

# MINUTES

## FACULTY SENATE MEETING

### 18 February 1997

---

Chairperson D. Eidam called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. in Chryst Hall, Room 210. All departmental senators except for the Nursing Department attended. P. Leahy attended for student senate and M. Wayde for *The Snapper*.

#### Minutes

Senate approved the 4 February 1997 meeting minutes. Eidam noted the following corrections to today's agenda: In item VIII. Proposed Courses and Programs, change CSCI 450 and 456 from one to two meetings to challenge courses. Under item IX Faculty Senate Elections, note that Professor S. Lotlikar no longer served on the Judiciary Committee and senate will not hold that election.

#### Reports

##### Chairperson's Report

Chairperson D. Eidam welcomed parliamentarian C. Scharnberger back to senate. Eidam talked to J. Sheridan regarding senate's timelines on the General Education Task Force Report. Senate is targeting a completion date of March's first meeting (4 March). APSCUF and the Provost agree to the new date. Eidam reserved Chryst Hall, Room 210, for next Tuesday, February 25, in case senate needs a special meeting solely devoted to discussion of the General Education Task Force Report. He asked the UCPRC and GERC committee chairs to be ready to reschedule their meetings.

Eidam's email survey indicates that senators agree with the dates. Before today's meeting ends, senate must decide whether to meet next Tuesday. Eidam distributed a senate email directory Attachment C but said it would be the last that he would distribute in hard copy form. He can place it on MU's senate Web page faster than he can print it.

Eidam announced that senate secretary M. Margolis now sends senate's minutes electronically to senate's Webmaster, M. Warmkessel. She puts the minutes on Marauder on senate's part of the MU Web site home page. Last meeting's minutes are already available there. Eidam suggested that senators check senate's web site; Webmaster Warmkessel improves it every day. The minutes are linked and an index is planned for the future.

Eidam recognized senate Webmaster, M. Warmkessel, and thanked her for all her work she has done so far. She said she appreciated comments from senators. Her goal is to put current minutes on line and then work backwards. All minutes and action summaries are available on line for 1995 and 1996. When secretary M. Margolis sends the minutes to her electronically, she can put them on senate's Web site immediately.

She does have a concern about attachments to the minutes. There are two ways of putting attachments in minutes for the Web: either keying or scanning them in. Without ocr software with scanning, an indexing system cannot index the attachments. Warmkessel moved that senators provide attachments that go with minutes either electronically (e.g., email) or on a floppy disk. The motion passed.

Eidam represented senate at last night's SPARC meeting. There was a discussion of the budget and L. Suskie presented an analysis of an attitudinal and background survey that is done about every three to

four years. Eida m would like to have Suskie speak to senate after senate completes important agenda items.

### **Student Senate President**

Student Senate President P. Leahy said student senate met February 13 and filled openings on committees. It elected six new committee members. If senators need to know who the student representatives on their committees are, contact the student senate office. Student senate also worked on its voter registration drive. The next meeting will be February 27.

### **Administrative Officers**

#### **President**

President J. Caputo said two weeks ago he reported on governor T. Ridge's annual budget address. University presidents have since met with Pennsylvania legislators to get their take on the governor's budget message. Recall that there was a fair amount of hostility towards us two years ago. Last year that anger seems to have subsided. Ridge proposed a two percent increase in the budget and legislators seem to support it. It is unlikely that the general assembly will raise the figure. Several line items were not funded.

Caputo said there was cumulative damage from the recent Lawless campaign against the SSHE schools. Lawless created an environment in which higher education is perceived as inefficient. In response to this, we are developing a letter writing campaign and are asking alumni and students to write to legislators. We are also developing a public relations campaign that will stress our mission and accomplishments.

#### **Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Vice President for Academic Affairs F. McNairy informed senators that MU held an open house last weekend. 1100 individuals attended despite snow. They stayed for the academic presentations. She thanked departmental representatives for coming out and helping.

#### **Associate Provost for Academic Administration**

Associate Provost for Academic Administration J. Stager said that MU moved the workshop that Jim Nichols will conduct from April 10 and 11 to April 1 and 2. The Women in Mathematical Sciences Conferences is also April 1.

### **Committee Reports**

#### **Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee**

Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee chairperson, R. Wismer, introduced four new course proposals and one option:

**MATH 269:** Calculus and Actuarial Science Problem Solving Seminar, a new one credit hour course to be first offered Spring 1998 if approved.

**HIST 209:** Women in United States History, a new three credit hour General Education Writing (non-liberal arts core) course first offered as a topics course in the Spring and Fall of 1995 and to be first offered Spring 1998 if approved.

**BIOL 447:** Chesapeake Bay System, a new, four credit hour General Education Writing course first offered as a topics course in the Fall of 1995 and to be first offered in the Fall of 1997 if approved.

Wisner requested that senate consider BIOL 447 under the one meeting rule.

**WSTU 491:** Topics in Women's Studies, a one to four credit hour new non-general education elective topics course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997 or Spring of 1998 if approved.

### **Option in International Business**

Wisner asked that senate consider the option today since it has already been presented and discussed in senate. Changes have been made where senators had objections in the past. Senate voted to consider the option today and again voted to approve it.

### **Academic Policies Committee**

Academic Policies Committee chairperson, K. Bookmiller, said the committee's first meeting will be on Thursday.

**Outcomes Assessment Committee** Outcomes Assessment Committee chairperson, R. Mainzer, said the committee together with the General Education Review Committee is applying for a system wide grant. The grant will involve Dr. J. Nichol's workshop. Senate voted in May 1994 to require and activate outcome assessment and evaluation plans and the grant also includes senate's action. The committee is restarting a newsletter and plans three issues. The first one will come out in about a month.

### **Joint Senate Conference Committee**

Joint Senate Conference Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, said he has distributed the rough draft of a report concerning the four year commitment to committee members. He has received feedback from them. He will make the appropriate changes based on their feedback. He will schedule a meeting soon; committee members can expect to meet shortly. He expects to complete the project quickly.

### **Academic Standards Committee**

Academic Standards Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, said if senate passed the proposal he made concerning the Academic Standards Committee today, he will bring to the committee a recommendation to raise the number of students as well. Chairperson D. Eidam reminded Piperberg that senate's bylaws require that a written proposal be submitted when changing a senate committee's size.

### **University Theme Committee**

University Theme Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, said yesterday was the due date for proposals for the year 2000-2001 University theme. He has received four suggestions. One proposer was anonymous and one did not want to be responsible for his/her proposed theme. Two suggestions were well fleshed out. Piperberg will distribute the descriptions of the two proposals to committee members. The committee will meet with the proposers shortly and will have a recommendation for senate either in the first or second meeting in April.

Piperberg deferred to B. Schneller, 1996-1997 Academic Theme Committee Co-Chairperson, so that she could describe some of the Spring semester' upcoming theme events. Schneller said the title of this year's theme is "Preparing for Life in the Twenty-First Century." She described two upcoming events: on February 27, 1997, Frederick Turner, a poet, essayist and Founder's Professor of Literature at the University of Texas at Dallas, will present a lecture entitled, "The Great Chain of Being - The Role of the

Arts in the Twenty-First Century." The event will occur at 4 PM in Lehr Dining Room of Gordinier Hall. On March 6 of the next week, Elijah Anderson, Charles Gay Professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, will present a lecture on violence in the inner city. The lecture will be at 7:30 PM in McComsey Auditorium.

Senate secretary and 1996-1997 Academic Theme Committee Co-Chairperson, M. Margolis, announced that Michael Rothchild, author of the best-selling book *Bionomics*, will speak on campus on the significance of biotechnology for America's future. The event will be held on April 15, 1997, at 8 PM in Lehr Dining Room of Gordinier Hall.

### **Proposed Courses**

There were no challenges to currently proposed courses under the two meeting rule.

### **Business**

#### **Faculty Senate Elections**

Senate needed to elect its secretary for a one year term (1997-1998) beginning in September 1997. Chairperson D. Eidam called for nominations. Hearing none, he noted that B. Schneller, although not currently a senator, was willing and able to serve as senate secretary. Eidam asked that senate suspend the rules and elect Schneller, a former senate secretary. A W. Dorman/B. Nakhai motion to elect B. Schneller as senate secretary for the 1997-1998 academic year passed unanimously.

Senate needed to replace S. Lotlikar on the University Theme Committee, a nonschool position ending in 1998. Eidam called for nominations. Hearing none, he said senate will carry the election over to the next meeting.

#### **Report of the General Education Review Committee**

The General Education Review Committee reported to senate on the report of the General Education Task Force of 19 November 1996 (see Attachment A, pages 4155-4156, of the 4 February 1997 senate minutes). Chairperson D. Eidam recognized senator J. McCade. McCade said that he had placed on the table written motions regarding the General Education Review Task Force (see Attachment A). He asked to make the motions one at a time:

##### **Motion 1: Advanced Writing Requirement**

The task force should completely withdraw both its reference to the English Department and the statement about the advanced writing requirement.

The motion passed after senator S. Thompson seconded it.

##### **Motion 2: Controlling Cost**

The task force should devise a strategy to assess cost or at least begin planning a strategy.

Senator W. Dorman seconded the motion. After considerable discussion, senate passed the motion 17 to 2.

##### **Motion 3: Controlling Cost**

The task force should accept responsibility to look into administrative side cost savings.

C. Koslowsky seconded the motion. Senate defeated the motion.

Before moving to McCade's motion 4, senate considered the General Education Review Committee Motions for Senate's Consideration (see Attachment B). The chairperson recognized senator C. Stameshkin. She asked that senate consider six motions contained in Attachment B. Motions 1 and 2 passed. Motion #3 reads as follows: That we not submit items in group 1 to the faculty as part of the task force recommendations package, but instead discuss and resolve this issue within faculty senate. Senator J. McCade amended the motion to read as follows: delete the words, "...discuss and resolve this issue within faculty senate." Then replace those words in motion #3 with "...include them in the rationale." The motion to amend passed and the amended motion # 3 passed.

Before it could vote on motion #4, senate decided to postpone debate until a meeting next Tuesday, February 25, 1997. The only business of the February 25 meeting will be General Education Task Force Report issues.

#### Program Approvals - Program Changes

Senate approved an **Associate of Technology in Industrial Technology**.

#### Expansion of the Academic Standards Committee - Returned to the Agenda

Academic Standards Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, has requested that senate raise the committee's size to give students more attention and better handle the committee's workload. Currently the committee has seven members serving overlapping three year terms.

Senate adjourned at 5:45 PM. The next meeting will be Tuesday, 4 March 1997, from 4:05 - 5:45 p.m. in Chryst 210.

Respectfully submitted,

Marvin Margolis, Secretary  
Faculty Senate

## Action Summary

18 February 1997

---

### 1. Course and Program Approvals

Program Changes Senate approved an **Associate of Technology in Industrial Technology** and an **Option in International Business**

### 2. Senate Minutes

Senators must provide attachments that go with minutes either electronically (e.g., email) or on a floppy disk..

### 3. Election of Faculty Senate Officers

Senate elected B. Schneller for the 1997-1998 academic year as senate secretary.

### 4. General Education Task Force Report

Senate approved two motions:

#### Motion 1: Advanced Writing Requirement

The task force should completely withdraw both its reference to the English Department and the statement about the advanced writing requirement.

#### Motion 2: Controlling Cost

The task force should devise a strategy to assess cost or at least begin planning a strategy.

Senate approved two General Education Review Committee motions (see Attachment B). Motions 1 and 2 passed. Motion #3 reads as follows: That we not submit items in group 1 to the faculty as part of the task force recommendations package, but instead discuss and resolve this issue within faculty senate. Senate amended the motion to read as follows: delete the words, "...discuss and resolve this issue within faculty senate." Then replace those words in motion #3 with "...include them in the rationale."

Senate approved a special meeting on Tuesday, February 25, 1997, to continue discussion of motions concerning the Report of the General Education Task Force.

## **Attachment A**

### **Faculty Senate Minutes**

### **4 February 1997**

---

#### Second Response to Task Force Recommendations by the General Education Review Committee

The position of the GERC is that the general education task force was put in the impossible position of being asked to recommend changes to improve the present general education curriculum without having available a clear and adequate account of the objectives of the system within the university. Without such objectives, there is no reasonably objective way of setting priorities, nor of deciding how to balance the costs and benefits of possible changes.

Over the last couple of months, our committee has had several opportunities to discuss the task force recommendations and we have received considerable input from both individuals and departments. Virtually all of this input has been negative. This second response, therefore, represents the committee's more considered opinion about the recommendations:

**A. Overall, we find the recommendations to be premature, and in some cases, ill-considered.** The task force does not offer support for its claims that any of these changes will actually save **any** money, which was its original charge. Further, it seems possible that some of these changes might have a **negative impact** on the quality of the general education program, and the committee offers no evidence to the contrary. Neither common senses nor empirical studies back up these recommendations, nor did the task force consult knowledgeable individuals and departments who could have provided them with information they lacked. For example, they did not ascertain the original rationale for C and Q courses, they did not consult the English Department about the rationale for its teaching advanced composition courses, nor did they check the catalogue to test their assumption that all QARC courses are math and computer science courses.

Some of their recommended changes would undoubtedly simplify advising students, in the long run, assuming that they were adopted on a long term basis and not likely to be changed again in the near future. Even these, however, would temporarily make things less simple for advisors, just by virtue of representing changes from the present system.

B. Phase 1:

**RECOMMENDATION: The committee is generally opposed to making any immediate changes in the curriculum,** other than those which represent continuing already functioning modifications of the curriculum on an ad hoc basis. (Such modifications include deleting the 10 pages of revised prose requirement from "w" courses, premitting students to replace one "p" course with another gen ed course, and permitting up to four required

related courses to count in the gen ed blocks.)

The GERC has been, and will continue working on the task of revising the goals and objectives of general education, as part of the university's move towards outcomes assessment, as mandated by the SSHE and Middle States. Within the next two years, this task must be completed to a significant degree, and will clearly result in a number of recommendations regarding how the general education curriculum should be altered to meet these revised goals and objectives. For this reason, any changes implemented by the faculty and administration in the next year may end up being in conflict with curriculum modifications eventually agreed to as part of the outcomes assessment effort; **any substantial changes made at this point, then, are likely to lead to at least some, and perhaps a significant amount of, wasted effort and money.**

C. Phase 2:

**RECOMMENDATION: The committee believes it is especially ill-advised at this point to attempt to tie the hands of those working on modifying the general education curriculum as part of the outcomes based assessment effort.** While we have no problems with general guidelines for change being formulated by the task force, faculty senate, administration, or faculty as a whole, it seems premature at this time for us to mandate any specific recommendations, such as "Eliminate labels!" or "Farm out advanced composition courses to departments." What would be in order would be recommendations such as, "Let us find a way that doesn't involve the use of the cumbersome label system?" or "Costs must be considered when recommending curricular changes. We must find ways to reduce the cost of the average general education class."

In conclusion, Millersville University presently lacks the knowledge necessary to make specific recommendations regarding changes in general education. With its completion of the Performance Review of General Education, the GERC has begun the process of obtaining some of the required knowledge, and members of the committee have accumulated some expertise. As reformulating general education objectives and stipulating how our general education curriculum achieves, or fails to achieve these objectives, is precisely the task on which our committee is now working, it stands to reason that it is unrealistic to attempt any real reform of our system, large or small, until this task is complete.

**RECOMMENDATION: We recommend voting against the task force recommendations at this time.**



**Attachment A**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**18 February 1997**

---

Motions Regarding the General Education Review Task force

Advanced Writing Requirement

**1: The task force should completely withdraw both its reference to the English department and the statement about the advanced writing requirement.**

Controlling Cost

One of the three reports the task force considered was a cost analysis. Very few conclusions could be reached with certainty. Was the new general education curriculum contributing significantly to higher costs? One cost increase seemed to be the movement away from large, entry level courses. This is why some of the committee recommendations are aimed at allowing a controlled migration to larger 100 level sections. Were P courses costing a lot of money? No--the average class size of P courses was greater than that of most courses. Other than these and a few additional conclusions, it became obvious that a good way of determining cost was not in place. Additionally, what happened to the task force on controlling administrative costs?

**2: The task force should devise a strategy to assess cost or at least begin planning such a strategy.** An acceptable method of assessing cost is needed just as much as the assessment piece for curriculum. Otherwise, we will not be able to do cost benefit analysis.

**3: The task force should accept responsibility to look into cost dsavings on the administrative side.** When the recommendations return to the senate they should include a plan for the investigation of administrative cost savings. One order of business should be to obtain a report from the task force on controlling administrative cost.

Senate's Response to the Task force's Recommendations

The senate should respond to the task force report issue by issue, not line by line. Let's get the concepts and leave the editing to the task force. I will move that we proceed to **4: discuss the specific recommendations one by one, limit the discussion of each to no more than 30 minutes and entertain motions on concept at no later than the 25 minute mark.** This schedule can be adjusted by appropriate action if needed; at least it gives us some direction and some hope of getting through this in a reasonable time frame.

Joe McCade

**Attachment B**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**18 February 1997**

---

General Education Review Committee  
Motions for the Senate's Consideration

**Procedural Motions:**

Motion #1. Divide the 11 items under phase 1 and phase 2 of the task force recommendations into three groups: **1. Outcomes assessment group**, items 1 and 2 under phase 2; **2. Minor changes group**, items 1, 2 and 6 under phase 1; and **3. Major changes group**, items 3, 4, and 5 under phase 1 and items 3 and 4 under phase 2.

Rationale: **Items in group 1.** recommended a procedure that has already begun, and, is not really in question because it is mandated by our administration and the SSHE, and previously approved by faculty senate, except for some details. It is our contention that these 2 items do not require a vote by the whole faculty, nor even the senate, at least at this time, and to include them as part of a package that could be voted down would create a lot of unnecessary confusion and uncertainty. Separation of these items would allow senate to discuss them on their own merits, if we so desire, or simply allow the process to continue as at present. **Items in group 2.** need to be revised to make it clearer exactly what they are trying to do, and why, (especially the second part of item 1 and all of item 6) but it is our committee's contention that, especially if presented as ad hoc changes rather than as formal, permanent changes, these should be construed as minor changes of the curriculum. Such minor changes can and should be made by the faculty senate, and do not need to be presented to the entire faculty for ratification. Indeed, as with 1. above, presenting these changes as part of a total package which might be rejected could be counter-productive because rejection of the package could make it difficult to put through any part of the package later. **Items in group 3.** It is our committee's contention that these all represent major changes and would require a faculty vote to approve. These are also the most controversial items.

Motion #2. Senate should first discuss group 1, then group 2, then group 3 (assuming Motion #1 has passed.)

Rationale: If senate begins with the least controversial, we can probably move very quickly on these. This would also allow us to schedule the most contested items for specific later meetings, which would allow individuals and departments who wish to testify regarding specific items to know approximately when they need to be present. It would also give the task force a chance to meet prior to discussions of the more contested items and withdraw any item they wished to prior to discussion.

Motion #3. That we not submit items in group 1. to the faculty as part of the task force recommendations package, but instead discuss and resolve this issue within faculty senate.

Motion #4. That items in group 2 be sent to the GERC for rewriting and clarification, in consultation with members of the task force, after which they will be brought back to senate for approval or disapproval as individual items. That we recommend that these items not be included in the package to be approved or disapproved as a whole by the entire faculty.

Rationale for #3 and #4: See rationale for Motion #1

Motion #5 That we discuss items #3 and 4 under phase 1 and item #4 under phase 2 together.

Rationale: all relate to the abolition of labels.

Substantive Motions (More to follow)

Motion #6. That senate recommend to the task force that it withdraw item 3 from the package.

Rationale: see the English Department's arguments.