

UPCC Meeting Minutes
March 10, 2016
Prillaman 1105, Kennesaw Campus
12:30-2:00pm

Members present: Neporcha Cone, Liza Davis, Ana Edwards, D. Michael Franklin, Ana Guimaraes (Secretary), Jerald Hendrix, Melissa Kramschuster, Lei Li, Judy Liu, Gail Markle, Kevin McFall, Pinder Naidu, Charles Parrot, Wes Rhea, Don Robson, Christina Scherrer, Gail Scott, Arief Setiawan, Judy Slater, Erin Sutherland, Anete Vásquez, Jennifer Wade-Berg (Chair), Victor Wakeling, Valerie Whittlesey.

Guests: Craig Brasco (Art & Design), Terry Carter (Digital Writing & Media Arts), Elizabeth Giddens (English), Nyasha GuramatunhuCooper (Leadership & Integrative Studies), Kim Haimen-Korn (Digital Writing & Media Arts), Wenhua Jin (Foreign Languages), Chien-pin Li (College of Humanities & Social Sciences), Margaret Loraine Lowder (Mechanical Engineering), Marilee McClure (Academic Affairs), Laura Palmer (Digital Writing & Media Arts), Scott Reese (College of Science & Mathematics), Susan Grant Robinson (Music), Ryan Ronnenberg (History), Heather Scott (Leadership & Integrative Studies), Deborah Smith (Leadership & Integrative Studies), Linda Treiber (Sociology).

The meeting was called to order at 12:35 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes from February 25, 2016

UPCC Chair, Dr. Jennifer Wade-Berg, called for a motion to accept the minutes from the February 25, 2016 meeting, without edits. Dr. Scott made the motion, Dr. Parrot seconded, and the minutes were approved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND
ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY**

Department of Mechanical Engineering Technology

As the proposed changes to MET 2501 have already been approved by UPCC, Dr. Wade-Berg announced that discussion of the proposed change in program will be addressed under New Business.

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Department of Foreign Languages

Discussion on the Change in Program for the B.A. in Modern Language and Culture will also be discussed under New Business.

NEW BUSINESS

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Department of Digital Writing & Media Arts

Before introducing Dr. Laura Palmer, Interim Chair of the Department of Digital Writing & Media Arts, Dr. Wade-Berg first called for a motion to limit discussion on the proposal concerning the B.S. in Content Design & Development to 30 minutes. Dr. Scott made the motion, Dr. Davis seconded, and the motion passed. She commented that UPCC's main concern in today's discussion is to determine whether a vote should be taken on the proposed program and its related new courses.

Dr. Palmer then addressed members of UPCC, providing opening remarks on how this program came about through consolidation. Her colleague, Dr. Jeffrey Greene then related the content of the courses proposed through a prepared statement. The year-and-a-half long "disentanglement process" was described in detail.

After representatives from the Digital Writing & Media Arts program had made their remarks, Dr. Wade-Berg then read a statement from the English Department Advisory Council, summarizing their concerns about the proposed change in program and new courses. Dr. Wade-Berg then read a statement from the American Association of University Professors chapter of KSU (AAUP@KSU). A copy of these statements, as well as other supporting information, is included on pages 6-13 of these minutes. Dr. Wade-Berg then opened the floor to questions by UPCC members and discussion ensued.

A question was posed about the legitimacy of reviewing the vote at UPCC when there is a dispute at the college level, to which Dr. Wade-Berg stated that UPCC precedence has always been to return disputed proposals back to the college for resolution. UPCC members agreed that this is common practice. There was further discussion on how disputed proposals were addressed in the past before Curriculog, with Dr. Whittlesey and Dr. Chien-pin Li clarifying their roles in the development of the proposal. Dr. Wade-Berg then returned the discussion to the matter at hand, for UPCC to determine whether a vote to approve the proposed change in program should occur.

Dr. Linda Treiber then addressed UPCC, and provided further contextual information about the proposal based on her experience as Chair of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences Curriculum Committee. Dr. Terry Carter of the Digital Writing & Media Arts Department also provided contextual information about the chain of events that lead to the tied vote at the College Curriculum Committee.

Once again, Dr. Wade-Berg returned the discussion to today's vote by UPCC. Several more questions were posed by UPCC members, including how these types of conflicts were formerly addressed at SPSU, how the KSU and SPSU faculty handbooks differed in their recommendations for addressing disputes, and how tied (failed) proposals could be advanced to a UPCC vote. Dr. Wade-Berg and representatives from Academic Affairs addressed these questions.

Seeing that the approved time limit on the discussion had expired, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion from the floor. Dr. Parrot made a motion to reject a vote on the proposed change in program for the B.S.

in Content Design & Development and the corresponding 12 new courses: CDD 2030, CDD 2045, CDD 3025, CDD 3040, CDD 3045, CDD 3050, CDD 3060, CDD 3065, CDD 3398, CDD 4030, CDD 4400, and CDD 4490. Dr. Hendrix seconded the motion, and Dr. Franklin amended the motion to establish a precedence that discourages UPCC from voting on proposals that are contested within the college-level. Other UPCC members concurred that it should not be UPCC's role to settle those disputes. Academic Affairs asked where the rejected proposal would go, to which Dr. Wade-Berg answered that she would ask the College Curriculum Committee for an amendment to revote. Dr. Parrot acceded to amend his original motion to return the proposals to the College of Humanities and Social Sciences and Dr. McFall seconded. 17 UPCC members were in favor of the vote, none opposed, and 2 abstained. The motion passed.

After some brief post-vote statements by UPCC members on next steps and recommendations to resolve the dispute as quickly as possible in the interests of the students, Dr. Wade-Berg closed discussion on this item.

Department of Foreign Languages

Dr. Wenhua Jin returned to present the proposed change in program for the B.A. in Modern Language and Culture. Their department's new course proposal for CHNS 4499 has already been addressed in a previous meeting. Hearing no discussion, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to approve on first reading the B.A. in Modern Language and Culture. Dr. Parrot made the motion, Dr. Davis seconded, and the motion passed. Dr. Franklin then made a motion to approve on second reading CHNS 4499, Dr. Naidu seconded, and the motion also passed. Finally, Dr. Naidu motioned to waive second reading on the change in program proposal, Dr. Franklin seconded, and the motion passed as well.

COLLEGE OF THE ARTS

School of Music

Dr. Susan Grant Robinson returned to speak on behalf of the proposed change in program for the B.M. in Music Education. The changes would affect the program name, prerequisites, and initiate an audition requirement. Hearing no questions, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to approve on second reading. Dr. Davis made the motion, Dr. Naidu seconded, and the motion passed. Dr. Scherrer then motioned to waive second reading, Dr. Franklin seconded, and the motion also passed.

School of Art & Design

Dr. Craig Brasco spoke on behalf of the School of Art & Design's proposed 9 new courses in Animation, leading up to a new major within the school. These courses would all fit into a core, with some course sharing with the BFA program.

Dr. Brasco then addressed questions from the Registrar's Office concerning the use of these courses as electives. It was suggested that the proposal originators change ANIM 2600 to ANIM 3600 to address the upper-level course requirement for students. Ms. Guimaraes then requested that the proposal originators contact their Librarian Liaison to the School of Art & Design, to address any requests for

material resources. Dr. Franklin mentioned a potential overlap between the proposed program and his department, and said he would welcome collaboration between programs.

Hearing no further questions, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to approve on first reading, with said edits, ANIM 3600, ANIM 3620, ANIM 3630, ANIM 3640, ANIM 3650, ANIM 3660, ANIM 4630, ANIM 4650, and ANIM 4660. Dr. Robson made the motion, Dr. Hendrix seconded, and the motion passed.

As no representative was present to address the proposed changes to existing courses and one new course in Art & Design, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to table discussion for a future meeting. Dr. Hendrix made the motion, Dr. Naidu seconded, and the motion passed.

COLLEGE OF COMPUTING AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

Department of Computer Science

UPCC heard proposals for 6 course discontinuations and 2 changes in existing courses from the Department of Computer Science. These proposals reflect the process of merging two computer science programs as a result of consolidation and the need to clean up previous incarnations of the degree program. The proposal originators then addressed questions from the committee regarding CS 3304 and why it is a change in course number rather than a discontinuation. Dr. Wade-Berg determined that a vote on these proposals have to be held as the change in program proposal works its way through Curriculog.

Hearing no further questions, Dr. Wade-Berg then called for a motion to approve on first reading, to be held on second reading until the Change in Program proposal is available, CS 2123, CS 2223, CS 2290, CS 2305H, CS 3223, CS 3304, CS 3502, and CS 4680. Dr. Hendrix made the motion, Dr. Franklin seconded, and the motion passed.

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

Department of Ecology, Evolution & Organismal Biology

Dr. Scott Reese came forward to present a new course proposal for SCED 2421, which results from the educational package reform he addressed in other UPCC meetings. He answered one question concerning the student fee requirement for school supervision. Hearing no further questions, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to approve on first reading the aforementioned course proposal. Dr. Hendrix made the motion, Dr. Scherrer seconded, and the motion passed. Dr. Scherrer then motioned to waive second reading, Dr. McFall seconded, and the motion also passed.

SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Department of Mechanical Engineering

Dr. M. Loraine Lowder presented her department's 5 proposals for changes in existing courses. These changes reflect an overall move from SYS prefixes to ENGR. The course numbers and descriptions remain unchanged. Hearing no discussion, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to approve on first reading ENGR 3501, ENGR 3502, ENGR 4501, ENGR 4502, and ENGR 4503. Dr. McFall made the motion, Dr. Franklin seconded, and the motion passed. Dr. Naidu then motioned to waive second reading, Dr. Scherrer seconded, and the motion also passed.

Department of Civil & Construction Engineering

Dr. Kevin McFall came forward to speak on behalf of the change in existing course proposal for ENGR 2214. The proposed change, which affects the course description and prerequisites, better aligns with current practices. Hearing no questions, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to approve on first reading the aforementioned proposal. Dr. Franklin made the motion, Dr. Naidu seconded, and the motion passed. Dr. Scherrer then motioned to waive second reading, Dr. Franklin seconded, and the motion also passed.

Lastly, Dr. Wade-Berg returned the discussion to the Change in Program relative to MET 2501. Dr. Robson made a motion to approve on first reading, Dr. Davis seconded, and the motion passed. Dr. Scherrer then motioned to waive second reading on the Change in Program, Dr. Franklin seconded, and the motion also passed.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Department of Leadership & Integrative Studies

Dr. Deborah Smith came forward to present proposals on 3 new courses, 1 course discontinuation, and a change in program for the Department of Leadership & Integrative Studies. The 3 new 2000-level courses would allow the department to offer a lower-level options for students enrolled in the Leadership Studies program. LDRS 4000 has not been offered since Fall 2013 and has historically had low student enrollment. The course content would be subsumed into another existing course, upon discontinuation.

After a brief discussion, Dr. Wade-Berg called for a motion to approve on first reading the proposals for LDRS 2000, LDRS 2100, LDRS 2200, and LDRS 4000. Dr. Davis made the motion, Dr. Naidu seconded, and the motion passed. Dr. Naidu then motioned to waive second reading, Dr. Scherrer seconded, and the motion also passed. Finally, Dr. Naidu made a motion to approve the Change in Program for the Leadership Studies Certificate. Dr. McFall seconded the motion and the motion was passed. Dr. Hendrix motioned to waive second reading, Dr. Davis seconded, and the second reading was waived.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:09 p.m.

MEMO

To: UPCC; HSSCC

From: English Department Advisory Council, on behalf of English Department Date:

March 8, 2016

Subject: Curriculum Process and CDD Proposal Concerns

We write to express concerns about how review of the Digital Writing and Media Arts (DWMA) department's B.S. in Content Design and Development (CDD) proposal was handled within the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. The CHSS Dean's approval of the CDD program proposal despite the fact that it was rejected due to a tie vote in the CHSS Curriculum Committee raises questions about the respective roles of faculty and administration in the curriculum review process at KSU. We hope you will join us in seeking answers to the questions raised in this memo and consider whether the Content Design and Development proposal should be reviewed by UPCC at this point. The concerns outlined in this memo relate to apparent violations of SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation and the AAUP's principles of shared governance.

In addition, the English Department is impacted by the CDD degree and has expressed serious reservations about the disciplinary foundations of the proposed program and about its overlap with the English major and professional writing minor. The English Department raised these concerns during and after consolidation, in meetings with Dean Dorff and Associate Dean Li, and in CHSS Curriculum Committee meetings. Some of the Department's concerns are recorded in Curriculog, and we have included a summary of our primary objections in this document.

Context and Process

January 26, 2016: DWMA's proposal for a B.S. in Content Design and Development was approved on first reading by the CHSS Curriculum Committee (5 in favor, 4 against, 1 abstention).

February 9, 2016: DWMA's proposal for a B.S. in Content Design and Development was rejected on a second reading by the CHSS Curriculum Committee as the result of a tied vote (5 in favor, 5 against).

February 16, 2016: Dr. Linda Treiber, chair of the CHSS Curriculum Committee, notified committee members that "[a]lthough the package was rejected as a result of a tie vote at the HSSCC level, the proposals were moved on in Curriculog to the level of the Dean." Dr. Treiber quoted from an "explanatory email . . . from Dr. Whittlesey, Associate Vice President for Curriculum at KSU" (see attached copy of this email). According to Dr. Whittlesey, "In the case of a tied vote, the fair thing to do is to move the proposal forward and not disadvantage the proposal originators because of a tied vote."

February 23, 2016: Dean Dorff attended the CHSS Curriculum Committee meeting, proclaimed it a closed meeting of the committee, and spoke about his decision to approve the CDD degree proposal despite the fact that it was rejected due to a tie vote in the CHSS Curriculum Committee. This is listed on the CHSS Curriculum Committee agenda as "Conversation with: Robin Doff, Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSSCC MEMBERS ONLY)."

Questions

We understand that shared governance on curricular matters involves the approval of a dean, the provost, and the president as part of the normal curriculum review and approval process outlined in the *University Handbook*, Section 3.7:

Category 4. All other proposals (that is, proposals not in Categories 1, 2, or 3) require approval by the:

- 1) Department curriculum committee (in conjunction with General Education Council if the proposal is related to a core course)
- 2) Department chair
- 3) College curriculum committee
- 4) College dean
- 5) UPCC or GPCC
- 6) Dean of Graduate College in the case of graduate courses or programs
- 7) Provost/VPAA and President.

The standard process was not, however, followed in the case of CDD. The faculty vote on the CDD degree proposal was overruled by administration. Dean Dorff included this comment in Curriculog after the program was “approved by force” within that system: “By moving this proposal forward, I am expressing my strong support for the degree program. The Provost determined that the proposal should be moved to the Dean’s level after the tied vote at the College Curriculum Committee. Consistent with our practice of shared governance, I am now sending the proposal to the UPCC.”

According to SACSCOC principle of accreditation 3.4.1, “each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved **by the faculty and the administration.**” Also, according to the AAUP’s *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, “[t]he faculty has primary responsibility for . . . **curriculum,**” and “differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand” (see Appendix A). **In light of these principles, why was it determined by administration that faculty approval did not need to be obtained at the college committee level before CDD moved ahead for consideration by the dean and then by UPCC?**

After considering the information above and Dr. Whittlesey’s comments in the attached letter (see Appendix B), we hope you will join us in seeking clarification and answers to the following questions:

- When a curriculum committee consists of an even number of members, as the CHSS Curriculum Committee does, **what voting procedures should be followed?** [See Appendix B: Letter from Dr. Treiber quoting Dr. Whittlesey.] Under what circumstances should a curriculum committee chair vote or abstain from voting? [See Appendix A: Policy and Procedure Information – *Robert’s Rules of Order.*] Because CHSS has 10 departments and consequently 10 voting members, this will continue to be an issue for the HSSCC and therefore must be addressed.
- **Why was the process described in the *University Handbook*, Section 3.7 not followed?** The *Handbook* states, “Rejection of a proposal at any of its designated levels of review precludes

adoption of the proposal in its present form and must be accompanied by a written explanation of the rationale behind the rejection. This explanation is to be distributed by the rejecting level of review to all earlier levels of review and to the initiator of the proposal.”

- The *University Handbook* mentions what happens in the case of rejection, but **what circumstances constitute rejection?** Does a tie vote result in rejection or acceptance of a proposal, or some third option? *Robert’s Rules* is clear on the matter of tie votes: “On a tie vote the motion is lost.” Yet Dr. Whittlesey claims, “In the case of a tied vote, the fair thing to do is to move the proposal forward and not disadvantage the proposal originators because of a tied vote.” Dr. Whittlesey also referred to past proposals that had been forwarded in this manner. What were these proposals and to what extent did they provide a precedent for her action in regard to CDD?
- **What is the AVP for Curriculum’s role** in determining “fairness” with regard to the outcomes of a college curriculum committee vote? Under what circumstances can the Provost/VPAA overrule or empower a college dean to overrule a faculty vote on curricular matters?
- **Why did the dean of CHSS, the Provost/VPAA, and the AVP for Curriculum confer** on this matter?
- **Why was the faculty vote overruled?** Why did Dean Dorff offer information about this decision only to HSSCC members in a closed meeting?

English Department’s Reservations about the CDD Proposal

After consolidation, Dean Dorff formed a “disentanglement” committee that included Associate Dean Li, three members of DWMA (formerly named the Department of English, Technical Communication, and Media Arts), three members of Communication, and three members of the English department. This DWMA Curriculum Review Committee discussed the B.S. in Interactive Design (formerly a B.A. in New Media Arts) and the B.S. in Technical Communication. Committee members suggested ways in which course titles and descriptions could be clarified to prevent overlap with existing COM and ENGL/WRIT courses. The committee was *not* convened to discuss the proposed B.A. in Writing and New Media (now B.S. in Content Design and Development), and a request for a joint meeting of DWMA, Communication, and English faculty with Dean Dorff was ignored; instead, Dean Dorff and Associate Dean Li allowed for written feedback on degree program drafts. Instead of acknowledging evident disciplinary commonality and the very relevant expertise of English department writing faculty, this one-way communication approach exacerbated consolidation-related tensions, prevented collaboration, and resulted in unaddressed overlap. As a result, the English Department has had no other option than to continue to voice objections.

For the benefit of UPCC members, we offer a summary of the English Department’s most significant reservations about the program:

- We object because CDD is described as a writing degree; because it emphasizes “professional writing”; because, as the Program Description states, the degree “prepares students for creative and technical approaches to writing for digital spaces . . . and content development” and therefore reproduces instruction already provided in English Department courses; and because

it draws heavily on the courses—and therefore the expertise—of English faculty without providing any means for these faculty to participate in the creation and delivery of a degree to which their disciplinary knowledge (in rhetoric, composition, digital writing, technical and professional writing, etc.) is so relevant.

- While we appreciate DWMA’s efforts thus far to carve out a unique niche for themselves, we argue that many syllabi and course assignments do not yet align with the proposed focus or offer adequate instruction in concepts and skills that are not already addressed in English Department or School of Communication and Media courses. Similarly, some program descriptions, courses, and syllabi are not sufficiently differentiated from *professional writing*, the name and focus of the English department’s Professional Writing minor and Master of Arts in Professional Writing program, which already necessarily provides instruction in and practice with writing for digital contexts and what CDD labels “content creation.” We argue that the proposed degree overlaps with the English department’s creative and professional writing courses and our Professional Writing minor.
- The CDD justification information states, “Taking classes alongside the other majors in our department forecasts the kind of teams that a content designer, developer, or strategist can expect after college”; however, the curriculum and degree requirements do not seem to encourage or enable students to make these useful connections. The connection between CDD and the B.S. in Technical Communication in particular should be strengthened.
- We do not see evidence that the proposed CDD degree actually “blends the humanities with a focused study of technology,” as suggested in the Justification statement. We take issue with a Bachelor of Science degree offering digital humanities coursework in a department that offers no humanities content.
- We question whether—with only four faculty and with those faculty holding degrees in Creative Writing (MFA in Poetry), Rhetoric and Composition, and Literature—the B.S. in CDD has the resources necessary to succeed and meet SACS accreditation requirements (see Appendix A, SACSCOC principle 3.4.11).

We hope that you will carefully consider these objections, especially since the CHSS Curriculum Committee vote indicates that faculty from other departments share some of our reservations about the quality and viability of the CDD program.

In conclusion, the English Department is concerned about the role of shared governance at KSU and the potential conflicts with the principles of the SACS accreditation board. The regular procedures in place for resolving consolidation issues and for reviewing curriculum proposals have been abandoned in order to advance a proposal despite significant faculty concerns. We hope that you will join us in seeking clarification from administration and in asking that CHSS Curriculum Committee procedures be restored to their long-established patterns, in keeping with shared governance principles. Further, we request that UPCC send the CDD proposal back to CHSS and to DWMA for revision in light of the concerns expressed by the CHSS Curriculum Committee.

APPENDIX A: Policy and Procedure Information

AAUP, *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*: According to the AAUP's *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, "[t]he faculty has primary responsibility for . . . curriculum," and "differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand." "The Academic Institution: The Faculty," Section 5 of the *Statement*, begins,

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.

***College of Humanities and Social Sciences Curriculum Committee Procedures*:** "After passage of the proposal, the author of the proposal will forward the proposal package to the Dean for review."

***KSU University Handbook*:** According to the *University Handbook* Section 3.7. Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Review and Approval Process, "Curriculum is the collective responsibility of the faculty. The curriculum development and review process will be guided by the policies and goals of the university, colleges, and departments. Proposed changes and reactions to those proposals should be communicated to all interested parties and multiple viewpoints should be considered." Further, "Rejection of a proposal at any of its designated levels of review precludes adoption of the proposal in its present form and must be accompanied by a written explanation of the rationale behind the rejection. This explanation is to be distributed by the rejecting level of review to all earlier levels of review and to the initiator of the proposal" (Section 3.7).

***Robert's Rules of Order, Article VIII. Vote. 46. Voting*:** On a tie vote the motion is lost, and the chair, if a member of the assembly, may vote to make it a tie unless the vote is by ballot.

***Robert's Rules of Order, Article X. The Officers and the Minutes. 58. Chairman or President*:** If a member of the assembly, he is entitled to vote when the vote is by ballot (but not after the tellers have commenced to count the ballots), and in all other cases where the vote would change the result. Thus, in a case where a two-thirds vote is necessary, and his vote thrown with the minority would prevent the adoption of the question, he can cast his vote; so, also, he can vote with the minority when it will produce a tie vote and thus cause the motion to fail; but he cannot vote twice, first to make a tie, and then to give the casting vote.

SACSCOC, The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement. PROGRAMS, 3.4. All Educational Programs.

3.4.1: The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. (Academic program approval)

3.4.10: The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty. (Responsibility for curriculum)

3.4.11: For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. (Academic program coordination)

APPENDIX B: Letter from Dr. Treiber Quoting Dr. Whittlesey

From: "Linda Treiber" <ltreiber@kennesaw.edu>

To: "Chris K. Randall" <crandal2@kennesaw.edu>, "Federica Santini" <fsantini@kennesaw.edu>, "Kim Haimes-Korn" <khaimesk@kennesaw.edu>, "Christopher Pallas" <cpallas@kennesaw.edu>, "Katarina Gephardt" <kgephardt@kennesaw.edu>, "Ryan Ronnenberg" <pryan4@kennesaw.edu>, "Pauline Howes" <phowes1@kennesaw.edu>, "Griselda Thomas" <gthomas2@kennesaw.edu>, "Matthew Mitchelson" <mmitch81@kennesaw.edu>

Cc: "Chien-Pin Li" <cli@kennesaw.edu>, "Valerie Whittlesey" <vwhittle@kennesaw.edu>, "Robin Dorff" <rdorff@kennesaw.edu>, "Laura Palmer" <lpalme32@kennesaw.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 10:47:52 AM

Subject: CDD proposals moved to the next level

Dear HSSCC Members,

I have received notification that the BS in Content Design and Development proposals were moved to the next level of the the College Curriculum committee. Although the package was rejected as a result of a tie vote at the HSSCC level, the proposals were moved on in Curriculog to the level of the Dean.

I have included portions of the explanatory email that I received from Dr. Whittlesey, Associate Vice President for Curriculum at KSU, quoted below:

Dr. Whittlesey noted that,

"We have actually had negative votes to move forward in the past, especially under the old hard copy process, if that negative vote was just at one level of review. We ask committees with negative votes to try to work out their issues with the originator of the proposal. But sometimes that is not possible"

"My perspective is I don't recommend having a committee with an even number of committee members, especially for the reason that we currently have, tied votes. In the case of a tied vote, the fair thing to do is to move the proposal forward and not disadvantage the proposal originators because of a tied vote."

"The Curriculog system does have an override function built into it for circumstances such as this, so that the system can be manipulated to match institutional curriculum review and shared governance policies and processes."

End quoted message from Dr. Whittlesey.

Finally, I would like to add that I appreciate all of your efforts regardless of whether you were for or against the proposal. I think that our committee has behaved with dignity and grace throughout the process. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Linda

Linda A. Treiber, PhD.
Associate Professor of Sociology Department
of Sociology & Criminal Justice Kennesaw
State University
Social Science Bldg.
Room 4070, MD 2204
402 Bartow Ave. NW
Kennesaw GA 30144 USA
PH: [470-578-2279](tel:470-578-2279)
Fax: [470-578-9148](tel:470-578-9148)
http://works.bepress.com/linda_treiber/