

Minutes
for the 424th Meeting
of the
SENATE OF KEENE STATE COLLEGE
Wednesday, November 14, 2012
4 p.m., Mountain View Room, Student Center

[SD12/13-16]

I. Call to Order 4:09

II. Roll Call

Absent: Senator White-Stanley and Senator Brown

Excused: Senator Hanrahan, Senator Martin and Senator Rust

III. Secretary's Report

Motion: To accept the minutes of the 423rd meeting of the Keene State College

Vote: Motion carries

IV. Courtesy Period

Nothing to report

V. Subcommittee Reports

Senator Stanish - Senator Darby has a guest here for the Curriculum. Would you like to go first? We will be doing the committees in reverse order and we will start with the SCC.

- **Curriculum Committee**

Senator Darby- We have had three meetings since our last Senate meeting on October 24th. We met and reviewed proposals from Communication, Criminal Justice Studies, and Sociology. Revisions were requested from each program. There are two courses presented to the Senate as information: SOC 210, SOC 433. Our next meeting was on October 31, in which we met and reviewed proposals from Anthropology/Sociology, Sociology, Film, Holocaust & Genocide Studies, and Sustainable Product Design & Innovation. Revisions were requested from HGS for selected proposals. The following approved course proposals are presented to the Senate as information: FILM 355, HGS 289, HGS 494, SPDI 152, and SPDI 352.

Motion: The SCC moves that the IHHGS 189 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the ISSOC 125 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Holocaust & Genocide Studies major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the addition of the Anthropology/Sociology major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Sustainable Product Design & Innovation major be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the CJS 340/WGS 340 course proposal be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

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

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Darby - We request that the next proposal be tabled. The Nursing major, there was some miscommunication around this proposal for which I apologize. I believe we will get it back on to our next meeting which is December 2nd. We need to table the Nursing proposal for the time being.

Motion: The SCC moves that the revision of the Criminal Justice Studies minor be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion Carries

Motion: The SCC moves that the addition of the Criminal Justice Studies major be approved by the Senate

Discussion: Senator Treadwell- Just one question for the Standards committee, when you reviewed the admissions criteria I am just curious if you could share your notes. I read through them but you had mentioned interest in a further study. Could you share your thoughts around this because it was an issue that was discussed in SEC as well?

Senator Lucey - What had happened was Senator Robinson asked if we should get an advisory opinion from Admissions and we did. There was a concern on Peggy Richmond's part that we are being a bit to, I am going to use the word liberal, with applying such standards and there were some perplexities with that result. It was her understanding that the admission standards were really there to sort of answer issues of accreditation within particular professional programs and that they have been used elsewhere say like Plymouth. If students are comparing they can say well their program doesn't have...so if the student with a C average can't be a Criminal Studies major now at Keene State because of this. It was troublesome and yes we do want to discuss this further. When, where it's prudent to have such things can we actually have a policy that we can implement sort of campus wide. Of course the impact would be huge depending on if we sort of let things go but as things stood the way the proposal was written forwarded to us by the SCC, Senator Darby. The standards were well in keeping with other programs that have admissions requirements. A couple of gatekeeper courses were in keeping with what we do in other programs because we have no campus wide policy or implementation policy.

Senator Treadwell - Thank you that is very helpful just as we talk about the standards committee a little later but I wanted the consideration. It is not for this proposal and I know there are other departments so I appreciate you discussing this.

Senator Darby - Around advisory opinions to admissions, Admissions is not an academic program as I understand it but maybe I am misinformed. The SCC guidelines state a list of names of affected departments with programs can include advisory opinions. A proposal must list all affected departments. Is there a precedent for requesting an advisory opinion from the department or program which is not recognized as an academic department at Keene State College?

Senator Lucey - I would like to add that I had asked the question when I was chosen to be Chair of the ASC and what exactly the ASC charge is. Unlike the AOC and SEC we have no bylaws, we have no standards. We just do whatever we want to do. When Senator Robinson suggested that, we were like sure why not. The term or phrase advisory opinion was interesting for discussion. I do not feel that just because I presented it as information I didn't feel one way or another about it. It was just interesting to have that information. The Provost just suggested there is a larger issue. I also suggested that the ASC needs some guidelines as a result. So it's one thing to consider. How does it act as a subcommittee with the SCC particularly because I would not have thought about the SCC guidelines?

Senator Robinson - In my experience the ASC seeks information from whatever source it feels it needs. It could be the Registrar's office, the Admission's office, the Provost's office, an academic department or to go back to the original proposals. So the information seemed relevant for discussion and it is usually sought. In past years we had Brendan Denehy on the committee who often represented the Registrar's office so he would go back and do a little research of the implications. So it seemed perfectly appropriate to ask for pertinent information.

Senator Darby - Number one, does Admissions have an objection to this proposal? Number two, do they have a philosophical objection to admissions requirements for programs?

Senator Lucey- I think the way you made those statements misrepresents both. The first one, there were no objections at all to the Criminal Justice Studies major and the second was just a concern. I am guessing it was a very short email that we got. Let me see if I can simplify the language, there is a pattern of admissions standards that students have had to meet

in the past as I mentioned earlier. It had been applied specifically to Professional Studies accredited programs. She is seeing a trend that is going in another direction but there was no value judgment. It was just information.

Senator Robinson - I do think concern is exactly the right word but the question is what the impact on overall enrollment is if we restrict enrollment in certain programs but not in other programs. Criminal Justice is interesting because it is a highly sought out major and one of the reasons we are going to that as a major. Many of our perspective students ask about Criminal Justice. So in fact it is an impact on enrollment but restricting in some way. What is the impact? Just a question, a concern question.

Senator Lucey - I'll just go back again and say that this came up in discussion that I had for Art History and if there had been a sort of gatekeeper kind of thing I would have been locked out of a potential major that I wanted because I screwed up as a first year student and that would have happened to anyone anywhere else. Those standards are more sort of campus wide. I realized I had to get on the ball and change it but I think about our students where you know first time in college coming in and not doing well in the first year and the fear is that they get locked out of programs that they are interested in because of that or they are spending all their time taking courses which very soon will be much more expensive but they have to take that course for a full credit. That does concern me but I don't think I really started to think about this until we were having this discussion.

Senator Prosper- I just want to say that I didn't attend the meeting with our subcommittee. So whatever I say is me and not the subcommittee. I think our Chair made a great point in saying that our student population are first year students and some of the challenges they face in navigating colleges and universities and its different when it's a 4 year institution and not at a community college. Also, we have in our mission that we are very concerned about our academic standards and we can definitely think of other ways we can make sure that the academic standards are held where we want it to be, other than having these initial gatekeepers. Does that make sense? Thinking of other ways on how we can make sure our academic standards are well thought out for us and also for students, for example, in training programs and having to maintain a certain GPA in that program.

Senator Stanish - This vote is really for the curriculum and then we also separately vote for the admissions standards. Although we are discussion the admissions standards right now we are actually voting on the curriculum piece. We will vote on the admissions piece in a second.

Vote: Motion carries

Senator Darby - Our next meeting is this Friday and all curriculum proposals are available on Blackboard

Senator Stanish - I have encouraged all Senators to take advantage of Blackboard and I want to thank Senator Darby for reorganizing and really cleaning up the Blackboard site. I encourage everyone to go there as it is very well organized and you can find curriculum proposals very easily.

- **Academic Standards Committee**

Senator Lucey - I have pretty much said what happened for the proposal for Criminal Justice Studies, during the SCC report. We did decide, because everything as we said is consistent with current practice and similar admissions criteria, to pass it and I did bring it forward as a motion. We did agree that part of what the ASC does and this would be kind of an interesting thing. We heard through the grapevine that we might be charged with having this actual discussion in the future about our criteria and their purpose. I want to backtrack for just one second and say the point that I was speaking to earlier that I am playing part of devil's advocate, that I do believe that certain admissions criteria are appropriate at certain times and others maybe not. I just didn't want to make it sound that I don't believe in them for fear when it comes to the ASC and that is not necessarily true. We do have a motion to bring forward to the Senate.

Motion: The ASC moves to approve the admissions criteria for the proposed B.A. program in Criminal Justice Studies be approved by the Senate

Vote: Motion carries

- **Academic Overview Committee**

Senator Blatchly - We are in our site visit cycle so we have two site visits scheduled and another one which I hope soon to be scheduled. We are very busy as we are seeing visitors on campus to look at programs and working through making reports from them for next time. I am also hoping to have the Geology report for next meeting which is lingering from last year. We are busy but not much to write.

- **Executive Committee**

Senator Stanish - We are still working with our new technology and hopeful it will help us save some time and we will let you know how it comes. The ISP Facilitation and Discussion team is in place and will begin meeting next week. The next item may take a little more discussion. The SEC did put together a bylaw change to update our policy regarding Senate absences. We bring that forward as discussion only today but will not be voting on it today. We will vote on it at one of the December meetings. We wanted to bring it forth for discussion. We welcome any discussion or comments on the attached proposal for the change.

Senator Stanish - I will point out a couple of the changes. A lot of it is the same when you see the whole picture. The big changes are instead of having a number of three unexcused absences. That number didn't make sense in a couple of different ways. In terms of these meetings, the full Senate meetings we meet 8 or 9 times a year so three absences is quite a few. We thought two absences were more appropriate for the full Senate meetings. However, for subcommittee meetings three absences may not be very many at all. Some subcommittees meet quite frequently and some subcommittees meet infrequently. It depends on the nature of the work and whether you may or may not need to be there or you meet individually. So having this sort of general catch all policy didn't seem to make a whole lot of sense, so we broke it into a couple of different pieces. There are excused absences and you can get excused absences simply by contacting your Senate Clerk or the Senate Secretary. But two unexcused absences from the regular Senate meetings will sort of trigger the process where the Senate Chair will contact the Senator and the Senator would have 48 hours to respond in writing for a rationale for the absences. The Senate Chair would bring that rationale to the SEC at their next meeting who would look at the rationale and determine if the Senator should continue to serve or do we need to find a new Senator. As opposed to the old policy, where the policy was to have the Senator come before the SEC and it was very unclear as to what was supposed to happen. We thought it was ironic that someone that is missing meetings is required to go to yet another meeting. We didn't think that made a lot of sense. As for subcommittees as they stand in the Senate, or any other special committees that may be formed in the future, it would be up to the committee Chair to determine what the threshold for an acceptable number of unexcused absences is. Once that threshold has been reached that committee Chair would notify the Senate Chair and that same process would go into action in terms of contacting the Senator, getting a rationale in writing and the SEC making the decision. Those are the main changes.

Senator Welsh-It looks just fine to me although the thing that did stick out as I was reading this was the 48 hours and I was considering that perhaps it is reasonable period and then I am a bit of a Luddite and I would go 48 hours without checking my email on occasion. I was wondering if given it 4 days or 7 days or something like that.

Senator Stanish - I think that's very reasonable. Do you have a strong suggestion on any of those two time frames?

Senator Welsh- 7 days will cover the bases and is very generous.

Senator Lucey -Point of clarification. You said the policy at the very end is consistent with that of subcommittees, so once the offender reaches that sort of number then....

Senator Stanish - The procedure is the same. It is the Senate Chairs responsibility to make contact with the Senator, then they would have whatever our time period is to respond. The Senator would have that time to respond and then the SEC would make a decision based on the rationale.

Senator Sapeta - Is there a problem with people missing too many meetings or is it that we want to have a system place?

Senator Stanish- Yes and Yes. Yes, there has been issues with Senators sort of disengaging and missing meetings and people rightly so wanting to know what the practice in the past as well as in the future. It certainly has been an issue that comes up every year or every two years or so. As well as going forward we want to make sure there is some policy in place in case it does become a bigger problem. Thank you, we will reconsider that time period Senator Welsh and will bring this forward for a vote at one of the December meetings.

Also as we mentioned several folks got together, the Chair of the AOC, Rich Blatchly, the Provost, myself and the Senate Secretary to discuss what will happen to program review once the AOC is no longer. It is ending this year. We began discussions and have been brainstorming some drafts. We started a draft and will keep you updated on that. We hope to bring that proposal to you in one of the December meetings. We gave ourselves a firm deadline so that we get it done.

Speaking of the ASC we are working on some charges for you and I want to get these in writing so it is clear as to what the charges are and I will do that for you. Certainly a big one is exactly as we heard this idea of admissions criteria, gateway to majors, gateway to programs and that sort of thing. This is something the Senate has been hearing for several years. Our thoughts are the first step would be to kind of do an inventory of what we have. We can get a feeling of what is the Keene States philosophy is about this. What is sort of the trend and then see where we want to go next from there.

Senator Treadwell - I think the interest in this is that we get a sense of where the campus is and what some of the programs are. Then from my position and that of the administration is what the triggers are for this. Is it a resource issue and is that what is driving some of these decisions and therefore how do we address that? It is an inventory so we understand the scope and magnitude and perhaps the trigger points within the departments for this. The help from the Standards Committee to conduct that assessment will be incredibly useful.

Senator Stanish - Some other charges that we are working on, last year the Academic Standards Committee did a review of the grading system that we currently use and other potential systems. We sort of pulled information for the Senate but haven't moved forward, so we will make sure we revisit that so we know what that means.

We have sort of been hearing from the campus is looking at the withdrawal deadline in light of some of the research we have heard from Institutional Research about the importance of students maintaining academic momentum. So, is our withdrawal deadline at the right time? Do we have the right policy around the withdrawal design? Again, we will get some of those questions in writing.

The last thing, some of the Chairs in School of Sciences and Social Sciences are looking at trying to add an additional Monday, Wednesday, Friday time block to try and keep our schedule a little more efficiently and so we are looking at that and we will be bringing this to the Senate eventually.

I. New Business

Parliamentarian Weed- Can I make an inquiry? I'm not sure but it goes back to Senator Darby's report in which he called for tabling the report on the nursing program because of miscommunication. I always understood that if something is to be tabled from a vote but also it seems to me that the request might have been referral back to the committee and goes back in the report. Is that correct?

Senator Stanish - Yes that would be correct. I do agree. We certainly have had the practice that once a motion has been made we would need to vote to table. But your right, he never actually made the motion to table and it was probably the incorrect word. Yes, thank you.

Senator Darby - That's correct

VII. Adjournment 4:43