

**MINUTES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**4 March 1997**

---

Chairperson D. Eidam called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. in Chryst Hall, Room 210. All departmental senators attended except one from the Earth Sciences Department. K. McGinnis and D. Strong attended for student senate.

**Minutes**

Senate approved the 18 February 1997 meeting minutes with the following correction: the 18 February 1997 minutes page numbers duplicate those of the 4 February 1997 minutes.

**Reports**

**Chairperson's Report**

Chairperson D. Eidam distributed a handout to senators listing senate recommendations so far to the Task Force on General Education in response to its report submitted to senate on 11/19/97 (see Attachment A). Senators have not yet received the printed copies of the 25 February 1997 special meeting minutes but the Web version is available on senate's homepage. Eidam noted the following correction to the 25 February meeting minutes and to Attachment A: Instead of "clarify part (a) of the rationale for Phase 1, item 1," it should read "clarify item 1, Phase 1, and eliminate part (a) of the rationale." Senate will approve the 25 February 1997 special meeting minutes at the 18 March 1997 senate meeting.

Eidam has invited Assistant to the President for Special Projects, L. Suskie, to come to senate two weeks from today to give a report. Eidam represents senate on the Medal Fund Management Board. The Board has elected as officers, E. Thomson, S. Luek, and L. Hopkins. If senators do provide handouts, please include your name and the date in which you provide them. Senate has a Fall elections problem because by tradition it will schedule the elections on the first class day. In the Fall of 1997 MU does not start classes until after Labor Day. Eidam will make suggestions about the elections at the next senate meeting.

Attachment to 2/27/97 memo from Provost to chairs

**Administrative Officers**

**Vice President for Student Affairs**

Vice President for Student Affairs, R. Thomas, asked senate's advice on a matter. In addition to the summer orientation program, MU has a supplemental orientation that occurs two days immediately prior to the Fall semester. After the freshmen move in, they participate in the supplemental orientation activities. Because of this Fall's calendar, classes will begin the day after Labor Day. There will be orientation activities during Labor Day and the day before it.

One traditional activity has been a picnic for new students and the faculty on Sunday evening. MU's objective has been for faculty to welcome new students to campus. All faculty are invited to the picnic and last year the event was well attended. New students can seek out members of the faculty from particular departments. If MU has the event in the Fall, it must fall on Labor Day, the night before classes begin. Thomas asked if MU should plan to have the event in the Fall. Please check with the departments and report back at the next senate meeting.

**Associate Provost for Academic Programs**

Associate Provost for Academic Programs, J. Roller, and C. Deen are making the rounds of the academic departments to discuss DARS, the degree auditing system. MU has been working on DARS for three years.

The two will provide background information on the current state of DARS and listen to issues that are surfacing in departments. The two will also discuss related advising issues such as exception processing. They have already gone to ten departments. Between now and May, they will visit the remaining departments. Two issues involve the formatting of the audit and access. They welcome comments and suggestions and any feedback from the faculty about what is working and what is not.

### **Committee Reports**

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

Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee chairperson, R. Wismer, introduced three new courses under the two meeting rule:

**HNRS/BIOL212:** Honors Zoology Seminar, a new one credit hour course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997 if approved.

**GEOG333:** Biogeography, a new three credit hour Liberal Arts Core course to be first offered in the Fall of 1996 if approved.

**SOWK405:** Human Behavior and the Social Environment II, a new three credit hour course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997 if approved.

New program for the agenda of the next senate meeting.

#### **Applied Mathematics Option**

##### **Graduate Course and Program Review Committee**

Graduate Course and program Review Committee chairperson, F. Erickson, introduced two courses for senate's approval at the next meeting.

**PSYC517:** Tests and Measurements, a new three credit hour graduate elective course to be first offered in the spring of 1997 if approved.

**BIOL647:** Chesapeake Bay System, a new four credit hour graduate course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997 if approved.

##### **Joint Senate Conference Committee**

Joint Senate Conference Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, said the committee will meet next week to complete the report on the four year contract. The committee has written and revised several drafts. It has distributed the drafts to relevant people and received feedback from them.

##### **University Theme Committee**

University Theme Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, said he is trying to schedule meeting with the people who proposed themes. The committee will consider them and have a report for senate within a month to six weeks.

##### **Academic Policies Committee**

Academic Policies Committee chairperson, K. Bookmiller, said the committee first met on 20 February 1997 and will meet again on Thursday. The committee has several issues that will keep it busy for several meetings. It is considering the issue of interdisciplinary majors and minor in terms of combining them, an international studies major, and the counting of courses that are interdisciplinary. The committee is checking the governance manual concerning plus/minus grade matters. It is also investigating the 50 percent rule applying to options for transfer credit in the same way it works for majors.

##### **Proposed Courses**

Senate approved three courses:

**CSCI450:** Artificial Intelligence, a new four credit undergraduate course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997.

**CSCI456:** Robotics and Computer Vision, a new four credit undergraduate course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997.

**BIOL447:** 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.

## **Business**

### **Faculty Senate Elections**

Senate needs to replace S. Lotlikar on the University Theme Committee, a nonschool position ending in 1998. Chairperson D. Eidam called for nominations. Hearing none for the second meeting in a row, he said senate would advertise the position one more time. If none apply at the next meeting, he will declare the position vacant for the time being.

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

Senate returned to the report of the General Education Task Force of 19 November 1996. Chairperson D. Eidam said there were 38 minutes left to make specific recommendation regarding the remaining items in Group 3. C. McLeod/W. Dorman moved that "...Where necessary, departments would create a productivity plan that would both increase enrollments and preserve the department's quality of education. Each department's plan should take into consideration specific factors and situations that exist within that particular department." After considerable discussion, the motion carried.

D. Hutchens/S. Thompson moved to suggest to the task force that item 4, Phaw 1, be dropped. Chairperson D. Eidam stepped down temporarily to speak to the motion. Chairperson pro tempore, J. Piperberg, acted in Eidam's place. The motion passed.

After considerable discussion of C and Q labels without a motion, senate completed the 38 minute limit. A J. McCade/D. Eidam motion to extend senate's discussion of group 3 items for 30 additional minutes passed unanimously although only a two-thirds majority was needed. Again senate discussed the group 3 items without a motion for thirty minutes. Once the time expired, senators asked that the task force report be an agenda item for the next meeting.

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

Academic Standards Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, requested that senate raise the committee's size to give students more attention and better handle the committee's workload (see Attachment B). A J. Piperberg/R. Mainzer motion to expand the committee passed.

Senate adjourned at 5:30 PM. The next meeting will be Tuesday, 18 March 1997, from 4:05-5:45 p.m. in Chryst 210.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marvin Margolis, Secretary  
Faculty Senate



## Action Summary

4 March 1997

---

### 1. Course and Program Approvals

#### Course Approvals

**CSCI 450:** Artificial intelligence, a new four credit undergraduate course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997.

**CSCI 456:** Robotics and Computer Vision, a new four credit undergraduate course to be first offered in the Fall of 1997.

**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.

### 2. Report of the General Education Task Force

Senate moved that "...Where necessary, departments would create a productivity plan that would both increase enrollments and preserve the department's quality of education. Each department's plan should take into consideration specific factors and situations that exist within that particular department."

Senate recommended to the task force that item 4, Phase 1, be dropped.

### 3. Expansion of the Academic Standards Committee

Senate raised the committee's size to give students more attention and better handle the committee's workload.

**Attachment A**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**4 March 1997**

---

SENATE <-- DAE

3/4/97

Task Force report: what we have passed so far

Recommendations of Faculty Senate to the Task Force on GenEd in response to its report submitted to Senate on 11/19/96:

Faculty Senate recommends that the Task Force

- completely withdraw its reference to the English Department and the statement about the Advanced Writing requirement;
- devise a strategy to assess cost, or at least begin planning a strategy to do so;
- not submit items 1. And 2. of Phase 2 to the faculty as part of the Task Force recommendation package, but instead include them in the rationale;
- express the interim nature of Phase 1, item 6. in their final report;
- include the language of B. Duncan in her "Write to Learn" document with regard to Phase 1, item 6;
- include information about the history and/or historical nature of Phase 1, item 6;
- clarify the difference between the Liberal Arts core and other similar terms such as the General Education curriculum;
- clarify part (a) of the rationale for Phase 1, item 1.

## **Attachment C**

### **Faculty Senate Minutes**

### **4 March 1997**

---

FYI

SENATE <-- DAE

ATTACHMENT A

Attachment to 2/27/97 memo from Provost to chairs

APSCUF and the University Administration have agreed to the following with regard to curricular and policy proposals:

Course and program development and modifications frequently have serious implications for resource allocations. To assure early administrative response to the implications of a curricular proposal, proposals submitted to the school curriculum committees for evaluation will be submitted simultaneously to the appropriate school deans. The school deans may provide an assessment of the impact on resources in writing or in person to the initiating department. Nothing in this statement shall be interpreted to mean that the deans can delay or prevent courses and programs from being considered by the appropriate departmental, school, or university committee.

The process would therefore function as follows:

1. Faculty (Interdisciplinary Program Director or Department Chair) submit the curricular (programs and courses) proposals to the Dean. Simultaneously, faculty (Department Chair) will submit a copy of the same proposal to the School Curriculum Committee. IDEALLY, THE CHAIR AND THE DEAN WILL DISCUSS RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS PRIOR TO SUBMISSION.
2. The Dean prepares a statement regarding resource implications. A copy of the statement is returned to the Department Chair. The Chair should attach the Dean's statement to the copy which is forwarded to the School Curriculum Committee. The Dean forwards a second copy of the Dean's statement to the Associate Provost or Dean of Graduate Studies, as appropriate, along with the curricular proposal.
3. The School Curriculum Committee reviews the proposal as usual. After full consideration and approval, it submits the document to the Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee or the Graduate Course and Program Review Committee.
4. The Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee or the Graduate Course and Program Review Committee will review the curricular proposal and the Dean's statement. Each Committee should ensure all curricular proposals which were processed as of the 1996 Fall Semester contain the Dean's Statement. The Associate Provost and the Graduate Dean are the Provost's designee and assure that such statements are available for the respective committees.

1. It has been the practice at Millersville University that Faculty Senate has only focused on the academic integrity of curricular proposals. This new process does not change that practice, but instead enables the respective committees and Senate to become more knowledgeable about the resource implications for all proposals.
5. Each respective committee (Undergraduate Course and Program Review and Graduate Course and Program Review) forwards its recommendations along with the Dean's statement to Faculty Senate.
6. Faculty Senate will act on the recommendations of the respective committees and forward its recommendations to the Provost.

Discussed with Eidam and APSCUF  
prior to 11/20/96 meeting.



**Attachment B**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**4 March 1997**

---

TO: Faculty Senate

From: Joel Piperberg, Chairman, Academic Standards Committee

RE: Increase in Faculty Membership on Academic Standards Committee

Date: March 4, 1997

Proposal to Increase Faculty Membership on the Academic Standards Committee

**MOTION:** According to the current Governance Manual, the Committee should include "seven faculty members elected by Faculty Senate for three year terms. Members are elected for overlapping years." I recommend the addition of four more faculty members to the Committee bringing its faculty membership to 11 individuals plus the Committee Chair who must be a Faculty Senator elected from that body. New members should be elected as soon as possible to fill the vacancies that will result from passage of this motion. To balance the Committee, two of the new members should be elected to one year terms ending in 1998, one should be elected to a two year term ending in 1999 and the last should be elected to a term beginning now and ending in 2000 (since it would make little sense to elect someone who will serve in June and then perhaps go off the Committee). If we follow this strategy, the Committee will have a turnover of 4 faculty members per year (including the Committee Chair every third year). For example, in Fall 1997, the terms of two current members will expire as will the term of the present Chair. Elections to fill those vacancies will be held at that time and their terms will end in 2000.

**RATIONALE:** In its semiannual meetings, the Academic Standards Committee meetings have routinely run late due to our desire to devote an appropriate and sufficient amount of time to each case. thus, the students awaiting their appeals often must wait for significant lengths of time. Since the number of cases that are considered each semester is remarkably constant, we should be able to stay on schedule if we enlarge the Committee. The four additional faculty members will allow us to divide the Committee into three rather than two subcommittees as in previous meetings. All other things being equal, students will consequently not need to wait nearly as long to have their cases decided and the efficiency of the Committee will thus be increased. In recent elections, there have been many more candidates to fill vacancies on the Committee than there have been openings. Therefore, it should not be difficult to fill the new Committee slots.