator Hanrahan wondered why students wanted to keep the grading system.

Senator Clemmenson explained the main reason was "if it's not broke why fix it". It affects people on the high end or people on the low end. Either way somebody is going to get the short end of it.

Senator Stroup requested raw numbers of the vote from the faculty.

Senator Jean reported 30 yes and 14 no.

Senator Timney stressed what needs to be a clarification of the chart for the rationale of not changing the grading system. There seems to be an assumption that all students at the AB grade will be getting the B+. They very well may get the A-, which will give them a higher score, and a better overall GPA. If we look at the grades on the bell curve, the majority of students with an AB would

probably be slightly more likely to get a B+ instead of an A-. The odds are it will not change much at all. There is potential opportunity to increase the GPA assuming the bell curve is skewed to the higher side rather than the lower side. If that is the case, the average GPA will increase.

Senator Hanrahan stated they left that in because it clearly says the lower half of the AB. A student with a cumulative average 3.3 in the future will not be on the Dean's list. It was important for students to understand that a B+ will not put them on the Dean's list.

Senator O'Brien questioned if the Student Assembly Representatives received any input from the student body as a whole.

Senator Saucier explained there were discussions at their first meeting whether they should survey students. At that time, they were also doing a survey on tobacco product sales on campus. They decided to keep the discussion within the Student Assembly because they are the elected representatives of the students and felt they would make the right decision with that.

Senator Jean continued with her report. She stated more discussions are needed on high credit majors. There are several factors including the difference between a high credit major and a dual major.

The Honors Admission Policy was accepted for the program even though they knew at that time the SCC had not approved the Honors Program in general.

At the February 25 meeting, they developed a flyer for faculty and student input concerning the proposed grading system change.

They have been looking at the Academic Honesty Policy and it will be on the agenda for their next meeting after the break.

Senator Stoup requested an attachment of the Academic Honesty Policy to go out to all Senators in advance of the packet.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Dunn stated the SCC met on February 25. She provided members information on the presentation from the recent Faculty Chairs meeting, which included changes to the Honors Proposal. At that time, the ISP Council and ISP Advisory Board had met and approved the Honors Proposal and have gone forward. There has been a request from Dr. Helen Frink that a couple of extra days are provided for departmental advisory opinions based on the faculty meeting that occurred on Friday. Senator Dunn checked with the School Curriculum Committee Chairs and the II Coordinator to see if it was ok to have advisory opinions, votes and proposals to those committees by this Friday at noon. They were fine with that. It gives departments extra time to discuss the proposal at length. The SCC will get everything by April 1 and will be discussed at their April 8 meeting.

The SCC looked at the 200 level ISP course proposals that came forward because of the SCC decision to not go forward with the 299 proposal from the ISP. The proposals at the 200 level if passed will be available for the fall 2009.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IH Comm 270 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IH Hist 220 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IH Hist 221 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IH AMST 291 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IA Art 207 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Dunn noted that she would notify the Registrar's office that these courses have been approved because the next step will be to get them into the student information system. Once they are in the system either she or the Registrar will contact the Department Chairs so their administrative assistants can put the information in and assign rooms.

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the Geology major and minor be approved by the Senate.

Senator Timney questioned if this included a change in credits.

Senator Dunn replied no, it does not. It reflects a change in the course number and that affected both the major and minor.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Dunn noted the next motion is for the fall 2010 catalog

Motion: The SCC moves that the IA ART 300 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

The next item on the agenda was proposals being presented as information to the Senate. They are listed and available on Blackboard.

Agenda Item # 4 - Senator Rosemary Gianno has been nominated and elected Chair of the SCC for the 2009-2010 year.

Agenda Item #5 - The signature page for 2009-2010 has been updated at the request of the President and Provost. The signature area for the President will be removed. The President will review only proposals that go to SAPC and all other proposals are within the Provost's authority to approve.

President Giles-Gee stated this recognizes the authority of the Provost with regard to act in matters of the campus. Once they reach the board level, she will respond as a representative of the institution in terms of advocating for the decisions made here.

Senator Dunn also reported on other items up for discussion:

1. The website information that is contained in the guidelines is outdated and will be removed.
2. Provost statement of resources for program proposal
3. Changes to the course proposal form.

Senator Jean reported there are guidelines specific to II courses proposals that are unique. They might address these issues on the Blackboard site.

Senator Dunn acknowledged part of the conversation was that it would come forward to the SCC Chair from the Coordinator of the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee and then presented as information to the Senate. It would be helpful to have guidelines on Blackboard for all ISP course proposals.

They are holding off presenting formal changes to the guidelines and forms because one area is the catalog deadlines given the move to the electronic catalog. They will begin to look at changes to deadlines for next year. They need to take into consideration the timing and availability of courses in the student information system in time for course registration. Registrar Tom Richard was not at the February 25 meeting and they felt it was important to have him there to provide that perspective.

They discussed that there might be a bit of an extension in the deadlines. In terms of considering the time for the School Curriculum Committees and the Inter Disciplinary Sub Committee to meet, and then getting proposals to the SCC and have reviewed in a timely fashion before fall registration begins there is not a lot of wiggle room. They will continue discussions at their April 1 meeting.

Provost Netzhammer added that as we move to an online version of the catalog they are hoping that we will think creatively about what works best for the institution and not simply move the catalog online to give us a few more days to get stuff done. They are prepared to update quarterly and not just once a year. Something that might be approved in January or February could go into the schedule and be offered in the fall. Something that might be approved in September or October could go into the schedule and be offered in the spring. Program requirements will be always be connected to the year in which the student entered.

Some discussions that should take place are what should be tied to an annual implementation date and what should be available as we do it. New courses should be available to students because departments are ready to offer them and students are ready to take them. Let us figure out a way to make that happen as quickly as possible rather than saying you have to wait a full year to be able to do that.

Senator Dunn added that it is in not only the guidelines that the SCC has established but also Senate bylaws. Therefore, there is an effective date component to that. If that were something that we wanted to look at in terms of the availability of courses that are going forward it would have to come forward as a change in the bylaws as well.

Senator Dunn mentioned a policy that they have in the SCC guidelines. Several programs require specific titles under topics based courses or "shell"-type courses. Programs cannot require specific titles under topics based courses. For example, in Women's Studies they have in part of their requirements that a student can take Psychology 495 seminar but the specific title of Prejudice is required. Based upon the guidelines they have outlined with regard to specific titles being required to meet the requirements of a program that is in violation of the policy because that specific title has not gone through the curriculum process to be a requirement for a major or a minor. They are looking to see how wide spread this violation of policy is in all the majors and minors that are listed in the catalog. She will report at the next Senate meeting

Senator Stroup explained there are other course topics offered under the same number. The question is how they review that student's record.

Senator Dunn stated yes but also the course itself or that specific title has not gone through curriculum review process. That policy has been in the curriculum guidelines for about ten years.

Senator Antonucci questioned if the program requirements should be by number.

Senator Dunn informed that specific topics offered within the topics courses have not gone through the curriculum approval process required for courses listed in the catalog. There has never been any oversight on the specific title itself.

Senator Dunn also noted that 3 of the 4 Schools are meeting the week of March 23rd.

VI. New Business

Senator Saucier shared an FYI with the Senate. The student assembly was charged by the President to take on the topic sale of tobacco products on campus. Last week they ran a poll in the Student Center Atrium asking if the college should continue to sell tobacco products. About 430 students responded to the survey, which is only about 10% of the student population. From that number 181 students said yes to continue selling products 243 said no. After debating last night at the Student Assembly meeting, the vote that came forth was to continue to sell products. Geoff Ness the Student Assembly Chair will be sending their recommendations forth to President Giles-Gee

VII. Adjournment 5:00pm

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 4/10/09

Minutes
For the 392nd Meeting
Of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE

[SD 08-09-36]

Wednesday, April 15th, 2009
4 p.m., Mountain View Room Student Center

VI. Call to Order 4:06pm

VII. Roll Call

Absent: Senator Cutts

Excused: Senator Stanish, Senator Merry, and Senator O'Brien

VIII. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 391st meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Vote: Senate voted to accept the minutes as written

IX. Courtesy Period

President Giles-Gee invited the campus to this evening's event on Appian Way. The Governor had very positive things to say about the college today at the State House. Provost Netzhammer did the first leg of the Centennial relay this morning. It will be exciting and should be a wonderful turnout.

Senator Cerilli announced *An Evening of Dance* will take place from 4/22/09 – 4/25/09 at the Main Theatre, Redfern Arts Center starting at 7:30pm.

Senator Timney informed April 30 at 8:00pm in the Night Owl Café, some of his student's will be presenting their findings in a class he teaching on the Daily Show. The program is *When News and Comedy Collide*.

Senator Clemmenson mentioned Bruce O'Hurley from an energy company talking about taking solid waste and landfill and turning into usable energy approached him. Bruce O'Hurley mentioned that it is at no cost to the college. Senator Clemmenson stated he does have contact information and that IBM is backing this and will be starting to use it at their company. He had looked at the budgets and stated it is about \$40,000.00 for waste removal for the dining services. This may be a way to cut costs.

X. Subcommittee Reports

Senator Stroup acknowledged this week's Senate packet is over fifty pages because it includes the Academic Honesty Policy Proposal as well as advisory opinions from departments and the School Curriculum Committees. This is an appendix to the SCC report. The meeting will start with the SCC report so Dr Frink and other guests can be part of the discussion.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Dunn stated the SCC had met on April 1 and April 8 since the last full Senate meeting. There is overlap from both of those meetings so she will present motions for SCC approved course and program proposals and then present courses that are here as information. The SCC has reviewed and discussed the following proposals.

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the Communication major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that revisions to the Journalism major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the II Math 310 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: The SCC moves that the II Math 315 course proposal be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Dunn mentioned the SCC reviewed the course proposals that are here as information. They are Math 102 and Chem 365.

Over the last two meetings, the SCC also reviewed items that do not have motions. These three items are:

1. The Honors Program Proposal
2. Catalog guidelines and forms, which include catalog deadlines
3. Review of programs that have special topics courses titles as a requirement.

The Honors Program Proposal

They do not have a motion for this proposal. The SCC spent a great deal of time reviewing and discussing the revised proposal with regard to advisory opinions as well as tallied votes. The resounding theme that came across was resource concerns. The SCC grouped these concerns into three areas.

- a. Continued availability of scholarships and travel abroad funding for students - What is the availability of that level of support for the program director with regard to reassigned time as well as faculty who are participating in travel abroad component?
- b. Tenure Track faculty availability to deliver the program - The Honor's program is promising that Tenure Track faculty will teach courses and that is not currently happening.
- c. Departments largely opposed to the program, asked to deliver courses for the Honors program.

Senator Stroup advised any Senator wishing to discuss the proposal that a motion and second is required to bring this to the floor. A majority vote would then be required to bring it to the floor for a vote.

Motion: Senator McDonald made the motion to bring this proposal to the floor for discussion and vote.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Discussion:

Senator Stroup extended courtesy of the floor to Dr. Frink.

Dr. Frink responded to some of the points from the SCC report. She spoke with Sean Gillery in Advancement and they will hear back from the William T. Morris Foundation in May about the ongoing support for student scholarships. She will leave questions concerning the resources available for tenure track faculty to the President and Provost to address.

There is a listing on page 17 in the packet of Tenure Track faculty who taught or will teach in the program. There are about dozen people and only one is an adjunct. He is a full time adjunct with a PHD and has been at the college full time for five years. She had good response from faculty elsewhere in the Sciences about teaching this course but biologists this past semester were still facing a very difficult situation of a young faculty member in biology who just passed away. People were covering her courses and not able to come up with an offering as they had hoped. There are expectations for both next fall and spring that tenure track faculty will be able to offer those courses.

Dr. Frink addressed the issue that some faculty who have taught and honors course come from departments that voted against the proposal, pointing out that among the faculty present at the meeting as observers were Sara Hottinger from Philosophy and Women's Studies and Nigel Malcolm from Communication and Journalism. Their departments voted in favor of the program. Dr. Frink comes from Modern Languages and her department voted in favor of the program. There are places where having one faculty member teaching one course every few semesters in the honors program does not have a serious impact. She does recognize from the advisory opinions they have received from departments, such as Art, that is just about impossible to offer an honors course in the near future. That is not a critical factor. There are courses to offer without the participation of every department on campus. She will leave the issue of faculty resources to the President and Provost.

Provost Netzhammer welcomes the input of resource issues from the Senate. At the end of the day, it is the work of the President and Provost to take the recommendations and figure out how to make those resources available. This vote has come down from the SCC level to something that is largely the responsibility of the administration to deliver based on the recommendation from members of the Senate.

One thing that is very important in this discussion is the issue of resources was in the very first hugely flawed iteration of the proposal. This was before a William T. Morris foundation visit to our campus. It had never intended to be a scholarship program. It was an attractive program and almost immediately, there were donors saying they wanted to contribute to an honors program on our campus. If the William T. Morris money went away tomorrow, it would mean that we would package students in a different way and would not have the \$25,000.00 a year to apply to the twenty students who are in the class. He does not see this piece as an issue. The availability of faculty is an issue. Up to this point, they have made available the resources to departments to replace full time faculty who have participated in the program. He does not see that changing and feels there is a strong commitment to support the program.

President Giles-Gee fully supported what Provost Netzhammer had stated and had a question regarding the SCC charge itself. Is it possible to decouple the curricular aspects from the resource issues? One substantially is curriculum, is it ok? Secondly, outlining what you believe are important resource issues. If this process always stops the curriculum at this point, then the question is how would there ever be a question to the administration about getting funding. It would diminish the opportunity for the administration to be able to respond to your question.

This curriculum is sound yet it needs resources in order for it to go. She believes what is needed is a different process. In order for this to go forward, these are resource issues believed necessary for this program to continue. Raise the question with the administration, are there sufficient funds to meet these needs and in what timeframe. She wanted to substantiate that when there is a program, the administration has sought to look for funding to support that program. Case in point, when Architecture became a major, the administration looked, asked and received funding for another faculty member for that program. Honors, when this program was approved, they looked for and fortunately found a donor to support it. It is their obligation with programs to try to find this funding. So, the question is, to decouple the curriculum from resources and saying, sound curriculum but these are the resources needed and then question the administration rather than closing the door to new programs that could benefit this campus before that question is asked.

Senator Duggan stated the resource issue is real. It is a lot of work and the last thing a student needs is another course taught by an adjunct. In her department, adjuncts willing to teach Economics are usually retired people and do it for fun, not with same total seriousness that tenure track faculty do. This is a real difference in her department and she believes we have come to a point where

we have said yes to a lot of change without coming up with new resources. In addition, people are not just angry about the resources but they have made a lot of effort in the past two years and are tired. There is a feeling this came from above and not asked about the program. It is just happening to them. It has created a difficult culture for getting people to make an extra effort and an extra sacrifice.

Senator Stroup mentioned that the emphasis in the summary statement by the SCC draws attention to the resources that we have been discussing. One reason behind the decision to edit the bulk of the packet to include the departmental and school advisory opinions is to reflect the range of discussion that has gone into this. Some of which does not involve resources as much as it involves other curriculum matters

Senator McDonald wanted to thank the SCC for their hard work and recognized that they studied this very carefully. It is obvious this is not a perfect proposal but most of our major proposals have needed adjustments along the way. He believes there is commitment concerning resources for this program. If the Senate believes this is a worthwhile proposal that is good for KSC and the students of KSC then vote in favor of this proposal. If you do not believe this, then vote against it. At this point, we can give it opportunity for life then a possibility for adjustments as we go along.

Senator Clemmenson clarified that the SCC was not against the Honors program. The Student assembly supports an honors program but felt they did not have complete information to vote on this particular proposal. The vote was 17 for and 4 against an Honors program. Non-voting members such as the Student Body President and Vice President voted on this as well.

The issue came up about double dipping. You can count the Honors program ISP courses towards ISP credits. That would hold honors students to a less standard than an average student. Those who voted against the program believed students come to college to specialize in a specific area. They do believe that an honors program is a great recruiting tool.

Senator Jean commented that resources are a part of this proposal. She understands the SCC is considering that as part of the proposal. If it is decided to not to consider resources as a piece of it, then a change is needed to the course and program proposals. This is an important issue. If it can come from administration, then that should be taken out of the curriculum proposal.

Senator Stroup advised it is a complicated matter. The Senate certainly would not move to approve any major within a department with one faculty member. That kind of matter has obtained in curricular discussions in the past.

Dr. Rancourt believes the initiative of resources and what resources are available to offer the program is important. What she finds interesting about this proposal is that has gone through the curricular process twice over the past few years. She has been here twelve years and has never seen a program proposal go through the entire curricular process twice. Each time it has gone through, the resource issue has been addressed. There seems to be a lack of trust. The institution in fact will support the students and faculty to teach the program. Those on the Honors council are baffled by the fact of how many different ways it can be said that resources are available.

Motion: Senator Stroup made the motion to continue discussion of the Honors Program.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Hanrahan stated the President and Provost told us a while back that if we passed the Honors Program, resources will be provided. Why is this even an issue?

Senator Dunn explained this goes back to what Senator Duggan stated earlier. Faculty are feeling strapped at this time. They are contributing to their majors which have growing numbers and contributing to ISP. To put an adjunct into a course for a major is where departments are beginning to feel resistance. With the stipulation that honors courses are to be taught by full time tenure track faculty, and then those courses in the major where the full time tenure track faculty will be taken out of and replaced by an

adjunct, many departments are feeling resistant against that. Even if that component is covered, what is happening to the courses delivered in ISP and courses in the major? There is also the point of another new class preparation.

Senator Stroup extended courtesy of the floor to Dr Mallon.

Dr. Mallon addressed the issue raised that this is coming from above because it would shed some light on this. We need to clarify the history of this program. It began with sessions President Giles-Gee called when she was first here. She asked what our concerns were, what our priorities were and what we wanted to see happen at KSC. She held a number of different sessions where faculty gathered and talked about what our values were and what priorities in our curriculum were and what in our actions could invite those values. The honors program came out of those discussions from the faculty. The President gave us the go ahead for this and said let us try to do this. This is one of several initiatives. The faculty generated and the President supported this priority. A number of faculties from all schools and many disciplines gathered and began conversations about what it means to have an honors program and looked at models from across the nation. It is important to address the mistaken notion that this came from somewhere above. It is a product of many hours of work from our colleagues.

Senator Clemmenson questioned since resources are currently part of the proposal can it be over looked to vote on today.

Senator Gianni stated over a year ago at the SCC meeting where they first voted on this, they asked for a copy of the email or communication sent prior to the announcement in the Campus News of the formation of this committee. They never received a copy on anything sent to the faculty, as a whole, inviting the faculty to be a part of this committee. It was communicated the committee had already been formed. There was not a general invitation made to the faculty to participate in this.

Dr. Frink responded in August 2008, she sent an email to the whole campus inviting faculty participation. The door is certainly open. They would love to have faculty from other departments, particularly, people interested in teaching an honors course. They meet 9am-11am and their next meeting will be on Friday, April 24 in the Hale building. Faculty participation is always welcome at any of the meetings, including concerns about the kinds of courses they offer and the nature or shape of the program. It is also possible to entertain proposals for faculty interested in teaching in the program. It would then go to the Chair of the department, Dean or the Provost and say how do we make it possible for that particular faculty member who would like to teach an honors course be able to do so with appropriate replacement staff for the major or ISP courses

Senator Duggan believes faculty want more resources. If the message were the honors program would bring more resources in, there would be more approval.

Provost Netzhammer stated it is wrong to say that they have not put more resources into the faculty. In the time the President and Provost have been here, in each of those years, they have hired at least three additional faculty over the number who resigned or retired. If you look at the recent data, they are up ten faculty. In the current year, they took three professional staff positions and turned those into faculty lines. The priority is the classroom. They have been very deliberate about adding additional resources into the faculty. It was a departmental decision to pursue Political Science as a major and to take one of those lines vacated and gear it as a Political Science hire. They have reorganized resources but have put hundreds of thousands of dollars of new resources into the faculty and the academic program on this campus.

Senator Schmid-Gagne wanted to refocus on the current proposal as it stands in front of the Senate and move forward.

Senator Pages stated resources is important in discussing the honors program. Looking at the list of faculty members on page 17 of the packet, she sees allot of people from A&H and some from the Social Sciences but only three people from Natural Sciences. Is this an accident? Is it reflective of the numbers of our faculty? Is there some reason why the Natural Sciences do not feel they should be as much a part of the honors program as other faculty members from other departments?

Senator Abernethy explained it was impossible for any member to contribute to the honors program because they are strapped with prior commitments to their own majors, service teaching, and the commitment they made to the ISP program. The resource issue is very real. For the Natural Sciences, it is not a question of replacing a tenure track line with an adjunct. There is not a pool of qualified people to teach Natural Sciences and run a safe lab.

Motion: Senator Stroup made the motion to continue discussion of the Honors Program.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Timney stated the resource issue has two aspects to it. One aspect is from the administrative side and the type of monetary support they will get. The other aspect as appropriately noted by the SCC, concerns resources from faculty members within the departments themselves. There is an honors program now. He would like to amend the proposal that would allow for curriculum changes the same as they did for the ISP proposal so they can modify it in the future.

Motion: Senator Timney made the motion to amend the Honors proposal as follows:

The Honors Program Advisory Council, any faculty member(s), or academic department(s) may propose a change to the structure, principles, or policies of the Honors program by submitting the proposed change in writing to the Honors Committee. The Honors Committee will consult with the proposal originator(s), and within three weeks of receiving the proposal, the Honors Committee will submit the proposal with an advisory opinion to the School Curriculum Committees. The School Curriculum Committees will forward their recommendations to the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC) and the Academic Standards Committee (ACS). The SCC and ASC will bring their recommendations to the Senate for approval.

Discussion:

Provost Netzhammer explained the intent of the amendment is that the honors program is an all college program; we would adopt an approach that would say if faculty beyond the Honors Council were interested in offering changes to the program, they would have that right to do so.

Senator Clemmenson believes what this is saying, is the Senate is ready to put accelerated students that come to college looking for an Honors program into an imperfect Honors program. Why would we approve a program that is not perfect?

Dr. Frink stated her understanding of the amendment is there will be a process for curricular change to the Honors program. It doesn't say the Honors program is flawed, it says there needs to be a process in place to make changes to it as we see fit in the way we can change departmental majors or the ISP requirements. It puts the Honors program within the same framework for curricular change. She does accept the amendment as proposal sponsor.

Senator Antonucci questioned when this takes place.

Senator Timney explained they are voting on the amendment first. If the Honors program itself is accepted, it would go through the normal curriculum process according to dates set by the SCC.

Senator Dunn confirmed this would happen for the fall 2010.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the amendment and have attached it to the proposal.

Senator Clemmenson questioned again about putting students into a program that is an experiment. That is not benefiting the student.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained it is not an experimental program. All curriculums on campus are reviewed, and change constantly. It was not a question from the SCC about the curriculum. It was about the resources to deliver the program.

Senator Abernethy stated discussions in his department regarding the honors program, there was concern that the curriculum as described did not seem to serve students who had an interest in Physical Science

Senator Hartz brought attention to page 8 in the bylaws under The Curriculum Committee. *This includes working the School Curriculum Committees and the Integrated Studies Program Committee to ensure that the process of curriculum revision is professional and uniform across schools.* It does not refer to examining resource issues or identifying those types of issues.

Senator Dunn acknowledged the sentence above that one that states *The SCC oversees the College's undergraduate and graduate curriculum.* In that sense, they are addressing resource issues as it relates to curriculum. The availability of courses, availability of faculty to teach those courses and faculty input into a program. They were acknowledging the fact that in the advisory opinions, departments did have concerns over the actual curriculum that was set forward in this proposal. They chose to focus on the resources because resources are directly tied to curriculum, the curriculum development and implementation.

Senator Cerilli wanted clarification on the double dipping for Honors students.

Dr. Frink explained students that go through the ISP, take eight courses in their perspective area. For Honor students, three courses are Honors courses and they take four courses in their perspective area. Since they are going to take four perspective courses as all students take, in fact a larger number of perspective courses, it is all right. For example, the Natural Sciences courses that they will need to take are not Honors courses. They will get those Natural Sciences courses as part of the non-honors ISP requirements they take anyway.

Senator Stroup extended courtesy of the floor to Dr. Malcolm.

Dr. Malcolm acknowledged the proposal is better. It is a process of change and the issue of resources is on the table. People have expressed their commitment to find more resources. The question now is, is this something good for the college?

Dr. Rancourt mentioned the most number of sections of honors courses is three. We are not talking about allot of courses every semester. As long as we are enrolling twenty students into the program a year, we need to find faculty to teach three courses a semester. Resources will be needed, but it is not a significant amount to deliver this program when you look at the number of courses needed to be delivered every semester.

Senator Saucier confirmed three Honors courses offered every semester and twenty students admitted to the program every year. Can Non-Honor students take Honors courses?

Dr. Frink explained according to the proposal, if an Honors course has space, (they are capped at twenty students) up to five non-honors students can be admitted to class by permission of the instructor. That window is there to provide access in case there are students in a major who need to get into a particular course taught as an Honors section that semester.

Senator Stroup extended courtesy of the floor to Dr. Darby, the Chair of Music.

Dr. Darby stated he has filled out many curriculum forms and they mandate a resource statement on the course proposal or program proposal. It is a mischaracterization, by reviewing advisory opinions that full time faculty feel the curriculum is sound. He asked Senators to review the advisory opinions because there are many significant curriculum concerns. We do have to ask ourselves if this is in the best interest of the college where there are so many reservations by full time faculty. There are 185 full time faculty that represent 2900 years of service and this is an important voice to consider.

Dr. Rancourt explained two out of three schools and the majority of the departments approved this.

Senator Duggan does not like fact of creating the Honors program when a large number of people do not think this is a good idea. She would like to find a way to bring the campus together on this and she sees very dedicated people with serious concerns.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne requested clarification from Dr. Frink concerning the survey of faculty. How many supported the program.

Dr. Frink reported seventy seven percent were in favor of the program.

Dr. Darby questioned how many people responded to the survey. He recalled the results as seventy five to seventy seven percent were in favor of the idea of the Honors program.

Senator Stroup acknowledged it was a fair point but the debate needs to stay to the proposal that is front of the Senate.

Senator Stroup requested the Senate take a ballot vote on the proposal. They are to write yes, no or abstained on the index card and bring their vote to the Senate Clerk.

Senator Stroup reported the Senate Clerk and Senate Secretary counted the votes. The results are as follows: 12-yes 10-no 1-abstained. The motion carries

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the Honors Program Proposal as amended earlier in the discussion.

Senator Dunn continued with her report.

The SCC discussed process concerns at their April 1 meeting submitted by the Science and Social Science School Curriculum Committee chair. These were to emphasize department/discipline representation on School Curriculum Committees, possibly changing School Curriculum Committee terms, and submitting Curriculum Proposals to the deans and School Curriculum Committee chairs simultaneously.

They also discussed the SCC guidelines were not emphasized or followed when it came to membership. In the SCC guidelines, it states that School Curriculum Committee memberships form at the end of every spring semester. She noticed that many of the School Curriculum Committees were scrambling to get their membership together by the end of September of the academic year. It poses a hectic way to approach curriculum for the upcoming year. She sent an email out to the Deans, Assistant Deans and the School Curriculum Committee Chairs to identify membership for the upcoming year and have a Chair in place at the start of school year. She hopes there will not be any issues about representation and making sure there is a smooth transition of the School Curriculum Committee receiving proposals. The other piece was to make sure there was representation from the dean's office on the School Curriculum Committee. She does not believe that has always been happening. This was a concern that came from the Science and Social Science School Committee.

Catalog Deadlines

The SCC discussed the potential of altering the catalog deadlines due to moving an electronic catalog at their February 25, April 1 and April 8 meetings. This is a complex issue. They know there will be two forms. One form will house program requirements, which is similar to our current catalog. It will be available in both paper and online forms. The other form will be an academic guide. This will list course offerings and updated quarterly. They would like to extend the deadlines for faculty and allow more flexibility for course proposal implementation, particularly, for the corresponding semester. That would be for course proposals that do not have an impact on program requirements. For course proposals that do have an impact on program requirements, they would still follow the traditional catalog deadlines, for instance, December-to-December timeline. Course proposals that do not effect program requirements would be due twice a year to the Senate at their September and February meetings in order for them to take effect for the corresponding semester. For example, course proposals to take effect for spring would have to have approval by the Senate in

September in order for them to go into the student information system, the Registrar's office to update web advisor and to make sure there is room availability. It would be the same of process for February.

Obstacles that they are facing, is how to do this efficiently and effectively for extending deadlines and allowing flexibility. There would be three separate due dates, one for course proposals that do not effect program requirements and one for course proposals that do effect program requirements. Looking at proposal dates, seeing when these proposals need to come to the Senate, and backtracking in terms of when they need to go to the School Curriculum Committees, Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee and then the SCC has been a challenge. They have not gotten there yet.

Another obstacle is opening up dialog between the SCC, School Curriculum Committee Chairs and the Coordinator of the Interdisciplinary Sub Committee. Once that happens, they will need to change their guidelines and propose a bylaw change. At this point, the SCC does not believe they will be ready to propose catalog deadline changes in time for the Senate meeting next week. She believes they will have to work through this transitional period of moving from the paper catalog to an online catalog and go by using the same guidelines that are in place now. Maybe have some type of advisory guidelines and extend the deadline into February of next year. This will have to be one of the first orders of business for the incoming SCC at the start of the fall semester.

Senator Stroup questioned the instructions included in the revised guidelines for the School Curriculum Committees. He believes the two-year commitment is very difficult in terms of precedence that is in place for department business. What does two year staggered term mean?

Senator Dunn explained that you would have a combination of new and old members.

The SCC does have minor updates to the SCC guidelines and forms that they will be presenting at the next Senate meeting as information.

She will contact all faculty as well as department chairs about catalog deadlines for the upcoming year and explain that we are in a period of transition but for now we are going to continue what we have set forth.

Special Topics Course Titles

Special topics course titles are part of the requirement for majors and minors. They were reviewing the catalog to see how wide spread the issue is but did not have time during their April meetings to address this. That will be unfinished business left for the incoming chair for the fall semester.

- **Executive Committee**

Senator Stroup reported the Senate's last meeting of the year is a week from today. At the end of that meeting, we will be electing officers for next year. The newly elected Executive committee will work toward the formation of the subcommittees besides those that are already in place, such as, the election of chairs that have already happened.

Senator Timney asked representatives from the Sciences and Professional Studies about an election held or any notification sent. He will follow up with the deans.

Senator Stroup would like to have the full Senate, except for student Senators, in place so they can watch next week's proceedings and be here for the first meeting next year.

The SEC will charge a task force to discuss high credit majors.

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Warder reported the AOC has met and approved the Chemistry review. They will have it available for the Senate at next week's meeting.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Jean reported they received 78 faculty responses from the 184 surveys sent out regarding the grading system. Of those 78 received, 56 voted yes and 22 voted no. For the Student Assembly vote, 12 voted to keep, 5 voted to change and 2 abstained. A motion was made at the subcommittee the vote was 3 for, 3 against. Therefore, because it was a split vote they decided not to bring a motion to the Senate. Because this has been discussed widely on campus, Senator Jean made the following motion:

Motion: To bring the grading system proposal to the full Senate floor for discussion.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: Senator Stroup made the motion to table said discussion until next week when proposal sponsors Dr. Germana, Dr. Charry and Registrar Tom Richard can join us.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Jean reported on the revised Academic Honesty Policy.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revised Academic Honesty Policy be approved by the Senate.

Friendly amendment by Senator Stoup:

Motion: Senator Stroup moves to add the following sentence to the end of Part II, Section D, at the end of the first paragraph on page 44. "A copy of the Assistant Dean's report will be sent to the Faculty member."

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the friendly amendment.

Senator Denehy pointed out a typographical error on page 43. Section D, on the third line. It should read*student's KSC mailcruiser*....

Senator Stroup mentioned that the Senate last considered this as a whole last spring and tabled those revisions at the time. The document is substantially different from what they had looked at a year ago.

Senator Timney question if he had a student that commits a violation, does he decide if it is a level 1,2 or 3 or does he suggest what level it should be at. How does that work?

Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained the faculty member would fill out the faculty report form stating whether it was a 1, 2 or 3. The Assistant Dean would look at that and assuming with the Assistant Dean's knowledge of all other things that have happened, they would discuss the situation with the faculty member if they felt any change would need to take place. If a student has a minor citation issue but you have suspended them, the Assistant Dean may say this is what generally has happened for that. The only time an Assistant Dean might make a change that is required, is if the Assistant Dean has knowledge of the student's prior history. As a faculty member, you may not have that information. If the Assistant Dean discovers that this is the 2nd or 3rd violation, the Assistant Dean with consultation of the faculty member would need to make a change to the level and possibly to the sanction or outcome of the case.

Senator Timney noted page 47 of the packet at the end of the first paragraph. *Finally, any subsequent confirmed offense after a level-three violation requires a sanction of immediate dismissal.*

Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained there are different ways to be out, suspension and dismissal but there is still some latitude. Is this the end of their career at KSC? Will they have the opportunity to re-apply?

Senator Gianni was looking for a better understanding of the example on page 48, *submitting an assignment, completed for one class, in any other class without explicit permission from the faculty/library staff.*

Senator Stroup believes the idea is to be clear, a student cannot choose courses based on overlap and would have to do a different paper even if some of the material was similar in a different class. It is a more subtle one to explain.

Senator Gianni thought it should be more visible because it very different. If everyone agrees, can it be listed in the beginning where you list some of the major ones? She found it very hard to find.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne stated she would be happy to consider that an amendment and add it to the feature list.

Senator Stroup wondered if system council had reviewed this version. The current version in the catalog, every word of it, had gone through legal counsel of the University System. He wondered about the implications of Senate action in terms of something that would have that legally binding effect.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne explained there was nothing within the current changes that seemed to apply to that.

Senator Jean stated it was more a clarification of the previous document.

Senator Hanrahan clarified that once we approve this policy, it goes to the administration and it is part of their procedures to consult with legal council

Senator Stroup advised this is an important document printed in the catalog that all faculty and students are responsible for.

Vote: The senate voted to approve the Academic Honesty Policy as printed in the document and amended.

Senator Jean reported on the high credit majors. They listed the charges given to the ASC and addressed item three. Senator Denehy did a phenomenal job in researching comparable colleges and institutions for their credits. He took six programs, two from each school here and compared them to comparative schools to see what they did in that particular program. They made some suggestions but the ASC felt it needed a much larger audience and would like to pass this on to an Adhoc committee.

Senator Stroup reported the SEC has communicated the need to create such a task force for the next year.

- VIII. New Business
- IX. Adjournment 6:20

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 4/20/09

Senate Executive Committee Report , prepared by Senator Stroup

April 20, 2009

The Executive Committee did not meet, however email discussions subsequent to last week's Senate meeting have led to three items to report.

1.For the convenience of next year's Executive Committee (whoever is on it) as it establishes subcommittee membership and proceeds with planning for the 09-10 Senate, the Crowley Room in Rhodes Hall has been reserved for 4pm for Wednesday, April 29th.

2..SCC Chair Senator Dunn, after last week's meeting where the amended Honors Curriculum Proposal was accepted, raised a concern about the clarity of one part of the Honors Curriculum Catalog Copy and proposed the following change:

I'd like to propose an amendment to the Honors program proposal (page 2 of the proposal)

The current wording reads as follows:

Integrative Studies Requirements

IQL Quantitative Literacy

Four additional Integrative Studies Perspectives courses (16 credits). The three honors Arts and Sciences courses and four ISP Perspectives courses must be distributed among the four areas (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences) so that there is at least one course in each area.

For clarity purposes, I'd like to propose the following amendment: (amended part is in red).

Integrative Studies Requirements

IQL Quantitative Literacy

Four additional Integrative Studies Perspectives courses (16 credits). **Students must take one course from each area (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences).**

3.Messages from Tom Richard, shared the current and future SCC chairs and members of the SEC, brought up the possibility that the Honors Program Proposal approved last week could still be included in the 2009-10 catalog. This would require a motion for immediate implementation which, if approved at this meeting, could be discussed and voted on at the next meeting of the Senate (immediately following). Senator Schmidl-Gagne offers the following motion:

Motion: That the Honors Curriculum, approved by the Senate on April 15, 2009 be implemented immediately for the Fall 2009 semester.

Notes **[SD 08/09-39]**
Senate Academic Standards Committee

The Academic Standards committee individually reviewed the Academic Calendars and Guidelines revisions to the Academic Calendars and Guidelines that were accepted by the Senate. Please see the revised calendars and guidelines below. The revision made were are follows:

On the calendars:

09-10

- 26** Residence Halls open for new students at **8 a.m.**
- 27** New Student Convocation at 10 a.m.
- 30 Residence Halls open for returning students at **8 a.m.**
- 31 Classes and schedule adjustment period begin at 8 a.m.

10-11

- 25** Residence Halls open for new students at **8 a.m.**
- 26** New Student Convocation at 10 a.m.
- 29 Residence Halls open for returning students at **8 a.m.**
- 30 Classes and schedule adjustment period begin at 8 a.m.

11-12

- 24** Residence Halls open for new students at **8 a.m.**
- 25** New Student Convocation at 10 a.m.
- 28 Residence Halls open for returning students at **8 a.m.**
- 29 Classes and schedule adjustment period begin at 8 a.m.

In the Guidelines:

The Fall and Spring semesters will each include two quarter semesters of seven weeks duration. They are identified as follows:

The 1st quarter begins on the first day of the Fall semester.

The 2nd quarter begins on the first day of the eighth week of the Fall semester (the Semester Mid-point)

The 3rd quarter begins on the first day of the Spring semester.

The 4th quarter begins on the first day of the eighth week of the Spring semester (Semester Mid-point)

These quarters will be listed in the campus calendar.

The vote by e-mail was 6 For, 0 Against.

Motion: The Academic Standards Committee would like to make a motion that the Senate accept the revised Academic Calendars and Guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,
Sally Jean, Chair

[SD 08/09-41]
2008/2009 Senate Curriculum Committee Report
Final follow-up from spring 2009

From April 8th (awaiting EDUC advisory opinion)

Revisions to the B.A. in Mathematics major were approved by the SCC (6-0-0-2).

****The SCC moves that revisions to the B.A. in Mathematics major be approved by the Senate.**

Final follow-up on curriculum forms and guidelines for 2009/2010

Discussion of updates held at prior SCC meetings during the spring 2009 semester. The SCC has held off on presenting these changes as we continued to discuss the possibility of changing the catalog deadlines. However, as presented at the April 15th Senate meeting, the SCC will continue with current deadlines during this period of transition with the on-line catalog. The in-coming SCC will re-visit catalog deadlines at the start of the fall 2009 semester.

Based on current curriculum guidelines, the deadlines for 2009/2010 are:

Curriculum proposals are due to the School Curriculum Committees and Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee by October 7th (first Wednesday in October). Proposals shall be forwarded to the SCC 3 weeks from that date (Wednesday, October, 28, 2009).

The SCC chair has notified the School Curriculum Committee chairs and the coordinator of the Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee. The SCC chair will notify department chairs and faculty by the end of April of these deadlines, and also remind departments and programs to complete the "Intent of Curriculum Changes" form by June 1st (due to the dean's office).

- Forms - updates

Course proposal forms: addition of "course offering change" to proposed action area.

Both program and course proposal forms have been updated with the academic year; these forms will be available via Blackboard.

Signature page: President's section removed (as presented in the February 25th SCC report and presented to the Senate on March 11, 2009)

- Guidelines - updates

Updated President's section of the approval process (only signing those proposals requiring SAPC approval) (p. 2 of guidelines).

- Guidelines – updates, continued

Web site information under (p. 5) "course or program objectives" has been removed as it's no longer available.

Provost statement of resources for program proposal has been eliminated per request of the Provost (p. 5 guidelines). The deans' offices are reviewing for resource issues early in the planning stages. The Provost feels that it is his responsibility to support the proposal if it's been approved by the Senate.

Respectfully submitted,
Becky Dunn
SCC chair, 2008/2009

Minutes
393rd Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 22nd, 2009
4 p.m., Mountain View Room Student Center

Call to Order 4:07

I. Roll Call

Excused: Senator Lynn Richardson, Senator Karen Stanish and Parliamentarian Ann Atkinson

II. Secretary's Report

Senator Schmidl-Gagne acknowledged members that will be leaving the Senate this year because their terms are up. They are Colin Abernethy, Rebecca Dunn, Lynn Richardson, Merriam Pages, Deb Merchant, Karen Stanish, Lynn Rust, Tom O'Brien, Matt Cutts and Anna Cerilli.

Senator Stroup acknowledged Ann Atkinson for her work as the Senate Parliamentarian. She had been a Senator for several years. When her term was up, she has been serving as the Parliamentarian for the past two years and has been a great help to the Senate.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne wanted to thank Senate Clerk Cheryl Martin for the quick turn around of the last Senate minutes from the last week. They were extensive.

Motion: To accept the minutes for the 392nd meeting of the Keene State College Senate.

Senator Smith noted on page 12 the third motion should read *The ASC moves...*

Senator Jean mentioned on page 13 that the last sentence of the last paragraph should read ...They made some suggestions but the ASC...

Senator Warder stated the last sentence on page 11; his name is misspelled and should be Senator *Warder*.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the minutes as corrected.

III. Courtesy Period

Senator Stroup passed around flyers for the following two events:

Monday, April 27th at 6:00pm in the Thorne-Sagendorph Art Gallery Conference Room – Dr. Lauret Savoy, a professor of environmental studies and geology at Mt. Holyoke College will give a lecture on the book written by her father, *Alien Land, a novel by Willard Savoy*.

Students in the Creative Writing minor will be reading from their portfolios on Tuesday, April 28 at 6:00pm in the Atrium Study Room, Young Student Center.

Senator O'Brien stated that last month the Student Senators brought the results of their polling on the issue of tobacco products on campus. In his Stats class, his students did some research and contacted about 126 faculty and staff. They received 56 responses and of those 45 opposed the sale of tobacco products on campus.

Senator Saucier reported the student government has finished going through elections for next year. Senator Donnie Clemmenson will be the Student Body President and Anna Cerilli will be the Student Body Vice President.

Senator Timney mentioned that he would like to talk with any faculty who might be interested in a pet project of his. Recently, in the news, the Texas Board of Education is tweaking its curricular to allow for alternative theories in the teaching of evolution. It is not as drastic as past attempts but it is a back door effort to shove science out of the way to bring religious ideology in. He is hoping to get a statement from faculty that would go directly to the textbook manufactures. In Texas, grades K-12 curriculum books change radically because they are the largest buyer of books. He would like to get a group of people together who would be willing to say they would never buy a book from McGraw-Hill ever on any subject if they were going to bow to a change in their science curriculum. He is not sure if McGraw-Hill is involved or not.

IV. Subcommittee Reports

- **Executive Committee**

Senator Stroup confirmed for the convenience of next years Executive Committee who will be elected at the Senate meeting immediately following this one, there will a meeting in the Crowley Room of Rhodes Hall next Wednesday to plan for upcoming Senate agenda and on going business including creating a task forces.

There was a matter brought up and then tabled for a week at last weeks Senate meeting so the grading system proposal sponsors could be here to answer questions during deliberations.

Senator Stroup extended courtesy of the floor to Dr. Germana and Dr. Charry to be a part of the discussion on the grading system proposal.

Senator Stoup verified the proposal considered at length by the ASC was to change the grading system from AB, BC to a proposal that included thirds of grades. After the split vote and opinions stated in the ASC proposal, that committee was not recommending it. Senator Jean's motion last week brought the matter back to the floor.

Senator Denehy reported that he studied the issue of changing the grading system in depth. He researched approximately 30 comparative and COPLAC schools as well as our USNH peers. Roughly two thirds of the schools use some form of the +/- system, officially know as chromatic variance. One third uses a different grading system, others a .straight A, B, C, D and F grading system, no letter grades or something else. While doing further research, some schools around the country use only the b+, c+ d+ which work out to be the 3.5, 2.5 and 1.5.respectfully. This is the same quality points we use with our AB, BC, and CD and so on.

In a 2004 report by the American Association of Collagent Registrars and Admission Officers found that approximately 54% of respondents use the +/- system, while 39% use some form of the letter only system. In short, there is no standard grading system used throughout the United States in higher education.

The one standard that does apply to almost all US institutions is the quality points system. That means the highest grade is a 4.0 and the lowest being Zero. This is the most important scale to remember. The quality point scale is what educational institutions use when evaluating transfer students and employers look at when evaluating résumés. He checked with Sue Goding our transfer recorder, she rarely recalls anyone asking what an AB is, and lately it has been what an ITW is.

There is no official standard or relationship between letter grades and the hundred-point scale many of us are familiar with from high school. While one faculty can consider a 90 to be an A, another faculty member who grades on a curve might consider the student who receives a 79 deserves that same A.

The revised proposal given to the ASC had three rationales implementing this major change to the grading system. The first rationale concerned grading individual assignments but this is a separate issue from the official grading system. Faculty members are free to come up with their own systems to grade students' individual assignments as long as the system is fair and equitable to all students. Faculty can and do currently use the +/- system to grade individual assignments.

The second rationale is that a +/- system would have more steps in it, twelve instead of eight. This would allow for more precise grading of students. The grade points under the proposed system would be .33 points apart rather than the .50 system currently in place. However, the ASC heard from faculty that felt that these grade points would be too close together. Over the course of grading several projects, the same quality of work may receive a grade of an A- for one student and B+ for another student.

The third rationale provided to the ASC was that a change in the grading system would affect the students GPA. While this may be true, the proposal does not give any evidence to prove this hypothesis. Based on the information provided in the proposal and the research he has done on the issue, he does not see any justification of changing the current grading system at this time. While there may be a slim majority of schools which use the +/- grading system in this country this does not make it correct.

Senator Timney disagreed. The fact that two-thirds of the schools use a similar system does not hurt us to move in that direction. At the same time, he agrees it may not help at all. He does not understand faculty being unable to determine the difference between an A or an A-. Perhaps in an individual assignment it may turn out to be close, but when you do an aggregate over the semester, the grades will begin to differentiate themselves. As far as GPA averages, there is no indication or argument put forward that this would improve the GPA, on the other hand, there is no evidence that this would hurt the GPA. From a standardization standpoint, it makes sense to make a change to the grading system

Senator Pages stated part of the reason they feel the system is not broken is because faculty seem to already using the A-, B+. At the end of the semester, they come up with a number and use the A, AB scale because they have to. One could argue that it is not fair to the students. The results of a survey was sent to 184 faculty concerning the change to the grading system are as follows, seventy-eight responded - 56 voted yes, 22 no. Over 71.8% support a change in the grading system.

Senator Hanrahan declared 56 out of 184 faculty did state they were in favor of it. The vote went out before faculty was aware of the student's feelings on the issue. He is not sure all would vote the same way if they had the students representatives take on it. There are all of students who have AB currently and if there is a new plan, certain things have to go into the notes and transcripts that make the process almost impossible. Registrar Tom Richard stated to Senator Hanrahan that the AMA does accept the current grading system and he has had no complaints from any graduate schools or institutions with the process we now use.

When he spoke with other faculty, they mentioned that when you average, everybody has to put some numerical equivalent onto the grade as you are averaging. When you do that, you have to come up with a number. Whatever system we have, you can just plug that number in. What you do during the semester is a real feedback to the student. The last time this was done, we had A, B, C and D, and went to A, AB, etc. we allowed those people that wanted to stay with A, B, C and D to do so. In this particular situation, 22 people want to stay with the A, AB etc. and this is not allowing them to stay with their system.

Amendment to the motion: Senator Hanrahan requested the AB to stay within the current system.

Senator Hanrahan explained this is a Fitchburg State Law. The law allows us to include the 3.5 in addition to the A-, B+ and keep the current system.

Senator Lucy was concerned about numbers thrown around and only half of the faculty responded.

Senator Stroup explained that it is important to move cautiously, but even with ISP and four credit poles; there has never been 100% response.

Senator Dunn questioned both the amendment and the original proposal. Is there a plan in place for implementation? What would be the effective date? How would this be communicated to students and incoming students?

Dr. Germana stated this was a question put to the Registrar, Tom Richard. He made it clear that he did not think any logistical issue around the transition should be an impediment if faculty wanted it. There was a question about what this would look like on the transcript and how it would happen. Tom Richard stated in the end, whatever decision made by the Senate would be taken care of but would not happen next year. There would be a cost of labor. This would be due to figuring out and having notated on the transcripts. Registrar Tom Richard believed these changes are doable and made that point to the ASC and Student Assembly.

Provost Netzhammer verified that even though Senate Bylaws would allow for this, implementation would not happen in time for fall.

Senator Abernethy inquired with the current financial straights of the college, is this valuable use of resources.

Senator Lucy – Are we grandfathering students currently under the system? Does that mean they could have two sets of grades if you have a mixed body?

Senator Stroup explained there would be a transition where a student might have 3 years of AB's and one-year of +/-.

Senator Stroup turned it over to the proposal sponsors to see if the amendment is acceptable.

Dr. German advised the Senate should do what is in the best interest of the college. The amendment is not acceptable to them because the gradations were too fine. By putting it into thirds, it creates a finer level of gradation where a grade range can constitute of 3 points. In terms of complications and confusion of transcripts, it would only compound the issue.

Senator Pages agrees with the issue of transcripts looking strange due to a grade change and believes the amendment would only further the problem.

Senator Saucier stated the amendment would further complicate things.

Senator Hanrahan pointed out that we will have a 3.5, if passed. This was an attempt to allow the transition to be clean.

Motion: Senator Jean called to close debate on the amendment.

Vote: The Senate voted to close debate

Vote: The Senate voted against the amendment to the motion.

Senator Stroup returned debate to the proposal as originally included in the packet.

Senator Timney inquired about the costs that would be involved.

Senator Abernethy informed that Registrar Tom Richard indicated the design of the transcript would need altering, a flyer inserted to explain the old and new grading system, and how the new GPA was going to be calculated. The production and distribution of the flyer would require additional cost.

Senator Duggan expressed general inclination that it is a good idea to switch to A-, B+. It penalizes the students who are at the A- to get the same as a B+. It does not provide a stimulus to students to get an A-. It is unjust. If other schools have made a change like this from an AB program to an A-, B+ program what experiences have they had.

Dr. Charry explained most of them are happy of the change. There was some confusion but nothing mind boggling that they could not handle.

Senator Clemmenson reported the Student Assembly findings: 7-yes, 12-no and 2 abstained. The reason for voting against the new proposal is that both the current and new grading system has gaps. Students on the high end, 3.5 will get the bump up to a 3.67; this does not help students on the low end.

Senator Antonucci questioned the real dollar amount involved with the change.

Senator Stroup advised in extensive debate on the Senate floor such matters are not the break or make issues for the Senate. It was took look at the shortcomings and not how that would be explained or codified on the ledger.

Senator Denehy clarified the motion in the minutes was to bring the grading system proposal to the full Senate floor for discussion. Are we voting on this?

Senator Timney verified any discussion automatically leads to a vote unless the Chair clearly states this is for discussion purposes only.

Motion: Senator Timney made the motion to adopt the new grading system as proposed, to be put to a vote by the Senate.

Senator Jean stated her motion was just for discussion.

Provost Netzhammer stated discussion with the parliamentary last week concerning items on the agenda coming forward; she clearly indicated that if material were in the packet and information indicating discussions on it, that it was entirely appropriate to vote.

Motion: Senator Stroup made the motion to continue discussion of the grading system proposal toward a vote.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Motion: Senator Antonucci called to close discussion and calling the question.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Hanrahan requested a ballot vote for the grading system proposal.

Motion: To accept the grading system proposal

Vote: The Senate voted against the motion.

Senator Stroup turned discussion over to Senator Dunn to raise the second point of the Executive Committee's report.

Senator Dunn advised there was discussion about the Honors curriculum package last week after the vote. It concerned changing some of the wording to the program proposal to make the language clearer for students and academic audit purposes.

Motion: The language in the Honors Program Proposal changed to read as follows; *Four additional Integrative Studies Perspectives courses (16 credits). Students must take one course from each area (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences).*

Senator Lucy asked if Dr. Frink would speak to the motion.

Dr. Frink advised she did not understand how this is clearer than how it is states in the proposal. The language reflects the very last change before the SCC considered the proposal with what Registrar Tom Richard had suggested.

Senator Dunn explained what Registrar Tom Richard was saying, was the way he will have to set this up in the audit program. He would have to include the three Honors Arts and Science courses as part of the academic audit piece, as well as, the four ISP perspective courses. It would be clearer to include the four additional courses in the perspectives area.

Dr. Frink stated if it works more easily for the Registrar's office, she has no objection.

Senator Warder wanted clarification because there is a change of what is actually required. The rewording makes it one in each area among four courses. The change does not mention three Honors Arts and Science courses; it just mentions four ISP courses having one in each.

Senator Dunn verified the honors courses are not ISP courses. The courses approved last week, serve students in the honors program. They are replacing what the requirements would be for ISP requirements. Honors Arts, Honors Humanities etc. are not perspectives courses in ISP so they are not ISP requirements.

Senator Hanrahan questioned if a student in the honors program chose not to continue in the program, would those honors courses be counted as ISP courses?

Dr. Frink replied that if a student drops out of the honors program and had taken for example honors humanities course, the answer is yes it would count as an ISP IH course.

Provost Netzhammer advised the confusion is that the proposed change does not quote the entire Honors Program. It is just correcting how the courses in the areas of the ISP are reflected. It does not change the issue of the three honors courses students will take. They must take four additional courses and they must be from the ISP and represent the four areas of the ISP.

Senator Antonucci stated there is a fifth part of the ISP and it is in the interdisciplinary area not named. Is it because it is the Capstone?

Dr. Frink replied yes.

Senator Duggan questioned how it went from seven to four courses.

Senator Lucy stated it is seven; the three courses are listed elsewhere in the proposal. It is just clarifying the ISP portion because the three honors courses are counting toward ISP. It is a clarification in the language of which courses are not honors courses.

Senator Dunn reported three honors courses - 12 credits in the Arts and Sciences taken from three areas. Honors Art 290, Honors Humanities 290, Honors Natural Sciences 290 and Honors Social Sciences 290. Three courses out of the four areas would be honors courses and an additional four courses to fulfill the ISP would come from each of the disciplines.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the amendment as stated in the packet.

Motion: The Honors Curriculum approved today by the Senate implemented immediately for the fall 2009 semester.

Senator Stroup clarified he wrote to the campus about what happened at last weeks meeting. He received a response from the Registrar's Office that it is possible that it could be in the fall catalog.

Senator Timney acknowledged this would give students, faculty and staff definitive outlines.

Senator Jean reminded the Senate that the ASC had already approved admissions for the possibility of current students entering the honors program.

Senator Timney requested clarification of the bylaws to have implementation begin this quickly. Is there a rule about a portion of a vote?

Senator Stroup had discussed this with the Parliamentarian. The bylaws clearly state that a motion for immediate implementation can be approved and the vote would take place at the next Senate meeting. The next meeting of the Senate is today. It does not mean it cannot come up for debate but the official vote can take place today.

Senator Timney questioned if it is a majority, two-thirds or unanimous vote.

Senator Schmid-Gagne reported it is a two-thirds vote.

Senator Duggan asked why not be vote on this now.

Senator Stroup explained you could make the motion for immediate implementation of something, but you cannot make and approve the motion at the same meeting.

Senator Stoup confirmed the motion will come up for discussion but will require two--thirds majority vote for immediate implementation. The vote will take place at the next meeting

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Smith discussed the final AOC report to the Senate on the program review of Chemistry. It includes the Chemistry Subcommittee report, Dean Gordon Leversee's and the Chair of the Chemistry department's formal responses to the subcommittee report. Before making the motion, she wanted to have Senator Tom O'Brien, chair of the AOC subcommittee who wrote the report, share some highlights.

Senator O'Brien reported the external reviewers were Professor Jeff Byers of Middlebury College and Professor Frank Gorga of Bridgewater State College. For introduction, the department offers three undergraduate programs - B.A. in Chemistry, a B.S. in Chemistry and a B.S. in Chemistry/Physics. The design of the program meets the American Chemical Society requirements.

The Chemistry department's role in the college is to provide a number of courses that students may take to fulfill their general education requirement in the Physical Sciences. They also serve other majors by providing introductory level courses and in some cases advanced courses. The department also offers service courses that fulfill requirements in electives in Environmental Studies, Geology, Physical Education, Heath Sciences and other programs.

The resources they have available:

- i. The new Science Center is first rate.
- ii. The equipment is very good and the sophisticated instrumentation that is tied into allot of the computers allows them to simulate experiments perhaps they could not do themselves.

iii. The library has over 1500 academic monographs and journal titles in the field of Chemistry.

Changes in the program since the last review - there were five items they noticed and a few of those still remain as recommendations as they move forward. One thing mentioned in the last review ten years ago, was to appoint a department safety coordinator. It may have overstated the safety issue. It seemed to imply there were existing safety issues in the department. That is not true nor meant to imply that. With certain conditions in the department, it was possible that safety concerns could arise.

The strengths of the department are that the tenure and tenure track faculty are well qualified. Bob Lammela and Jeudi Davis effectively manage support staff under difficult circumstances. They have a heavy workload and laboratory scheduling is a problem. Courses taught are with the best long-range interests of the students in mind. The department remains supportive of student research, which is one of the big goals and strengths of the department. Going forward they would like to expand the student research that is offered.

He pointed out that the report is a few years old so they are working under some old information. There are a few references in there about some research programs perhaps not in effect yet, but it is in effect and has been for a summer or two. The physical facility of the renovated Science Center has provided both students and faculty with new separate teaching labs for general analytic/inorganic organic and physical chemistry. The department remains successful in obtaining outside funding for the purchase of instrumentation needed to maintain the program. In some cases, the college has supported the process with matching funding.

Administrative support for securing maintaining ACS accreditation has been articulated as a priority.

Challenges for the department are that the current teaching load among chemistry faculty is high. That was one reason the application for certification from ACS was denied a couple of years ago. Other college programs place demands among chemistry with far reaching effects. The nature of having all the service requirements has stretched them out quite a bit.

Additional lab space is needed to handle the large number of students and allow time between sections to breakdown, clean, repair and setup equipment. This does not necessarily mean that they need more space but rather should look into more creative scheduling. Another challenge is the lab facilities require constant maintenance. Lack of a full-time Chemical Technician places pressures on faculty workloads, taxes equipment, and potentially compromises safety.

Concerning the budget issue, they have had a long static budget that places the department in an unwinnable situation. That is a touch situation for everyone.

Communication issues between Chemistry and other programs it serves needs to be addressed. Dr. Gorga, from a similar institution was surprised at the lack of interdepartmental communication.

Recommendations are as follows:

1. Accreditation by the ACS will greatly enhance reputation of the program and improving safety is a prerequisite for accreditation by the ACS. Given the expectations of the ACS, the chemistry department should have the opportunity to expand the program with the addition of a full time tenure track hire.
2. Opening better lines of communication with departments and programs dependent upon Chemistry courses is essential. One of the issues is perhaps some of the service courses not be lab courses, which would free up time.
3. The department should proceed with its expansion of student research.
4. Chemistry should also develop a plan for the eventual replacement of old and outmoded equipment.
5. The College should address the issue of faculty workloads.
6. Developing a plan for the future expansion of the Chemistry program will include consideration of operational space. Dean Lerversee stated in his reply that this does not mean to find and spend more money but perhaps require creative thinking.

Finally, Dr. Byers noted during his visit, "Research is education." The department's speakers program should be revived.

Senator Smith clarified that the AOC review written in 2008-2009 is based on the 2006 Chemistry self study. It is a result of the extension rated by the AOC and the Senate to the chemistry department in the academic year 2007-2008. Therefore, it does not reflect the integrative studies program.

If the AOC reports and replies are approved, a copy of the self-study external reviewer's reports that are replies to the external reviewers reports from both the chair and dean, the AOC sub committee report and the formal replies to the subcommittee report are all forwarded to the Provost and the President.

Motion: The AOC moves that Chemistry Subcommittee Report and Responses be approved by the Senate.

Senator Stroup asked the Chair of Chemistry department to speak to the Integrative Studies and campus wide curricular changes in the last couple of years.

Dr. Blatchly stated he could not say there are any big changes. They have been and still are involved in General Education on several different levels. Some of the course numbers and prefixes have changed. The general practices, which were relatively successful on several levels, continue to be successful. If you look at the numbers of seats and faculty who are involved and had time to spend on it, they do allot. Education includes some very hands on lab-based concrete learning that offers a nice alternative.

Senator Smith mentioned their report was in 2006.

Senator Schmidl-Gagne inquired about when the AOC committee deferred the report. There was a recommendation that there be a discussion between the Chemistry department and the Provost to deal with some of the pressing faculty issues. In the report, it spoke about a full time Tenure Track faculty member hired but that was after the 2006.

Dr. Blatchly explained since the time of the report, which was nearly three years ago, Sally Jean was a member of the department and moved over to education. That is a net loss. There was an authorization to hire a replacement and that person will be starting in the fall. They were short staffed for a year while this review was going on. The recommendation is that another person is needed.

Senator Hartz asked if they could talk about the accreditation by the ACS. Is this tied to the assessment of the program?

Dr. Blatchly explained the accreditation first. They are blessed by the committee for professional training as part of the American Chemical Society. The American Chemical Society is nearly one hundred thousand chemists that encompass industry, government and academics. They sat down and said what Chemists need to have coming out of college. This is really information about the outcome of the program. In a sense, they have taken allot of the language and put it into their assessment but it is a separate effort.

The accreditation is thorough reviews about not only the construction of the major, but if the personnel and the facilities are in place. Another is whether you have enough time to do the job, which was a sticking point about 3 or 4 years ago when the preliminary application was done. They work on contact hours. Their recommendation is for the contact hours to be fundamentally what the campus averages, which are 12. In the past, we were teaching 14, 15, 16, and 18 contact hours and they said 15 is the absolute max. They also look at the library. It is a very thorough review of what we have. If they accept all of that, then an accreditation is given to the program. For an institution than may not be so well known, having that stamp of approval is vital.

Senator Abernethy stated the American Chemical Society is a huge organization and is the largest professional organization in the world. Fortunately, for chemists it is a very well endowed organization with a lot of support from the industry. In addition to the increase in status that students would have, having an accredited program on campus would allow students and faculty within the Chemistry department to apply for additional resources to enhance the program and scholarships for students. There is a real financial benefit in addition to the status of being fully accredited.

Senator Timney stated from reading the report, he is seeing that they are burdened with having to serve Integrative Studies in general education.

Dr. Blatchly replied they are struggling to do both, but as you expand additional staff, it makes it easier to do both.

Senator Timney asked if there should be a recommendation from the standpoint that the department serve its major's first and general education and ISP second. Perhaps this would influence how resources are allocated. In his department, they are constantly pressured by the Registrar and Advising to offer more general education courses. They refuse because they serve their majors first. They also refuse to teach overloads because they will not sacrifice time that goes toward teaching service and scholarship. He is not suggesting that Sciences are doing anything wrong but wondered if there was much consideration given to the expenditure of resources where they are so shorthanded.

Senator Abernethy stated everyone in the Chemistry department is mindful of the importance to the teaching of all non-chemistry majors who are studying other Physical and Biological sciences. That is crucial. Other departments support their students as well and there is a natural synergy there. They are also mindful that they should be actively contributing to the education of all students on campus. A background in sciences is increasing in importance in the modern world. Their role in general education and the ISP program is crucial and do not want to walk away from it or diminish it.

From his standpoint, he noticed there is a recommendation deciding whether some programs should require a chemistry course or lab or not. He believes that can be dangerous. All of the Physical Sciences are experimental sciences. There is no science without experimentation. He has difficulty teaching the 100 level classes, which does not have a lab component. When you have a science class with no lab there is a fundamental problem. Students that are going study Sciences need hands on experiences.

Senator Timney clarified he did not imply they were doing anything wrong. He was suggesting that in his department the strategy has been to serve the major. When it becomes apparent to the Administration, Registrar and Advising that you cannot meet demands, things start to happen such as more faculty.

Senator Duggan – Would one more faculty be enough to bring the contact hours down to 12?

Dr. Blatchly stated he believed so.

Senator Duggan – There is a recommendation in the report that a full time lab technician is needed, is this still necessary for accreditation.

Dr. Blatchly explained the American Chemical Society would look in a general way at institutional support. It was clear in the report that the time required of faculty to do the various parts of the job was too much to do a high quality job. They have \$600,000.00 - \$700, 00.00 worth of equipment just in Chemistry and really have no technical support for it. Anything that breaks, they have to figure out how to fix with a maintenance budget that has been the same for a decade. It is a concern when you go for accreditation.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Stroup explained the AOC's reports would look different next year under the newly revised guidelines.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Jean reported they did not have a chance to meet but went though email. On page 15 of the ASC notes, there is a typographical error. The last sentence of the first paragraph should read *The revisions made as follows*.

Motion: The ASC moves that the revised Academic Calendars and Guidelines be approved by the Senate.

Senator Denehy wanted to add a friendly amendment under Ceremonies that Commencement will be at 1:00pm on Saturday.

Senator Hanrahan stated it is a typo and not an amendment.

Provost Netzhammer - The calendar dates are for August.

Senator Stroup advised it should reflect the 2009/10 calendar included in the packet.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Dunn reported the SCC did not formally meet. Beginning on page 16 is clean up before end of the semester. From their April 8 meeting, they reviewed a program proposal for revisions to the B.A. in the Mathematics Major. They requested an advisory opinion from the Education department. The ACC has received that with their approval and support of the changes.

Motion: The ACC moves that revisions to the B.A. in the Mathematics Major be approved by the Senate.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Dunn reported that the additional information that is presented in the committee report is focusing on updates and some changes to the curriculum forms and guidelines. They have been working on making changes to the guidelines and forms throughout the semester. They waited until this particular meeting to present those changes because they were waiting to see whether they were going to put forward changes to the catalog deadline. As presented at the April 15 meeting, they are going to continue with the current catalog deadlines based upon the number of obstacles presented over many discussions. Based upon what is in the guidelines, the dates for the upcoming semester are to be presented to the Senate by the end of the spring semester. Notification can go out to the entire campus before the close of the spring semester.

Presented on page 17, are the deadlines for curriculum proposals for the 2009/10 academic year. The curriculum proposals will be due to the School Curriculum Committees and the Interdisciplinary ISP Subcommittee by October 7. Those proposals will be forwarded to the SCC three weeks from then, which is Wednesday, October 28, 2009. Senator Gianni will be addressing the catalog deadline issue at her first SCC meeting at the start of the fall semester. Senator Dunn notified the current Chairs of the School Curriculum Committees and Coordinator of the II Subcommittees. She will also send a notification by email out to the campus to let them know what the catalog deadlines are. She will also remind the department Chairs to work with members in their department on submitting their Intent to Curriculum Changes Form. It was a form established last year that goes to the Deans by June 1 to let them know what their thinking about for curriculum changes. They are hoping the information will come out during Curriculum Assessment day, which has been scheduled after finals week.

They are updating the Course Proposal Form by adding a course offering change to the proposed action area. It has come up several times this year and was a recommendation from the Sciences and Social Sciences School Curriculum Committee because it has been missed in the past.

Both program and course proposal forms are updated for the academic year and available on Blackboard.

The 2009/10 Signature Page Form is up to date and the Presidents section removed. The President will only be signing proposals requiring SAPC approval.

Other updates to the guidelines include website information on page 5 of the curriculum guidelines under the area of course or program objectives. The website has been removed. At the request of the Provost, the Provost statement of resources for program proposal has been eliminated. The Provost feels the Deans offices are reviewing resource issues early in the planning stages, particularly when the intent of changes of curriculum form has been submitted to them. Also based upon the curriculum guidelines the Deans office is part of the actual curriculum review process. The Provosts feels that it is his responsibility to support the proposal if approved by the Senate.

- X. New Business
- XI. Adjournment 6:05pm

Submitted by Cheryl Martin 6/2/09

**Minutes
394th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, April 22nd, 2009
6:30 p.m., Mountain View Room Student Center**

- I. Call to Order 6:20pm
 - II. Roll Call
- Absent: Senator Christa Parravani, Senator Michael Antonucci and President Giles-Gee

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

- Chair: William Stroup
- Vice Chair: Larry McDonald
- Secretary: Kim Schmidl-Gagne

Senator At-Large: Mark Timney

- Secretary's Report
 - Courtesy Period
 - Subcommittee Reports
 - New Business

Senator Gianni gave a brief explanation of the charge of the Curriculum Committee.
Senator Jean gave a brief explanation of the charge of the Academic Standards Committee.
Senator Stroup gave a brief explanation of the charge of the Academic Overview Committee.

Senator Stroup requested everyone take an index card and write their preferred choices of the committee they would like to partake in. They can pass them in tonight or hold onto them, think about it and give to him prior to the SEC meeting next Wednesday.

Motion: The Honors Curriculum, approved by the Senate is implemented immediately for the fall 2009 semester.

Vote: The Senate voted to approve the motion.

Senator Stroup stated the motion carries and will be communicated to the editor of the catalog immediately so the honors curriculum will be included in the 2009/10 catalog.

- Adjournment 6:45pm