Members of the Integrative Studies Program Committee (ISPC)

Mark C. Long, Director; Mike Cullinane, QL Coordinator; Katherine Tirabassi, ITW Coordinator; Steven Harfenist, II Coordinator; Carol Leger (fall) and Bob Schauman (spring), KSCAA; Kathleen Forrister, Professional and Graduate Studies; William McCulloch, Sciences and Social Sciences; Randall Hoyt, Arts and Humanities; Elizabeth Dolinger, Library; George Smeaton, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

1. Summary of Work

The ISPC enjoyed a productive year. Our work focused on 1) curriculum and program development; 2) aligning policies and practices; 3) communication, outreach, and promotion; 4) visibility and representation of the ISP; 5) enrollment and staffing; 6) faculty development; and 7) program assessment. The fall 2016 ISP curriculum proposal included a simplified list of ISP learning outcomes approved last year and revised (and simplified) description of the purpose and philosophy of the Program. The ISPC completed a review of ISP policies and the ISPC and the KSC Senate Executive Committee unanimously approved a revised policy document. And, in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, we designed a cycle for ISP assessment that offers faculty time and space to consider what we discover in our assessments, and to consider possible changes to the ISP based on our findings. As we look ahead to 2017-18, we are hopeful that the proposed two-school administrative structure for the College will strengthen the Integrative Studies Program, and the place of integrative learning, in the undergraduate curriculum at Keene State College.
2. Work Accomplished

- **ISPC Charge Approved by the College Senate** Developed in consultation with the Office of the Provost and in conversation with members of the College community. The ISPC presented the agenda items to the SEC so that the working agenda would be shared with the campus via the Senate.

- **Submitted Program Redesign Proposal** to curriculum committees and Senate Executive Committee/Academic Standards. Unanimously passed by Senate. Policy changes approved as retroactive to earlier catalog years.

- **Drafted Statements of Roles and Responsibilities for ISP Coordinators** We outline the QL, ITW and II coordinator responsibilities, subcommittee charge and responsibilities, as well as course review policies/processes. These reports will be useful for the coordinators, the associate provost and provost, as well as faculty considering serving in these roles. The reports will be reviewed and, when necessary, updated, annually. (See documents in Appendices to this Report)

- **Completed Comprehensive Policy Review and Update** that was approved by the College Senate and made available on the Senate ISP and the ISP web sites.

- **Revised ISP Amendment Policy** The Integrative Studies Program Committee (ISPC), any faculty member(s), or academic department(s) may propose a change to the structure, principles, or policies of the Integrative Studies Program by submitting the proposed change in writing to the ISPC. The ISPC will consult with the proposal originator(s) and with the chairs of the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC), the Standards Committee (ASC), and the Academic Policy Committee (APC) to determine an appropriate timeline for considering the proposal. The ISPC will then send the proposal to all Department Chairs for advisory opinions. After the time for departmental advisory opinions has past, the ISPC will submit the proposal with their vote and advisory opinion plus any departmental advisory opinions to the School Curriculum Committees. The School Curriculum Committees will review the proposal and forward their votes to the SCC, the ASC, the APC, and the Senate, as appropriate, for a vote.

- **Articulated and Clarified Transfer Credits Policy** The Keene State College Credit Transfer Policy allows credits to be allocated to Integrative Studies Program requirements or electives. Advanced Placement (AP) and College-Level Examination Policy (CLEP) equivalencies are available at Academic and Career Advising (ACA) web site on the “Credit by Examination” page. Other transfer credits for ISP courses are listed on the “Articulation Agreements” page. Transfer credits from institutions in the United States and at international institutions are listed on the “Transfer Credits” page. Study-Away credits may be used to fulfill one upper-level ISP course with the approval of the Director or Associate Director of the Global Education Office (GEO).

- **Completed a Successful Search for a Coordinator of Integrated Thinking and Writing** The committee (Mark C. Long, English (chair), Michael Cullinane, Mathematics, and Susan Whittemore, Biology, read the application materials, interviewed, and recommended hiring Irene McGarrity for a three-year term as Coordinator of ITW.

- **Updated and Revised the ISP Document Archive on the Senate Web Site** (See Appendices to this Report).

- **Hosted Team from Castleton University** to discuss AACU Foundations, Connections, and Directions Grant with Ingrid Johnston-Robedlo, Dean of Special Academic Programs; Chris Boettcher, Associate Professor of English; Sue Generazzo, Associate Professor and chair of Math Department; Dennis Proulx, Dean of Students.

- **Developed an ISP Advising Guide** and distributed to faculty and staff. Will be distributed in subsequent semesters prior to registration period in the fall and the spring.

- **Published Course Profiles** in the Academic Affairs Newsletter: Steve Harfenist’s Physics and Music and Marcia Murdock’s Dance as a Way of Knowing.

- **Monthly Meetings with the Chair of the Senate and Attended Senate Meetings (when necessary)** to clarify and strengthen alignment of ISP with existing curriculum process at the College.
• **Conducted Video Interviews with Students** and produced an ISP Promotional Video Featuring Student Sarah Dugas. During the semester Randall Hoyt, his student Dylan, and Mark Long interviewed four students about their experiences in the ISP to better explain the program—to faculty and staff, prospective students and families, and current students—and to empower students to make thoughtful decisions about their ISP course selections.

• **Meetings with Working Groups on Campus** to develop collaborative models with academic and co-curricular groups, college-wide learning outcomes, the Center for Creative Inquiry (CCI), Living Learning Communities (LLCs), Open Pedagogy Learning Community

• **Engaged in an Open and Integrative Project** to explore ISP involvement in Open Educational Resources, Open Pedagogy, and Technology Fellow Program. Mark met monthly with Jenny Darrow, Director of Academic Technology, and the Academic Technology Steering Committee (ATSC) chair Karen Cangliosi to design a Domain of One’s Own pilot project for 2017-18. In June Mark attended the Domains 2017 Conference with Jenny and Karen in Oklahoma City.

• **Collaborated with Student Affairs on a Title III Grant Project** that, if successful, will expand the College’s capacity to serve first-year, low-income, Pell recipients and transform the campus’s engagement with first-year students. The structured First Year Experience for entering students is designed 1) to improve academic success, 2) increase retention & graduation, and 3) enhance campus-wide community and culture

• **Developed a staffing plan for ITW** and worked with the Director of the Honors Program, and the Academic Affairs Council to discuss feasibility and implementation in a more deliberate and effective staffing model for academic year 2017-18

• **Promoted Writing in the ISP and Across the Curriculum** through a learning community using John Bean’s *Engaging Ideas: The Professor’s Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning*. Kate Tirabassi and Mark Long facilitated two meetings each semester

• **Conducted two Workshops on Supporting Student Writers at KSC** as part of the May Faculty Enrichment Day to share the work of teaching writing across the four year and sustain a collective of faculty teaching writing across the disciplines and in the disciplines. At these workshops, Kate Tirabassi and Mark Long distributed copies of *Engaging Ideas*, now in its second edition, a book that was developed for faculty teaching in a new core curriculum at Seattle University. We have distributed a copy of *Engaging Ideas* to all who attended ISP-sponsored workshops in the spring of 2016, fall of 2016, and spring of 2017

• **Conducted an ISP Workshop on Tuesday May 16** to review changes to the ISP and to offer faculty and staff a forum for sharing ideas about how to strengthen the Program. Part I, “Make it New: ISP Outcomes, Curriculum, Policies, Advising,” reviewed changes to the ISP in 2016-17 and offered an opportunity for faculty and staff to ask questions about the Program and to share thoughts with the ISPC as we look ahead to the 2017-18 academic year. Part II, “Looking for the ‘We’ in the ISP,” an integrative learning collaborator, invited the fifteen faculty and staff who attended to share ideas about integrating lower- and upper-level courses, building parallel courses or course sequences that bring faculty and students together, or addressing ISP and/or college-wide learning outcomes through concurrent or sequenced courses, academic and co-curricular collaboration, team-teaching

• **College-Wide Learning Outcomes and the ISP** Mark met monthly with Patrick Dolenc and Kim Schmidl-Gagne, and at the end of the semester with the CWLO steering committee. Mark worked with Pat and Kim to plan and present an ISP/CWLO presentation as part of the end-of-the-year Academic Affairs meeting

• **Developed a Three-Year Assessment Cycle for ISP Program Outcomes** (See Appendices to this Report.)

• **Worked with George Smeaton on an Assessment of Writing** Kate Tirabassi and Elizabeth Dolinger who developed a new rubric for assessing writing. Elizabeth Dolinger, Mark Long, Kate Tirabassi, and Michael Wakefield conducted a direct assessment of writing using essays from Thinking and writing.
• Met with Paul Baures, Chemistry, and Renate Gebauer, Environmental Studies, and George Smeaton to discuss the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine report “Integrating Higher Education in the Arts, Humanities, Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”

• Developed an ISP Question for the Alumni Survey for the Keene State College class of 2015 that asks: “What experience did you have at KSC—inside or outside the classroom—that has proved most valuable for whatever you are doing now in your life?” One respondent wrote the following: “My integrated studies courses proved helpful as they gave me the generalist educational background that I need out here to teach every class”

• Meeting with Faculty Participants in the Undergraduate Research and Creative Endeavors (URCE) Mark met with faculty in the summer 2017 Institute to explore possible connections between URCE and the ISP

3. What challenges had an impact on your work this year?

The Integrative Studies Program has become central to our identity at Keene State. And yet there remains considerable concern that it isn’t “integrative” in any meaningful sense. Integrative learning is a framework for teaching and learning in all ISP courses and a summative learning outcome for the Program. The challenge for us can be stated in the form of a question: how do we create opportunities for our students to integrate learning—within the curriculum, between the curriculum and the co-curriculum, and with communities beyond the classroom?

4. What goals would you suggest for the next year of work in this area?

• Continue ISP Visibility Project to more clearly articulate the ISP in the academic profile of the College and in the experience of our students. Continue revising and updating the ISP web pages to more directly and simply communicate values of the ISP and goals of a liberal integrative education. And develop additional short video features to capture and document how our students make the most of their ISP

• Work with Dean of the Mason Library to develop a transitional plan for the ISP in the new College structure in general and the Center for Integrative Learning in particular Discussions may include writing across the ISP, the relationship between ITW and 200-, 300-, and 400-level courses, upper-level ISP courses, and “pathways minors” in the ISP

• Complete a Foundational Requirements Review to address curricular and program structure of ITW and QL by engaging the ISPC in a deliberate review of the two foundational courses; write a report for the associate provost; meet with associate provost to discuss findings and possible recommendations for campus discussion, if necessary

• Meet with Faculty and Staff, Program Chairs and Coordinators to gather information and perspectives on the ISP and to cultivate relationships for program-related initiatives as we transition to the new College structure

• Meet with Registrar and Staff to clarify program requirements (most notably the NEASC requirement for a 40-credit program minimum) and to discuss consistency and fairness in waivers/exceptions/substitutions we approve

• Meet with the Deans and the Academic Affairs Council to discuss ISP-related issues and invite deans to an ISPC meeting to discuss the program as we transition to the new College structure

• Provide Guidance for Faculty in Revising Course Outcomes and facilitate the process in which each course will include the integrative learning outcome, the academic perspectives outcome, and two of the five skills outcomes

• Plan Faculty Development Initiatives and set goals related to ISP faculty development across the next three years. Collaborate with Faculty Enrichment, Center for Writing, and other relevant offices/programs/groups, as needed
5. What challenges do you anticipate in your efforts next year?

We anticipate challenges in moving ahead with strengthening the ISP when the focus of departments and academic programs will be articulating their work within the new administrative structure. However, we remain hopeful that the proposed two-school administrative structure will strengthen the place of the Integrative Studies Program in the Center for Integrative Learning.

6. Do you have any other comments that might be relevant here?

We appreciate the support we have received from the Office of the Provost and the deans this year. In addition, Mark would like to express his gratitude to the members of the ISPC. Each member of the committee provided valuable input and participated in various projects and initiatives.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark

Mark C. Long
Professor of English
Director, Integrative Studies Program
Appendices

1. Integrative Studies Program Senate Archive

2. Job Descriptions, Coordinator Roles, Supporting Documents

   **Director of Integrative Studies Program (ISP)**
   
   Director: Mark C. Long, English
   
   Three-year term, 2016-17 to 2018-19

   **Quantitative Literacy (QL)**
   
   Coordinator: Michael Cullinane, Mathematics
   
   Three-year term, 2014-15 to 2016-17

   **Integrative Thinking and Writing (ITW)**
   
   Coordinator: Irene McGarrity
   
   Three-year term, 2017-18 to 2019-20

   **Integrative Interdisciplinary Requirement (II)**
   
   Coordinator: Stephen Harfenist, Physics
   
   Three-year term, 2014-15 to 2017-18

3. Integrative Studies Program & Honors Program Scheduling

4. ISP Assessment Plan and Schedule

5. 2015-2016 Integrative Studies Program Final Report
1. Integrative Studies Program Senate Archive

The archive at https://dept.keene.edu/senate/isp/ includes all Senate documents related to the Integrative Studies Program (ISP). The page provides current documents and reports, and historical materials, including the original Integrative Studies Program Proposal.

Senate Approved Policy Revisions March 2017
ISP Policies Fall 2016

Program Changes
ISP Program Redesign Proposal.fall2016

Advising Guide
ISP ADVISING GUIDE 2017-18

ISP Policy Clarifications Approved March 2017
ISP Policies Fall 2016

Revised ISP Outcomes April 2016
ISP Outcomes Approved April 2016

2015-1016 Final Report
ISP Committee Final Report 15-16

Integrative Studies Committee 2013-2014
ISPC (membership and charge)
ISP Director recommendations amended 2Dec13
Recommendations for ISP final version

ISP Committee Charges
ISPC Membership and Charge 16-17
ISPC Membership and Charge 15-16
ISPC Membership and Charge 14-15

Facilitation and Discussion Team 2012-2013
ISP Task Force Report and Facilitation Charge
ISP Facilitation & Discussion Team 4-10-13

Integrative Studies Task Force 2011-2012
Integrative Studies Program Review Task Force Final Report
Faculty concerns for the ISP Task Force from Martin, Stemp, and Welsh 10-21-2011
Integrative Studies Program Advisory Board Response Final Draft April 2, 2012
Integrative Studies Program Task Force charge original
Revised Charge for ISP Task Force
KSC Mission Statement
KSC Academic Plan-2009-2014
Which Core Matters More
isp-manual no longer used2 (inactive as of May 2016)
Student survey with data tables graphs comments
Student Affairs Subcommittee Report
Faculty Survey with data tables graphs comments
Faculty Forum Notes 11-1-11
All Campus Forum Notes 11-2-11
Administrators survey with data tables graphs comments
Adjunct forum 11-1-11
Academic Affairs Subcommittee Report
Assessing Academic, Intellectual Skills in KSC’s ISP

Founding Documents
Keene Academic Plan 2004
Davis Grant Final
Davis Educational Foundation Grant Report 2008-2009
Integrative Studies Program Proposal Full Final Version
2. Job Descriptions, Coordinator Roles, Supporting Documents for Director of ISP, ITW, QL, and II

ISP Director Responsibilities and Goals

The primary goal of the Director is to advocate, develop, implement, and sustain the Integrative Studies Program (ISP)

Director Responsibilities

- Review, maintain, and update curricular procedures and materials (e.g., ISP manual and website, curricular proposals)
- Actively promote integrative studies program and pedagogy among KSC faculty and students (e.g., coordinate with CELT and other campus groups focusing on teaching, assessment, and curricular initiatives)
- Ensure open communication with the campus about ISP procedures and processes
- Facilitate and maintain appropriate connections with departments and offices
- Work with the ISPC to ensure alignment of ISP outcomes and assessments with campus-wide initiatives (such as college wide learning outcomes, strategic plan, Center for Creative Inquiry)
- Provide leadership for and meet regularly with the Integrative Studies Program Committee and ITW/IQL/II coordinators
- Regularly meet with Senate Chair and attend Senate meetings as needed

Submitted by Mark C. Long, AY 2016-17 and reviewed by the Spring 2017 ISP Committee: Kate Tirabassi, Thinking and Writing Co-Coordinator, Center for Writing Director, English, Mark Long, ISP Director, English/American Studies, Mike Cullinane, IQL Coordinator & Math, Stephen Harfenist, II Coordinator & Physics, Elizabeth Dolinger, Mason Library, Kathy Forrister, Nursing, Randall Hoyt, Graphic Design, Carol Leger, Adjunct Faculty, Geology, William McColloch, Economics
Keene State College Quantitative Literacy (QL) Coordinator Job Description

Summary Job Description

**Working with Faculty:** Coordinates faculty development related to the QL Requirement; supports adjunct and full-time tenure-track (FTTT) faculty in their teaching of QL courses, especially IQL 101; each semester reviews student course evaluations of adjunct faculty teaching IQL 101; completes formal evaluations for KSCAA faculty teaching IQL 101; schedules and staffs all sections of IQL 101 on a yearly basis and monitors enrollments.

**Working with Students:** Advises students with transfer credit questions; fields student complaints and concerns about IQL 101 or instructors of this course; mediates student grievances/complaints and potential academic honesty and grade appeal cases; works with the Admissions Office, the Registrar’s Office, and quantitative literacy/reasoning/math programs at other institutions to help students transferring from KSC to receive credit for IQL 101.

**Working on Program Assessment:** Reviews syllabi of QL courses; coordinates with ISP Assessment Coordinator to conduct ISP-related QL assessment; designs assessment tools and plans for IQL 101; coordinates the development of the common component of the IQL 101 final exam each semester.

**Developing and Maintaining an Online Presence:** Updates the QL Requirement website and continues to develop an online faculty resource site.

**Working with QL-related Committees and Campus Offices:** Serves on the Integrative Studies Program Committee; chairs the QL Subcommittee; meets with or serves on other campus committees/programs/offices with an interest in QL curricula; coordinates with the Information Literacy librarian concerning collaboration between the library and faculty teaching QL courses.

Detailed Job Description

**Working with Faculty**

Coordinates faculty development related to the QL Requirement including: the planning of two (2) QL faculty cohort meetings per semester; planning faculty workshops as needed (May/August); observing class sessions; responding to drafts of assignments and syllabi; facilitating opportunities for online and face-to-face pedagogical, procedural, and programmatic conversations; providing resources related to the teaching of QL; meeting with faculty interested in teaching a QL course; and offering one-on-one assistance with evaluating student work, designing assignments, and other work related to teaching a QL course.

Supports adjunct and FTTT faculty in their teaching of QL courses (providing print and online resources; providing assistance in troubleshooting classroom management issues such as dealing with academic dishonesty, student complaints, grade appeals, etc.).

Each semester reviews student course evaluations for adjunct faculty teaching IQL 101.

Coordinates with the Dean of Sciences and Social Sciences, and in consultation with the other deans, department chairs, and the Registrar, schedules and staffs all sections of IQL 101. Reviews schedules each semester and hires as openings arise, and consults with Continuing Education about CE and summer sections of IQL 101 (for summer, also consults with LINK and Summer Momentum program directors).

Monitors IQL 101 section enrollments during registration periods and communicates concerns to faculty, chairs, deans, Academic and Career Advising and/or the Associate VPAA.

Completes formal evaluations for KSCAA faculty who are teaching IQL 101 in their eighth, sixteenth (and so on) semesters of service. Also observes IQL 101 classes of adjunct faculty who are not yet eligible for bargaining unit membership and writes written responses to the visits. Evaluations are completed in collaboration with relevant department chairs if the adjunct faculty member also teaches courses other than IQL 101.
Works with chairs of departments offering courses that have been approved to satisfy the QL Requirement of the ISP to ensure these courses address appropriate QL learning outcomes and that these courses are included when QL is being assessed programatically.

**Working with Students**

Advises first-year and transfer students by helping them to identify a QL course that is appropriate to their overall academic plans, answering questions about IQL 101, and helping them to enroll in open sections of QL courses.

Fields student complaints and concerns about IQL 101 or instructors of this course.

Mediates student grievances/complaints and potential academic honesty and grade appeal cases related to IQL 101, and attempts to resolve them before they are handled at the level of the dean’s office.

Works with transfer students to help determine whether courses taken at other colleges/universities could be used to satisfy the QL Requirement.

Works with the Admissions Office, the Registrar’s Office, and quantitative literacy/reasoning/math programs at other institutions to help students transferring from KSC to receive credit for IQL 101.

**Working on Program Assessment**

Coordinates with ISP Assessment Coordinator to conduct ISP-related QL assessment, which requires: writing, revising, and refining QL learning outcomes; creating a plan for ongoing assessment of these outcomes; proposing curricular revisions based on assessment results.

Collects and reviews IQL 101 syllabi each semester (for consistency, existence of QL outcomes on syllabus, etc.).

Coordinates the development of the common component of the IQL 101 final exam each semester.

Designs assessment tools and plans for IQL 101, which requires: consulting with faculty teaching the course through cohort meetings, focus groups, and ongoing conversations; writing, revising, and refining the IQL 101 learning outcomes; creating a plan for ongoing assessment of these outcomes; proposing curricular revisions based on assessment results.

**Developing and Maintaining an Online Presence**

Reviews and updates website regarding the overall description of the QL Requirement of the ISP, its purpose as part of the ISP, and the various courses students can use to satisfy the requirement.

Continues to develop and add to a faculty resource site with sample syllabi, course schedules, assignments and workshops, and any official documents connected with the QL Requirement.

**Working with QL-related Committees and Campus Offices**

Serves on the Integrative Studies Program Committee as an advocate for QL and to represent the interests of QL courses, including IQL 101, and faculty teaching these courses.

Chairs the QL Subcommittee, which reviews and offers recommendations for revisions to the QL learning outcomes, collaborates in creating and implementing plans for the programmatic assessment of QL, offers recommendations for curricular and programmatic revisions, reviews and offers recommendations when an academic department proposes designating a course as satisfying the QL Requirement of the ISP, and meets with campus groups (Advising, Honors Program, etc.) who have a specific interest in QL curricula.

Meets with or serves on other campus committees/programs/offices with an interest in QL curricula (Summer Momentum, LINK, Aspire, ODS, ACA, ATSC, High Impact Practices, the Math Center, etc.).
Coordinates with the Information Literacy librarian concerning collaboration between the library and faculty teaching QL courses.

**Keene State College Quantitative Literacy (QL) Subcommittee Charge**

**Membership of the QL Subcommittee:** The QL Coordinator will serve as chair. Two other members of the Integrative Studies Program Committee (ISPC) will also serve on the committee.

**Primary Charge of the QL Subcommittee:** The QL Subcommittee is charged with reviewing proposals made by departments seeking to have a course approved as a QL Course, that is, a course a student may complete to satisfy the QL Requirement.

As part of the formal curricular review process, the department would need to obtain an advisory opinion from the ISPC, since such a proposal would affect the Integrative Studies Program (ISP). It is hoped that, well in advance of initiating this review process, the department will share a draft of its proposal with the QL Coordinator, who will then bring it to the QL Subcommittee for discussion relative to the following:

- the degree to which the course is focused around quantitative methods and concepts;
- the extent to which the student learning outcomes associated with the QL Requirement are addressed by the course;
- the means by which the department offering the course would programmatically assess these learning outcomes.

The QL Coordinator will consult with the department as needed in order to help shape the proposal and ensure that the course is appropriately aligned with the QL Requirement. The QL Subcommittee will ultimately draft an advisory opinion and then bring it to the ISPC for discussion and approval.

**Secondary Charge of the QL Subcommittee:** As needed, the QL Subcommittee will review and make recommendations regarding the student learning outcomes associated with the QL Requirement and the programmatic assessment of these outcomes. Any recommendations will then be brought to the entire ISPC.

**Frequency of Meetings:** The QL Subcommittee will meet as needed, either in person or electronically.

Submitted by Michael Cullinane, AY 2016-17 and reviewed by the Spring 2017 ISP Committee: Kate Tirabassi, Thinking and Writing Co-Coordinator, Center for Writing Director, English, Mark Long, ISP Director, English/American Studies, Mike Cullinane, IQL Coordinator & Math, Stephen Harfenist, II Coordinator & Physics, Elizabeth Dolinger, Mason Library, Kathy Forrister, Nursing, Randall Hoyt, Graphic Design, Carol Leger, Adjunct Faculty, Geology, William McCulloch, Economics
ITW 101 Coordinator Job Description, ITW Core Principles and Practices, and ITW 101 Subcommittee Charge

Summary Job Description

Working with Faculty: Coordinates faculty development for the Thinking and Writing Course; supports adjunct and FTTT faculty in their teaching of the course; schedules and staffs all sections of ITW 101 on a yearly basis and monitors enrollments; completes formal evaluations for KSCAA faculty; reviews teaching evaluations for ITW 101 each semester.

Working with Students: Advises students with transfer credit questions; fields student complaints and concerns about the course/instructors; mediates student grievances/complaints and potential academic honesty and grade appeal cases; works with admissions, registrar offices, and composition programs at other institutions to help students transferring from KSC to receive credit for ITW 101.

Working on Program Assessment: Reviews ITW syllabi and sustained writing project assignments each semester; coordinates with ISP Assessment Coordinator to conduct ISP-related ITW Assessment every other year; designs and implements qualitative/quantitative program assessments as needed, in collaboration with the ITW Subcommittee.

Developing and Maintaining an Online Presence: Updates website for ITW 101 and develops an online faculty resource site.

Working with ITW-related Committees and Campus Offices: Serves on the Integrative Studies Program Committee; chairs the Thinking and Writing Subcommittee; meets with or serves on other campus committees/programs/offices with an interest in ITW curricula; coordinates with the Information Literacy librarian on the library/ITW-related collaborations; coordinates with the Center for Writing Director/Assistant Director on the Center for Writing/ITW-related collaborations.

Detailed Coordinator Job Description

Working with Faculty

Coordinates faculty development for the Thinking and Writing Course, including planning ITW faculty meetings or teaching writing-related learning community meetings each semester, planning faculty workshops (May/August, observing classes, responding to assignment and syllabi drafts, facilitating opportunities for online and face-to-face pedagogical, procedural, and programmatic conversations, providing resources on the teaching of writing, meeting with faculty interested in teaching the course, and offering one-on-one assistance with evaluating student work, designing assignments, and other work related to teaching Thinking and Writing.

Supports adjunct and FTTT faculty in their teaching of the course (providing print and online resources, and assistance in troubleshooting classroom management issues, dealing with academic dishonesty, student complaints, grade appeals, etc.).

Reviews teaching evaluations for adjunct faculty teaching ITW 101 each semester.

With the Dean of Arts and Humanities, and in consultation with the other deans, department chairs, and the Registrar, schedules and staffs all sections of ITW 101. Reviews schedules each semester and hires as openings arise, and consults with Continuing Education about CE and summer sections of ITW 101 (for summer, also consults with LINK Program Director).

Monitors enrollments during registration periods and communicating concerns to Faculty, Chairs, Deans, Academic and Career Advising and/or the Associate Provost

As outlined in the KSCAA contract, completes formal evaluations for KSCAA faculty in their eighth, sixteenth (and so on) semesters of service. Also observes classes of adjunct faculty who are not yet union eligible and write written responses to the visits. Evaluations are completed in collaboration with department chairs, if the adjunct faculty members teach courses other than ITW 101.
Working with Students

Advises first-year and transfer students by helping them enroll in open sections of ITW 101 and by answering their questions about the course.

Mediates student grievances/complaints about the course/instructors and fields potential academic honesty and grade appeal cases and attempts to resolve them before they are handled at the level of the Dean’s Office.

Works with transfer students to help determine whether courses taken at other colleges/universities should count as ITW 101.

Works with admissions, registrars, and composition programs at other institutions to help students transferring from KSC to receive credit for ITW 101.

Working on Program Assessment

Collects and reviews syllabi and sustained writing project assignments each semester (for consistency, existence of outcomes on syllabus, etc.).

Coordinates with ISP Assessment Coordinator to conduct ISP-related ITW Assessment every other year, including asking faculty to have ITW students submit their final papers to an ISP-Canvas site, identifying reviewers to read 60 randomly-selected papers, and writing the ITW Assessment report for the ISPC.

Designs assessment tools and plans for the Thinking and Writing course, which requires consulting with faculty teaching the course through cohort meetings, focus groups, ongoing conversations; writing, revising, and refining course outcomes; creating a plan for ongoing assessment of the course outcomes; proposing curricular revisions based on assessment results.

Developing and Maintaining an Online Presence

Reviews and updates website regarding the overall description of ITW 101, its history, coordinator bio, descriptions of courses, and faculty bios.

Develops/adds to a faculty resource site with sample syllabi, course schedules, assignments, workshops, writing prompts as well as the ITW Course Theme Proposal Form and other documents connected with the course.

Working with ITW-related Committees and Campus Offices

Serves on the Integrative Studies Program Committee to represent the interests of the Thinking and Writing course and faculty who teach it.

Chairs the Thinking and Writing Subcommittee, which collaborates in creating and implementing assessment plans, offers recommendations for curricular and programmatic revisions, discusses current research in first-year writing and transfer of writing skills, and meets with campus groups (Advising, Honors Program, etc.) who have a specific interest in ITW curricula.

Meets with or serves on other campus committees/programs/offices with an interest in ITW curricula (LINKs, Aspire, ODS, ACA, the Center for Writing, the Center for Creative Inquiry, ATSC, Faculty Enrichment, the LLC Committee, the AEC, etc.)

Coordinates with the Information Literacy librarian on Mason Library/ITW 101 collaborations. These collaborations include:

- Meeting with the IL librarian to discuss the nature of the collaboration.
- Developing ways to assess IL skills within the course and across sections.
- Communicating with faculty teaching ITW about the collaboration.
- Piloting and proposing new means of teaching IL skills within and outside of the ITW classroom.
ITW Core Principles and Practices

ITW is one of two foundational requirements in Keene State College’s Integrative Studies Program. The Integrative Studies Program is at the core of the College’s commitment to a liberal arts education.

Core Principles for Thinking and Writing 101

- That students’ writing ability is largely a function of their thinking ability. Generally, the better students are as thinkers, the better they are as writers. This premise is supported by years of studies on student writing development.
- That the heart of academic writing is developing and supporting a complex claim or stance. In other words, it is not enough to provide information on a topic or craft a one-sided argument—academic writing requires the student to make a commitment to a stance or position while demonstrating an awareness of multiple perspectives on the issue.
- That in order to learn how to write well, students need to write about a subject in depth, over time, with consistent feedback and opportunities to revise.

Core Practices for Thinking and Writing 101

- *A clear focus or series of open-ended questions based on a course theme.* From “Why We Create” to “Encountering Adulthood” to “What is Nature?,” students in ITW read books, not just textbooks, that provide a context for their own writing project.
- *A sustained research and writing project.* This project asks students to develop open-ended research questions, to develop a complex claim/thesis, and to gather, synthesize, question, and incorporate research gathered from multiple perspectives to support and complicate this claim/thesis in a longer researched essay.
- *Opportunities for students to think for themselves.* Students in ITW generate their own topics, claims, or research questions and engage in independent research. Students must demonstrate that they understand more than one perspective on the issue they select for their long project.
- *At least three drafts of the sustained research and writing project.* Students are given substantial instructor and peer feedback on each draft.
- *Opportunities to collaborate with the Mason Library and with the Center for Writing.* The library offers useful handouts and online resources on information literacy skills, such as locating and evaluating good sources, and opportunities to work with faculty and Research and Technology Fellows. The tutors at the Center for Writing work with students’ writing-in-process, and offer opportunities for further collaboration through the ITW Partnership Program.
- *Discussions about academic honesty.* Students learn the Keene State College Academic Honesty Policy and they practice citing sources in text and in a works cited or reference page.

In ITW 101, students discover that learning how to write for college takes time, effort, and thought. ITW begins this process, but it does not complete it. After ITW, students will not necessarily have “mastered” the list above, but they will be prepared to continue developing as writers and thinkers.

Does Keene State College’s Thinking and Writing 101 = “English 101” or “First-Year Writing” at other colleges/universities?

Yes! Keene State College’s ITW 101 course is indeed a writing-intensive, inquiry-based course, similar to those housed in English Departments at other colleges and universities. As one of two foundational courses in the Integrative Studies (or “general education”) Program at KSC, ITW 101 focuses on helping students further develop their critical reading, critical thinking, writing and research processes, like first-year writing courses at other colleges and universities. The primary difference is that the course does not have an English (or ENG) prefix because it is part of the Integrative Studies Program, rather than the English Department.
**ITW 101 Subcommittee Charge**

Created in 2006, the Thinking and Writing 101 Subcommittee is an interdisciplinary group of faculty that works in an advisory capacity, meeting regularly each semester to discuss policies, procedures, and pedagogies related to the foundational ITW 101 course at Keene State College. Chaired by the ITW Coordinator, the Subcommittee consists of faculty across the Schools of Arts and Humanities, Professional and Graduate Studies, and Sciences and Social Sciences, and the Mason Library, the Director of the Center for Writing, and an adjunct faculty member who teaches ITW 101.

**Committee Composition/Term Limits:** Historically, the ITW Subcommittee’s membership has consisted of faculty members who have either expressed interest in teaching ITW 101 or in the teaching of writing at the college. While some members of the committee remain on the committee for consistency (the Center for Writing Director, former ITW Coordinators), others serve as they are able.

This subcommittee is charged with the following ongoing tasks:

- Offers recommendations for curricular and programmatic/administrative process revisions, professional development opportunities, new ITW course theme proposals, and new ITW-related initiatives such as linked courses or LLC possibilities.
- Offers revisions to documents related to ITW, such as the course theme proposal form, ITW-related correspondence to the college community, the ITW website, the ITW student learning outcomes, etc.
- Based on current research in first-year composition/writing, collaborates with the ITW Coordinator to create and implement ISP and qualitative assessment plans, such as conducting focus groups, developing surveys, reviewing and revising course outcomes based on ISP ITW assessment results, etc.
- Meets with campus groups (Academic and Career Advising, the Office of Disability Services, Honors Program, LINKS Program, Mason Library, Living & Learning Community Committee, etc.) who have a specific interest in ITW curricula to discuss collaborations and support.

Submitted by Katherine E. Tirabassi, AY 2016-17 ITW 101 Co-Coordinator, and reviewed by the Spring 2017 ISP Committee: Kate Tirabassi, Thinking and Writing Co-Coordinator, Center for Writing Director, English, Mark Long, ISP Director, English/American Studies, Mike Cullinane, IQL Coordinator & Math, Stephen Harfenist, II Coordinator & Physics, Elizabeth Dolinger, Mason Library, Kathy Forrister, Nursing, Randall Hoyt, Graphic Design, Carol Leger, Adjunct Faculty, Geology, William McColloch, Economics
Integrative Interdisciplinary (II) Coordinator Job Description, Core Principles and Practices for Integrative Interdisciplinary Requirement, Interdisciplinary Integrative (II) Course Proposal Instruction

Summary Job Description

**Working with Faculty:** Coordinates faculty development of II courses.

**Working with Students:** Advises students regarding II transfer credits.

**Working on Program Assessment:** Work with ISP Assessment Coordinator to conduct ISP-related II assessment.

**Developing and Maintaining an Online Presence:** Updates II webpage and develops an online faculty resource site.

**Working with II-related Committees and Campus Offices:** Serves on the Integrative Studies Program Committee and tracks II course offerings college-wide; meets with or serves on other campus committees / programs / offices with an interest in II curricula; chairs the II Subcommittee.

Detailed Job Description

**Working with Faculty**

Coordinates faculty development of II courses, including organizing one or two workshops per semester on developing and teaching interdisciplinary courses and the role of interdisciplinarity in general.

As chair of the II subcommittee, the Coordinator helps faculty navigate the II course proposal process.

**Working with Students**

Works with the Admissions Office, the Registrar’s Office, and programs at other institutions to help students transferring to KSC to receive II course credits.

**Working on Program Assessment**

Helps the ISP Assessment Coordinator conduct assessment of undesignated II courses.

**Developing and Maintaining an Online Presence**

Reviews and updates website regarding the overall description of Interdisciplinary courses and the II Requirement of the ISP, their history, coordinator bio, descriptions of courses, and faculty bios.

Continues to develop and add to a faculty resource site with sample syllabi, course schedules, assignments and workshops, and any official documents connected with the course.

**Working with II-related Committees and Campus Offices**

Serves on the Integrative Studies Program Committee to advocate for interdisciplinarity, provide the committee relevant information on II subcommittee activities and track II course offerings semester to semester

Meets with or serves on other campus committees/programs/offices with an interest in interdisciplinary courses

Chairs the Integrative Interdisciplinary Subcommittee that reviews all II course proposals.

  a. acts as a voting member of the nine-person subcommittee
  b. organize the subcommittee meetings and calls for new members to volunteer and/or be elected from each school at the end of each Spring semester.
  c. Sets the agenda for subcommittee meetings usually based upon receipt of II course proposals or on charges given it by the ISP committee.
  d. Receives all II course proposals and gives initial review to ensure all parts of the proposal are appropriately addressed.
c. Chair subcommittee meeting on specific course proposals and invite proposal sponsor to meeting if needed.

f. Document subcommittee deliberations as well as any invited guest comments.

g. Call for and record subcommittee vote to approve course proposal, report result to sponsor and, if approved, send course proposal with a record of subcommittee's vote and signature of chair to Senate Curriculum Committee and proposal sponsor.

Core Principles and Practices for Integrative Interdisciplinary Requirement

To make connections between two or more traditional disciplines is a fundamental hallmark of a liberal arts education. While all learning is truly interdisciplinary, we recognize the value of the purposeful approach of a topic from multiple disciplinary perspectives. Keene State College has its own history of interdisciplinarity through interdisciplinary programs (Holocaust and Genocide Studies, Women's and Gender Studies, American Studies, Criminal Justice Studies & Environmental Studies) and interdisciplinary (II) courses offered through the Integrative Studies Program.

Three types of interdisciplinary courses have been identified through work of past II Coordinators and II Subcommittees.

Interdisciplinary courses in fields of study: These courses are offered in minors and degree programs in the previously mentioned interdisciplinary programs. Each of these interdisciplinary fields has its own distinct relationships with the academic disciplines that inform the approaches taken to the various subjects, materials, and topics within the field. All have interdisciplinary methods designed to produce knowledge and enhance understanding about or pertaining to a specific area of study.

Multidisciplinary inquiry courses: Multi-disciplinary inquiry courses include departmentally-based courses that incorporate marginalized areas of study in a dominant field of discourse. Multidisciplinary inquiry courses investigate specific questions or problems by drawing on two or more disciplinary perspectives. These courses may demonstrate a fusion or blending of disciplinary methods, examinations of disciplinary bound evidence or collected data through an analytic lens or integrated application of material and literature from two or more disciplinary fields. Team-taught courses or co-teaching arrangements often assume a “multidisciplinary” form when instructors apply their academic training to a specific question or problem.

Trans-disciplinary courses: This category of interdisciplinary course is distinguished by its experiential approach to teaching and learning practices as well as the application of student centered course models. These courses may be listed as a “non-departmental II” or using a departmental/disciplinary prefix.

While these distinctions are important and must be articulated in any interdisciplinary course description, all such courses must meet the same criteria indicated in the II-Course Proposal Guidelines to be designated as an Integrative Interdisciplinary (II) course within the Integrative Studies Program.

The interdisciplinary requirement is satisfied through taking one II-prefixed course at either the upper or lower level within the 40 credit Integrative Studies Program. These courses are organized around four student learning outcomes related to the course's interdisciplinary nature, it's academic perspectives and two of five ISP learning outcomes:

Integrative Learning: You come up with these yourself, by thinking about the materials and approach taken in your course and considering the following:

- How are you taking an inter-, multi-, or trans-disciplinary approach to your course content?
- How is what you are hoping to accomplish inter/multi/trans-disciplinary?
- How are you exploring the question or issue that frames the course?
- Is there some mention of the disciplines from which you are drawing?

Academic Perspectives: Identify one of the Interdisciplinary outcomes (see the list below) that you feel is most central to your course:

- Cross disciplinary boundaries to reveal new patterns and connections that reframe
• Analyze the assumptions and actions of society from multiple perspectives
• Examine national and international issues through artistic, philosophical, cultural, scientific, technological, economic, social and political lenses.
• Assess their own roles and responsibilities as members of diverse communities.

And at least two of the following:

• Critical Thinking
• Creative Thinking
• Writing
• Quantitative Literacy
• Information Literacy

Interdisciplinary Integrative (II) Course Proposal Instructions

This packet contains suggestions for putting together your II course and submitting it to the II subcommittee this semester for approval for teaching it in AY 2017-18.

Interdisciplinary studies are a dynamic intellectual and academic presence at Keene State College (KSC): in courses offered by the Integrative Studies Program as well as offerings made by departments and programs in conjunction with minors, majors and certificate options. Interdisciplinary studies are defined most succinctly as those academic, creative, or intellectual activities that combine or draw upon perspectives or methods of two or more disciplinary fields. Such courses cross disciplinary boundaries, promote student awareness of disciplinary conventions and encourage critical thinking about how knowledge is constructed.

Here are some examples of the II courses that have been offered over the past few years:

II 330 A Just World?
II AMST 210 Citizenship, Culture, Difference
II AMST 210 Race, Sexuality, and Representation
II Econ 310 Games Theory
II ECON 380 Modern Middle East
II EDUC 310 Student Empowerment and Activism
II ENST 150 Global Environmental Change
II ENST 152 Principles of Sustainability
II FILM 362 The Politics of Film Adaptation
II Film 380 Filming War, Writing War
II HGS 254 Women in the Holocaust
II HGS 255 Genocide
II HLSC 445 Human Sexuality
II MATH 310 The Evolution of Mathematics
II MATH 315 Voting Power & Apportionment
II MGT 345 Organizational Diversity
II MU 241 Listening to Brazil
II MU 243 Film Music History and Technology
II PE 310 Psycho-Social Aspects of Sport
II PHYS 210 History of Science
II PHYS 305 Physics of Music
II PSYCH 350 When Harm is Done
II TDS 160 Peak Oil and Sustainable Solutions
II WGS 101 Intro to Women’s and Gender Studies
II WGS 240 Gender and the Media

Writing your interdisciplinary ISP course proposal
When the Interdisciplinary subcommittee of the ISP evaluates course proposals, it considers whether or not a student looking at your course would understand how and why it’s listed as an interdisciplinary course. This usually involves an explicit statement in your course description that this is an interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and/or trans-disciplinary course, and a brief description of what makes it so.

There are three modes of Interdisciplinarity at KSC

Interdisciplinary courses in fields of study: These courses are offered in minors and degree programs in American Studies, Criminal Justice Studies, Environmental Studies, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, and Women’s Studies. Each of these interdisciplinary fields has its own distinct relationships with the academic disciplines that inform the approaches taken to the various subjects, materials, and topics within the field. All have interdisciplinary methods designed to produce knowledge and enhance understanding about or pertaining to a specific area of study.

Multidisciplinary inquiry courses: Multi-disciplinary inquiry courses include departmentally-based courses that incorporate marginalized areas of study in a dominant field of discourse. Multidisciplinary inquiry courses investigate specific questions or problems by drawing on two or more disciplinary perspectives. These courses may demonstrate a fusion or blending of disciplinary methods, examinations of disciplinary bound evidence or collected data through an analytic lens or integrated application of material and literature from two or more disciplinary fields. Team-taught courses or co-teaching arrangements often assume a “multidisciplinary” form when instructors apply their academic training to a specific question or problem.

Trans-disciplinary courses: This category of interdisciplinary course is distinguished by its experiential approach to teaching and learning practices as well as the application of student centered course models. These courses may be listed as a “non-departmental II” or using a departmental/disciplinary prefix.

You can be clear about the interdisciplinary nature of your course by explicitly including:

- the disciplines from which you will be drawing
- the perspectives that will be represented
- the theories and/or methods that will be taught.

We recommend that you ask the following questions as you write your proposal:

- Are there other disciplines that will provide different perspectives on the question or problem that drives the course?
- How do the assigned texts reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the course?
- How do your assignments encourage students to engage in interdisciplinary inquiry?
- How will students know that this is an interdisciplinary course and, thus, a different experience from a disciplinary course they might take?

Frequently Asked Questions

If I want to teach an II course that is part of a program proposal for the 2017-18 academic year, what is my deadline for writing up the course proposal?

If your course is part of a larger program proposal (for instance, your department is revising its major and your new II course is being proposed as part of that), the II subcommittee must receive the II course proposal by October 5, 2016. However, there are several steps that you need to take before October 1st: 1) you need to get your electronic signature through the process outlined below under “electronic signatures.” 2) you need to obtain the signature of your department chair and Dean; and 3) you need to solicit an advisory opinion from any “affected departments”

What is the deadline for submitting II course proposals that are not part of program proposals?
Per the SCC Curriculum Guidelines, page 4, if you are proposing an II course that counts toward students’ ISP program requirements, there is no deadline to send your proposal to the Interdisciplinary Subcommittee. However, if the course is to be included in the 2017-18 KSC catalog, you need to get it to the II Subcommittee by December, or at latest, early January, for it to be discussed in the March senate meeting, which allows the proposal to be included in the electronic catalog.

*I haven’t completed a course proposal but I want to offer an interdisciplinary course next semester (Spring 2017). Can I still do that?

Experimental II courses may be approved by departments and deans, and offered as experimental courses with the 199 or 399 prefixes (e.g. II Film 199 or 399). The SCC Curriculum Guidelines, stipulate that experimental courses may be offered no more than twice.

*What is the process through which one obtains approval for an II course proposal?

II course proposals move the process as follows: Faculty member → Department or program → Dean’s Office → ISP Interdisciplinary Subcommittee → SCC → Senate → Provost → Catalog. The process is outlined in the current SCC Curriculum Guidelines.

*What do you mean by the terms interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and trans-disciplinary?

ISP courses that are defined as interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and/or trans-disciplinary in nature may be offered using the II prefix. The terms interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and trans-disciplinary have been extensively discussed and debated within academic literature, and the II subcommittee provides local definitions to shape your proposal.

*Who serves on the II Subcommittee?

2016-17 II Subcommittee members:

Representatives from the School of Professional and Graduate Studies:

Fitni Destani, Associate Professor, Physical Education, (fdestani@keene.edu)
Erin Greeter, Assistant Professor, Education (Erin.Greeter@keene.edu)

Representatives from the School of Sciences and Social Sciences:

Sasha Davis, Assistant Professor, Geography (sasha.davis@keene.edu)
Steven Harfenist, Associate Professor, Physics (sharfenist@keene.edu)
Philip Barker, Assistant Professor, Political Science (Philip.Barker@keene.edu)

Representatives from the School of Arts and Humanities:

Randall Hoyt, Associate Professor, Art. (rhoyt@keene.edu)
Jeannie-Marie Brown, Assistant Professor, Theater & Dance (Jeannie-Marie.Brown@keene.edu)
Leaf Seligman, Adjunct Professor, ITW (Iseligman@keene.edu)

*What can I do to ensure that my proposal gets approved?

The following checklist outlines the criteria that the II Subcommittee and the SCC will be looking for in your proposal:

- Does the course description clearly explain the interdisciplinary nature of the class?
- Are the disciplines that the course will include listed, and are the perspective(s) it will take discussed?
Does the proposal provide a brief overview of research or scholarship done on the course topic or other expertise the proposal sponsor might have in the subject?
Does the proposal include ISP integrative and academic perspectives outcomes?
Does the proposal include an attached syllabus that clearly outlines its inter-, multi- and/or trans-disciplinary perspective?
Does the proposal identify the rubrics that will be used to assess student work at the end of the semester?

How to fill out the II Course Proposal Form

Carefully read the SCC instructions for filling out course proposals (pp. 21-22 in the SCC Curriculum Guidelines at http://www.keene.edu/senate/senate-curriculum-committee/).

Course Description: On page one of the Course Proposal form, you will see the category “Proposed Course Description.” Your course description communicates to students the nature of your “II” course. In an effort to make it as clear as possible to our students that your course is inter-, multi-, trans-disciplinary, we are encouraging faculty to do a few different things in their course description:

1) use the word “interdisciplinary,” “multidisciplinary” or “trans-disciplinary”
2) list the disciplines or perspectives that are central to your course
3) pose a question or issue that frames the course.

Remember that these course descriptions are limited to 50 words, not including prerequisites.

Learning Outcomes: Also on page one of the course proposal form, you are asked to fill in, “Course Objectives and/or Learning Outcomes.” For II courses you draw on three different sets of outcomes that can be found within the ISP manual. This manual is currently located at:

All courses in the Interdisciplinary area will include the following two outcomes:

Integrative Learning: You come up with these yourself, by thinking about the materials and approach taken in your course and considering the following:

• How are you taking an inter-, multi-, or trans-disciplinary approach to your course content?
• How is what you are hoping to accomplish inter/multi/trans-disciplinary?
• How are you exploring the question or issue that frames the course?
• Is there some mention of the disciplines from which you are drawing?

Academic Perspectives: Identify one of the Interdisciplinary outcomes (see the list below) that you feel is most central to your course:

• Cross disciplinary boundaries to reveal new patterns and connections that reframe knowledge
• Analyze the assumptions and actions of society from multiple perspectives
• Examine national and international issues through artistic, philosophical, cultural, scientific, technological, economic, social and political lenses.
• Assess their own roles and responsibilities as members of diverse communities.

And at least two of the following

• Critical Thinking
• Creative Thinking
• Writing/Quantitative Literacy
• Information Literacy

Advisory Opinions: On page 9, the SCC Curricular guidelines stipulate “Advisory opinions are required whenever a proposal affects the curricula of other programs.” There has been a continuing conversation among the faculty about what
it means to say that the curricula of a department can be “affected” by another course offered at the college. In terms of your II course proposal, many specific circumstances may complicate filling out this section, for instance, when the class being proposed is not currently part of the curriculum of another academic department; when the class content falls between existing departments; when the approach taken would emphasize a different aspect of the course material. We urge you to do your best in articulating your perspective on the disciplinary connections at hand here and to communicate with the II subcommittee about this aspect of the course proposal. List any departments from which you sought an advisory opinion, and generally summarize their response. Note that you are asked to include documentation that you have sought advisory opinions from other departments. Include such materials in your documentation.

**Courtesy Notifications:** On page 9, the SCC Curricular guidelines stipulate that “when an academic program proposes to add a new course or topic that crosses disciplinary boundaries into the content of another KSC academic program” the proposal sponsor is to send a “courtesy notification” to these academic programs. Again, it can be challenging to understand how a given course proposal relates to the departments currently established on campus. This is especially the case, for instance, when the class being proposed is not currently being offered in an academic department; when the class content seems to fall between existing disciplines; when the approach taken would emphasize a different aspect of the course material. We urge you to do your best in articulating your perspective on the disciplinary connections at hand and to communicate with the II subcommittee about this aspect of the application.

**Sample Syllabus:** Please attach a sample syllabus to your course proposal. This sample syllabus needs to be clearly interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and/or trans-disciplinary in nature.

The SCC Curriculum Guidelines specify that the syllabus must include the following:

- Course title, prefix, and number
- Catalog description
- Course objectives and learning outcomes
- Course methodology. Briefly describe your approach to the course (e.g., lecture, discussion, demonstrations, etc.)
- Sample readings, instructional materials, and a list of reserve readings where appropriate
- Course topic outline
- Descriptions of other noteworthy aspects of the course (e.g., service learning, interdisciplinary, honors course) (from pp. 9 of SCC Curriculum Guidelines)

**Electronic Signature Page:** The SCC has implemented electronic signatures and provided the following instructions on how to create an electronic signature:

At Keene State College, all proposals for changing any academic program or course must be reviewed and approved in a prescribed series of steps. The last page of all curriculum proposals must be signed electronically at each level in the review process, in order to verify that the review process has been completed.

To create an electronic signature:

1. Sign your name on a blank sheet of white paper using blue ink.
2. Use a photocopier to scan the signature into a pdf file.
3. Forward the pdf file to Antje Hornbeck (ahornbeck@keene.edu) in Marketing and Communications; she will convert the signature into a usable format and send it back to you.

(from p. 3 of SCC guidelines)

Alternatively, I have an electronic notepad, and can quickly generate your electronic signature for you. All you need do is come by my office (Science Center room 379) to create the signature.

We hope that this information will help you to complete your II course proposal. Please feel free to contact the II Coordinator, Steve Harfenist at sharfenist@keene.edu with any questions.

Submitted by Stephen Harfenist, AY 2016-17 II Coordinator and reviewed by the Spring 2017 ISP Committee: Kate Tirabassi, Thinking and Writing Co-Coordinator, Center for Writing Director, English; Mark Long, ISP Director, English/American Studies; Mike Cullinane, QL Coordinator & Math; Stephen Harfenist, II Coordinator & Physics;
3. Integrative Studies Program & Honors Program Scheduling

**Goal** To create a more efficient and effective model to schedule courses offered in the ISP and the Honors programs.

**Desired Outcomes of Scheduling Process**

*Improve First-Year Retention* A more stable cohort of tenure-track and adjunct faculty will strengthen faculty mentoring and pedagogy for teachers of first-year writing and improve the success of students in the ITW course. Completing Thinking and Writing in the first year increases the probability of being retained by 32.4%--from 52.8% to 85.2% and improve the probability of retention for women, racial/ethnic minority students, first-generation students, low-income students, and non-residents than for their peers who are not in these groups.

*Assure Breadth in Program Offerings* Our current scheduling model adversely impacts the experience of students by restricting their intellectual pathways through the ISP and Honors programs. Our proposal would prioritize both the major and the breadth of course offerings in the two programs that serve every student at the College. The scheduling model will increase breadth at the 100- and 200-level courses to enhance the experience of our first-year students.

*Foster Intellectual Integration* With a scheduling model that begins with primarily departmental considerations it is challenging to enhance elements of the program (the upper-level courses, in particular) to foster the kinds of integration recommended by NEASC: “General education requirements include offerings that focus on the subject matter and methodologies of . . . primary domains of knowledge as well as on their relationships to one another.

*Strengthen Faculty Commitment, Enrichment, and Collaboration* The current scheduling model undermines a deliberate and thoughtful approach to faculty enrichment and collaboration across the disciplines. Scheduling sections based on department needs and restricting faculty availability to teach in the program makes it challenging to strengthen the programs through deliberate and meaningful faculty enrichment.

*Build Ownership of the Programs* A scheduling model that emphasizes breadth, and participation of faculty and programs in the ISP and Honors Program, will help to cultivate ownership of the program, improve student advising, and contribute to our efforts to improve our four-year graduation rate.

*Improve Efficiency of Scheduling* Our current scheduling model is inefficient and requires multiple timelines and people (Coordinators, Directors, Associate Dean, Dean, Administrative Staff). Moreover, inconsistent deadlines create challenges for students and faculty in advising meetings and for students doing longer-range academic planning. Some schools/departments have their schedules complete in August, and others well into November and December. Our model is designed to reduce the workload and inefficiencies in the current process.

**A Possible Scheduling Model** Program Directors will build program schedules much like program chairs—though in this case in consultation with the Associate Provost. The Directors will build a schedule template for ISP and Honors courses based on anticipated seat/section needs, curricular breadth, and program enhancement. Each dean will work with chairs to meet ISP needs as determined by the Directors and Office of the Provost.
4. ISP Assessment Plan and Schedule

Academic Perspectives Outcome Assessment

Each year the academic perspectives outcome will be assessed using student data collected from a portion of the disciplinary and interdisciplinary courses. This assessment will be incorporated into the annual program assessments conducted by the programs scheduled for Academic Perspectives assessment. These programs will collect data from at least one of their academic perspectives ISP courses. Assessment measures and procedures will be determined and supported by programs. The schedule for academic perspectives assessment for the next three years is as follows:

- **2016-2017**: Fine and Performing Arts (IA) courses.
- **2017-2018**: Humanities (IH) and Social Science (IS) courses.
- **2018-2019**: Natural Science (IN) and Interdisciplinary (II) courses.

Assessment of Remaining ISP Outcomes

The remaining outcomes will be assessed over the course of three academic years. Their assessment will be facilitated by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Funding for the purchase of instrument copies and/or faculty scoring will come from the OIRA budget. On the fourth year of the assessment schedule, the ISPC will collaborate on a report of the findings obtained for all outcomes.

- **2016-2017**: Critical Thinking, Writing,
- **2017-2018**: Information Literacy, Quantitative Literacy,
- **2018-2019**: Integrative Learning, Creative Thinking,
- **2019-2020**: Prepare and disseminate report on assessment of all outcomes.
- **2020-2021**: Cycle begins again with Critical Thinking, Writing,

Fall ISP Assessment Workshop

Beginning in 2017-2018, we plan to incorporate into the schedule an annual Fall ISP Assessment Workshop. These workshops would have three general agenda items:

1. Faculty involved in the prior academic year’s assessment efforts could report what they did and could talk about what went well and what could be improved.
2. The findings from the prior year would be presented, and groups of faculty would discuss concrete activities that could be done to improve student outcome achievement.
3. One or more groups of faculty who implemented an assessment-based teaching initiative could report on their activity and what they learned from it.
Committee Members

Elisabeth Roos, Interim Director; Mike Culinane, IQL Coordinator; Mark Long, ITW Coordinator; Steven Harfenist, II Coordinator; Carol Leger, KSCAA; Kathleen Forrister, Professional and Graduate Studies; William McCulloch, Sciences and Social Sciences; Randall Hoyt, Arts and Humanities; Elizabeth Dollinger, Library; Cathryn Turrentine, Assessment; George Smeaton, Assessment

This committee worked really well together. We seem to have hit the right number of members and the right balance of faculty represented. I would highly recommend maintaining this distribution. It was very important to have faculty reps with school curriculum committee experience. This assured that these reps understood the big picture view within their schools and were truly able to speak for their colleagues in a meaningful way, particularly in discussions of curriculum issues. Cathy was a non-voting member. George sat in to observe as he will take over ISP assessment next year. Both were crucial voices helping to guide our work on revising the learning outcomes.

Work Accomplished

A. We successfully revised the ISP learning outcomes through a campus wide process similar to that used for the College-Wide Learning Outcomes. The outcomes were passed by the Senate at the final meeting in April. We expect that each Perspectives and Interdisciplinary Perspective course will address four outcomes including; Integrative Learning, Academic Perspectives and two of the five skills outcomes. Faculty will have until Spring 2017 to revise individual course outcomes. (See Attached)

B. We reviewed three policy changes and presented our proposals to the SEC. Proposals will have to go through the Curriculum process in Fall of 2016 for inclusion in the 2017-2018 catalog.

Integrative Studies Program Proposed Policy Changes

One of the two required upper level ISP courses must be taken in residence at KSC. Current policy requires both of the upper level courses be taken in residence. The change allows flexibility for students studying away and transfer students.

Perspectives courses must be taken in six distinct disciplines. If a seventh Perspectives course is taken, as the ISP elective, a discipline may be repeated. Current policy requires all Perspectives courses to be from separate disciplines. The change allows for a student to take two courses in the same area, deepening a student’s connections with that field. We also see this as opening a pathway for a student to explore a minor. Nurses could take a second Spanish course focusing on vocabulary of the profession. A science major could explore further in an allied field. An artist could count two courses towards a minor.

Upper level Perspectives or II courses may require a specific lower level ISP course besides ITW and IQL as a prerequisite. Current policy precludes disciplinary prerequisites. This proposal may work in tandem with the one above. We see a benefit to students to allowing further exploration in a field outside the major. However, the majority of seats offered at the upper level will need to be without disciplinary requirements as only one discipline may be repeated.

C. We offered Faculty development workshops in ITW, IQL, and Integrative Learning as well as two additional sessions with faculty discussing the revised outcomes.

D. We revised and updated the Integrative Studies Programs webpages looking to introduce the program to incoming students and their parents. The faculty resource pages will continue to grow as needs are identified. This is also a great place to continue the important work of telling the stories of the great work faculty are doing with our students. The stories are rich and varied and a wonderful testament to teaching and learning in the ISP. Putting together a video of these stories is a worthwhile future project. The end product would be useful for discussing the program with students, faculty, and administrators.
E. We were asked to consider reducing the ISP by four credits. That request ran counter to NEASC’s requirement of 40 credits in General Education for a bachelor’s degree. So, we then considered alternative uses for the “Elective” course. Many of these were innovative and all would have been of benefit to our students. A first year seminar to improve engagement and retention, suggested by the Academic and Co-Curricular Committee, would involve staffing 36 new sections all in the fall semester. Besides the resource question, our concern was that this new course would run into similar issues as IQL which, as a new course without departmental structure behind it, has struggled mightily. The truth is, it would take us longer than any of us would like to get a brand new course up to speed to the point where it is actually serving all first year students in the way we wish. We opted to leave the “Elective” course in place, allowing flexibility within the program for course development in a more organic way. Without this elective in place, we would not have been open to the policy changes we are proposing. We do not wish to sacrifice the breadth in the Perspectives Area that is the heart of the program.

All efforts were highly successful with the exception of one policy change. We were asked to consider a policy change such that any student transferring to KSC with an Associates Degree would need only two upper level courses to consider the ISP requirements fulfilled. Our research indicated that KSC policy was already in line with UNH and PSU. General Education courses transfer in on a course by course basis. A search of the existing articulation agreements with the NH Community Colleges revealed that while each school has a general education component to the degree, the number of required credits in Gen Ed varies from 21 to 28. Adding eight credits in upper level ISP still leaves a student missing 4-12 credits out of the forty required by NEASC for a Bachelor’s degree. Our committee could not agree on a path through this discrepancy. While we understood and supported the desire to make the transfer process easier to navigate, we could not find a compromise that accounted for the missing credits. The SEC agreed to revisit the proposal at a later date.

Challenges

The prevalent idea that ISP can solve everything. There are many challenges facing KSC and many folks are quick to point to ISP as a place where the solution might reside. This is a very simplistic approach to the complex problems of student retention and advising, for instance. While ISP as a campus-wide academic program can and should be part of the solution, the truth is it will take the entire campus working together to change the campus culture. ISP should remain flexible enough to embrace new ideas, but it can’t possibly be all things for all students. The resources are such that we can only offer an array of creative options and allow students to select those that work best for their educational goals.

And ISP is to blame for everything….Resource Allotment and “right-sizing”. I am concerned that as we reduce the size of the student body there will be changes affecting ISP faculty but no ISP representation in the conversation at the Dean level. A few examples: The growth in PGS programs offering IN courses is seen as “cutting into” the IN courses taught in the School of Sciences—instead of being seen through the eyes of the PGS students who now finally have courses that can “double dip” in the major and ISP thereby making navigation through the ISP easier and helping with retention. In A&H, tenure track humanities faculty bemoan the lack of students in their IH courses but don’t see that the Language Requirement encourages students to fulfill their sole IH requirement in an ML course staffed by adjuncts. The A&H language requirement has not been assessed or even discussed since the move to forty credits. At that point in time, two IH courses were required. All students had to take a second IH outside of the language department and might actually have taken a third IH in lieu of a second IA course. It is time for A&H to revisit this requirement. Some PGS faculty continue to voice complaints about ISP not serving the needs of their students as it is focused on breadth and does not allow for 4-5 courses with in a single discipline. There is an administrative level conversation to be had around the needs of these high credit majors and the realities of meeting their requirements at a public liberal arts institution. Compromises may well need to be made and they can’t all be in ISP.

I worry that structurally the ISP is isolated as an academic department that reports to all the deans and none of the deans, and that has added to the level of miscommunication and confusion that we have worked hard to cut through this year. Perhaps it would help to have the director included in meetings with the department chairs and deans in order to improve communication and understanding of the larger campus picture especially as it concerns curriculum and faculty allotment. I know this was an issue for previous faculty directors. One reason I felt I could make a difference in this position was because I brought seven year’s experience as the Assistant Dean of Arts and Humanities dealing with scheduling and curriculum issues.