

Faculty Senate Minutes
April 18, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 4:12 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Nursing, Philosophy, Physics and Sociology & Anthropology.

I. Minutes of previous meetings

The minutes of the March 21, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

The minutes of the April 4, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Dr. Börger-Greco reported that Faculty Senate will begin meeting in Osburn Hall, Room 200 beginning next fall. She also announced that the summer meeting of Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, June 20 at 3:00 pm in Osburn 201. She also reminded committee chairs that annual reports should be submitted by June 1 and requested that electronic copies be sent to Dr. Börger-Greco, Dr. Miller and Dr. Warmkessel.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

None

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Association

None

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

Provost Prabhu

Dr. Prabhu shared that there is now an elective Community Engagement category as part of the Carnegie Classification of Institutions. This is a new elective classification for which institutions must voluntarily apply and submit supporting documentation. He expressed the administrative intent to apply for the designation based on the partnerships we have with our community.

A question was raised regarding whether the number of students participating in Co-Ops is declining. Dr. Phillips noted that numbers are up this year and commented that the opportunities available generally fluctuate with the economic state of the businesses involved. Dr. Prabhu mentioned that we should continue to actively seek out these opportunities.

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips distributed a report from the Task Force on Future Directions for Major Campus Lectures and Events [see Attachment #1). The Task Force was established to explore the decline in faculty and student attendance at campus events and seek ways to foster participation and coherence in programming. She requested that this item be added to the agenda for discussion at the next meeting of Senate.

VI. Faculty Emeritus

A White/Igyor motion that Dr. Charles G. Denlinger be granted the honorary title of Professor of Mathematics Emeritus was approved without dissent [see Attachment #2].

VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

UCPRC

Senator White requested that senators check with their departments about any additional proposals to be considered before fall.

First Reading

(1) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
HIST 360: The Second World War, 3 credits, G3.

GCPRC

First Reading

(1) CHANGE IN GRADUATE COURSE
ART 526: Current Trends in Art Education. Proposal to replace ART 524: Administration and Supervision of Art Programs with ART 526.

Academic Policies

Senator West distributed a proposal for changes to be made to the undergraduate catalog [see Attachment #3]. One recommendation was to specify that students enrolled in a course without meeting stated prerequisites could be removed from the course by the professor. Students may be enrolled without these if they registered with prerequisite courses in progress. A question was raised regarding the timeframe for removing students. It was noted that the intention was for it to be early in the semester, probably during the add/drop period. Another issue discussed was the need for faculty to manually review enrollment in these courses since the registration system cannot go back and correct for these problems. Dr. West will check about the timeframe and report back to Senate.

The second modification proposed was to allow students to retake a less advanced course to improve GPA, meet minimum competency requirements or satisfy graduation requirements. It was noted that these courses would still need to be repeated at Millersville, and the suggestion was made to include that statement as well for clarity. The proposed modifications should be reviewed by departments for feedback.

Joint Senate Conference Committee

Senator Rosenthal reported on a proposal from Joint Senate regarding the composition of the Selection Committee for the Educator of the Year Award. Joint Senate recommended a committee of 7 members: 4 faculty (1 from each school and 1 non-school) elected by Faculty Senate, 2 undergraduate students elected as sophomores or juniors by Student Senate, and 1 recent (graduated within past 5 years) alum selected by the Alumni Association. All members will be limited to two-year terms and will not be eligible again for 5 years. Each year's award recipient will be strongly encouraged to serve on the committee the following year. If a committee member accepts a nomination for the award, a second election will be held to select a replacement member from the same academic unit. On the first committee, 2 faculty and 1 student will serve 1-year terms and the other 4 members will serve 2-year terms.

Concern about a lack of graduate student representation on this committee was discussed. The Committee noted that undergraduate students were specified because of concerns that graduate students have more limited exposure to faculty across campus. However, it was then pointed out that since selection is based on documentation submitted by nominees, graduate students should be at least equally qualified to serve in this role. Dr. McNairy encouraged senators to reconsider the decision to not include graduate students. Another issue raised was whether there was a stable body for selecting a graduate student representative. It was expressed that the GSA should be able to meet this need but GCPRC was also suggested as an alternative, although it is not a peer group. The fact that an alum from graduate programs might also be selected as the alum representative was also mentioned. A Mowrey/DiBartolomeis motion to amend the proposal to indicate that the two student members of the Selection Committee should be one undergraduate student and one graduate student, selected by the GSA, was approved without dissent.

Discussion was then held about whether the alum member of the committee might possibly be a current graduate student, employee or faculty member at Millersville. There were concerns that a current affiliation might create bias in the selection process or that the composition of the committee would be shifted towards faculty members. A DeCaria/Saunders motion to clarify that the alum member of the Selection Committee should not be a current student or faculty member at Millersville was approved with one dissenting vote. The amended proposal detailing the composition of the Selection Committee for the Educator of the Year Award was approved without dissent.

GERC

Senator Ward distributed a report outlining the GERC interpretation of feedback at the April 4 meeting of Senate [see Attachment #4. He noted that more clarity arose regarding some issues and indicated that Senate should return to a consideration of the goals and objectives for Gen Ed. Discussion was then held regarding the development of new vision or mission statements for Millersville that might impact the direction of Gen Ed. Dr. Phillips noted that a new vision statement is in final revisions and should be available soon. However, a new mission statement is not yet under review. Dr. Börger-Greco indicated that she would be able to forward a draft by next week.

VIII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

None

IX. Proposed Courses and Programs

Second Readings

(1) NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

AS CHEM with a Pre-Pharmacy option. Proposal was approved without dissent.

(2) CHANGE IN COURSE/CURRICULUM

CHEM 232: Organic Chemistry II. Proposal was approved without dissent.

(3) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

CSCI 475: 3D Game Programming and Computer Animation. Proposal was approved without dissent.

(4) CHANGE IN COURSE/CURRICULUM

SPED Post-Baccalaureate Certification. Proposal was approved without dissent.

The proposal from GCPRC to change to the Graduate Academic Policy regarding transferring distance-learning credits was approved without dissent.

X. English Department Composition Committee

Dr. Judith Halden-Sullivan represented the Composition Committee of the English Department to share their concern about large class sizes for writing classes. She commented that large classes make it difficult to effectively teach writing skills. It was pointed out that this is also true in W courses being taught across the curriculum. The question of practicality was raised considering that additional permanent faculty would have to be hired to reduce these class sizes. Dr. Halden-Sullivan indicated that, compared to writing class sizes at other PASSHE institutions, Millersville is in the middle. She noted that the distributed document has already been approved by the English Department and requested support from Senate. A Mowrey/DeCaria motion to extend

collegial endorsement of the proposal to reduce the size of writing classes was approved without dissent.

XI. Other/New Business

None

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller
Faculty Senate Secretary

Action Summary:

A White/Igyor motion that Dr. Charles G. Denlinger be granted the honorary title of Professor of Mathematics Emeritus was approved without dissent.

A Mowrey/DiBartolomeis motion to amend the proposal to indicate that the two student members of the Selection Committee for the Educator of the Year Award should be one undergraduate student and one graduate student, selected by the GSA, was approved without dissent. A DeCaria/Saunders motion to clarify that the alum member of the Selection Committee should not be a current student or faculty member at Millersville was approved with one dissenting vote. The amended proposal detailing the composition of the Selection Committee for the Educator of the Year Award was approved without dissent.

A Mowrey/DeCaria motion to extend collegial endorsement of the proposal to reduce the size of writing classes was approved without dissent.

Report to Faculty Senate
Task Force on Future Directions for Major Campus Lectures and Events

In Spring 2005, President McNairy shared her thoughts with Faculty Senate regarding what future directions might be indicated for our major campus lectures and events. She asked the group if they felt the Academic Theme was continuing to fulfill its purpose and received an interesting array of responses. She commissioned a presidential task force to explore this matter, which commenced meeting in July 2005 and has continued its work throughout the fall semester. It was anticipated that the task force would develop recommendations to be shared with the Faculty Senate for review and input in January 2006. In the course of its work, the Task Force determined that it was important to wait for the final report of the institutional identity initiative, which will delay the report to Faculty Senate until early April.

The charge of the task force is:

To investigate new models for revitalizing our major lecture series to increase faculty and student participation, answering the following questions:

- ❖ How has our academic theme fulfilled its purpose?
- ❖ How do we enrich our social and cultural programming so that our students and faculty will participate?
- ❖ How do we foster a cross-disciplinary approach to programming?
- ❖ Are there ways, without stifling lecture purposes, to facilitate a more coherent approach to programming and subsequent marketing of major events (“Tradition and Innovation” has served us well in this fashion.)?
- ❖ Are there ways to integrate further the academic purposes of a new model (e.g., freshman reading program around the theme)?
- ❖ How do we utilize our resources, both human and material, effectively to promote what is best for MU?

In investigating responses to the questions identified in the charge, the task force first reviewed the history of the academic theme at the University. The theme commenced in 1990 with the inaugural Arthur Miller Festival, and it has continued with the conclusion of the 150th anniversary celebration in Spring 2006. In its review of past themes, the task force determined that some themes were more successful than others in providing an integrating, coherent perspective to programming that fostered interdisciplinary conversations and exploration.

1990-91	The Arthur Miller Festival
1991-92	Encounter of Two Worlds [Columbian Quincentenary]
1992-1993	Encounter of Two Worlds [Columbian Quincentenary]
1993-94	Earth: The Next Generation
1994-95	Technology and Human Evolution

1995-96	In Search of Justice: Balancing Rights and Responsibilities in a Pluralistic Society
1996-97	Preparing for Life in the 21 st Century
1997-98	Culture and Communication in the Electronic Village
1998-99	MU, a Community of Learners
1999-2000	Achievements throughout the 20 th Century
2000-01	Building a Community of Partnerships: The Role of Arts in Society
2001-02	World of Cultures in Our Own Back Yard
2002-03	Crossing Boundaries: Decolonializing the Curriculum
2003-04	Unity, Excellence and Strength through Diversity
2004-05	150 th Anniversary: Tradition and Innovation
2005-06	150 th Anniversary: Tradition and Innovation

A brief review of the major lectureships on campus, including their mission/charge and basic funding information also was undertaken. This yielded the following information, noted below. Generally, these lectures have not considered the current theme selected by the Academic Theme Committee in selection of lecture speakers and/or focus of the lecture itself.

Brossman Science Lectureship: The mission of the Brossman Science Lectureship and Competition is to stimulate interest in science among middle/high school students and the general public. The Lectureship advances the commitment of the University to the community and public higher education. The lecture series advances the image and awareness of the University by bringing on campus a nationally known speaker to address about 600 middle school students, 80 high school students and teachers, several hundred members of the general public, and several hundred members of the University community. In addition to the two lectures presented by the speaker there is a science knowledge competition for high school students and a series of demonstrations and displays presented for the high school students and teachers by the Millersville faculty. Funding Source: Mr. & Mrs. William F. Brossman Charitable Foundation. Total budget is approximately \$10,000.

Christie Lecture: An annual lecture by an up and coming economist (sometimes a business/economics journalist) with name recognition. Speaking fees are a real issue. Most economists of any distinction are commanding \$15K and up. The lecture is funded by corporate sponsorship obtained by the Advancement Office. Past speakers have included Nobel Prize winners.

Kenderdine Lecture: Endowed annual lecture on a current issue in international political affairs. Usual cost is \$6,000-8,000 per speaker but can vary given the speaker if additional funds available.

Lockey Lecture: Endowed lecture in the field of education. Currently do an all-call to the education faculty for nominations in the spring for the following year. Amount that can usually be spent is \$2,500, although supplemental funds have been received to support special speakers (Jonathan Kozol was about \$10,000).

Carter Woodson and Hazel Jackson Lectures: Woodson lecture is sponsored and has a budget of approximately \$8,000. The Commission on Cultural Diversity pays for the Hazel Jackson Lecture (\$5,000). Black Culture Celebration has a \$10,000 budget.

Millersville University International Holocaust Conference: Founded in 1980, the conference brings world-class scholars to the University as part of the ongoing struggle to understand this horrific event in human history. During the last several conferences, a close working relationship has formed with various departments of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. Beginning with the 25th conference in 2005, the focus of the conference emphasizes various genocides in world history. The conference has a \$10,000 budget.

University funds of about \$35,000 provide additional support for the lectures. This allocation has not changed in recent years and has not kept pace with costs today.

Recommendations of the Task Force:

Purpose of University Theme:

The primary purpose of the academic theme is to provide a co-curricular experience in the Liberal Arts, designed to build intellectual community, engaging students and faculty in discussions of broad questions of importance across a two academic year span. The theme will be informed by the goals and purposes of general education, serving to make the University's liberal arts curriculum more explicit. The selected thematic question must also foster interdisciplinary and inclusive conversations.

As a secondary purpose, the university theme will serve as a bridge to the regional community.

An important consideration is that it will support and address the University identity.

Planning and Organization

The academic theme (or question) will cycle for two years to facilitate intentional planning for course development (topics or seminar courses) and related events, and available monies may be allocated differently. Where possible, major lectures will "take turns" at getting a larger portion of available funds so that special, big name speakers may be brought in one time per cycle. Also, while we want to maintain a rich array of offerings, LESS is BETTER, and we must look

for natural synergies across existing or newly planned programs in both Academic and Student Affairs to see where they might be combined. This reduces competition among many offerings and should facilitate attendance and active participation.

The theme committee will be reconfigured to be a combined Joint Faculty-Student Theme Committee, so that we will foster programming across the major lectures, an array of other programs, courses, co-curricular and extracurricular activities. It will permeate the entire campus experience as best as is possible, without force-fitting (some years, some major events may not lend themselves well to tying into the theme but should be held). Faculty involvement is central to the success of the theme and the Theme Committee will be restructured to include faculty leaders for all major lectures, the director of the Center for Academic Excellence, as well as staff, student and community members. The Committee's work will be expanded to include major responsibility for planning theme implementation throughout the year. The Committee needs a new mission, objectives, tasks and broader membership.

Integration of the theme across campus:

- All invited speakers will be asked to respond to several theme-related questions (2 or 3), determined by the Committee, even if it isn't a major focus of their address. These could be combined into a book of interviews or a video presentation, providing additional learning opportunities for students.
- The Exchange/Snapper could keep emphasis on the theme evident throughout the year.
- Faculty will be asked to share their expertise on the issue. Faculty will be invited and encouraged to provide talks, inviting other colleagues into classes to share insights, etc. On-campus expertise will be stimulated and acknowledged. We might consider maintaining a history of profiles of faculty through student interviews, etc.
- Special connections will be sought. For example, this year the American Democracy Project, Constitution Day, the Robin Wright address (Kenderdine lecture), the Katrina symposium, the Rwanda lecture, service-learning, civic engagement, Japanese American Internment Symposium, extracurricular community service, all tie into citizenship. This unofficially has emerged as a "theme" addressing, from very different perspectives, what it means to be a citizen.

The task force recommends continuing the citizenship theme for at least another year. This will foster the conversations on general education. We further recommend that **citizenship needs to be viewed broadly as, "from family, to neighborhood, to community, to the world."**

The first new approach to the academic theme should begin in Fall 2007 with the change in student orientation from summer to immediately prior to the fall semester. It will be coordinated with a reading program for all new students, which will be expanded to include upperclassmen

(and graduate students where appropriate) as well so that dialogue on the reading may occur across all student groups.

Theme Days and Events

Early in the fall semester and late in the spring semester, theme days should be held. These days will serve as a focused beginning (a “kick-off”) and ending (a closing) to the academic year. An evening and following all day venue appear to be the best way to schedule these theme days. A major lecture/event will be held on the opening evening and the following mid-day. Numerous other activities will occur throughout this day as well so that faculty, students and staff will be afforded many different approaches to discussing the theme question.

In addition to theme day activities, there will be multiple conversations, opportunities to engage in significant dialogue and discussion on issues related to the theme throughout the entire academic year. The campus will be alive with events, and integration of these co-curricular events into course syllabi and included as course requirements with expectations of participation should be fostered to the fullest extent possible. The inherent benefit to all on campus will be explicated and all students and faculty will be strongly encouraged to participate in the programs that are provided.

Suggested Questions for Theme Consideration

Who am I? Who are we?

How do we define sustainability?

What does it mean to be human?

What defines a liberal arts education?

What does it mean to be a citizen (American/global)? Do we have a civic responsibility?

What does it mean to be an educated person?

How do we discover truth?

What does it mean to be thoughtful?

Can there be peace? What is peace?

How can I (each individual) make a difference?

What (is) about privacy in the 21st century?

University Theme Committee

Purpose: The primary purpose of the University Theme Committee is to provide leadership and direction for the selection of the university theme and the implementation of theme programs and activities throughout each academic year.

Objectives:

1. On a biennial basis, (beginning in Spring 2006 for a Fall 2007 implementation), select the question that will guide University programming and cultural affairs events for the subsequent two years.
2. In collaboration with lectureship chairs/committees, provide recommendations for the selection and implementation of speakers, performers, and specific special events, including the venue and the budget decisions.
3. Provide direction and coordination for all other co-curricular and extracurricular-related programming, including such items as selection of books for academic reading programs, determination of questions to be posed to each speaker, and synchronization with related performing arts events.
4. Submit an annual report to the President by June 1 of the work of the committee; this should include an annual review as well as a biennial evaluation of the success of each selected theme.

Membership:

- Faculty chairs/representatives of all lectureships (Brossman, Christie, Kenderdine, Lockey, Carter-Woodson, Hazel Jackson, and the Holocaust Conference)
- Four additional faculty, one representing each school plus the library, appointed by the Provost
- Director, Center for Academic Excellence
- Representative from Cultural Affairs Committee
- Coordinator, General Education
- Representative from University Advancement
- Provost or designee
- Vice President of Student Affairs or designee
- Three students, two appointed by Student Senate and one selected by the Vice President of Student Affairs
- Representative from the Alumni Association
- Two members representing the community

Task Force Committee Members

Dr. Kirsten Bookmiller, Kenderdine Lecture
Dr. Robert Buchanan, Chairperson, Academic Theme Committee
Mr. Tony Elliot, Chairperson, Cultural Affairs Committee
Dr. Michael Gumper, Christie Lecture
 Mr. Dwight Horsey, Advisor to the Cultural Affairs Committee
Dr. Linda McDowell, Lockey Lecture
Dr. Carol Phillips, Task Force Chairperson
Ms. Carol Reichler, Director, Special Events
Dr. Lyman Rickard, Brossman Lecture
Dr. Rita Smith Wade-El, Commission on Cultural Diversity
Dr. Diane Umble, Representative, Deans' Council
Dr. Marjorie Warmkessel, Director, Center for Academic Excellence
Dr. Tracey Weis, Women's Studies
Dr. Sepi Yalda, Women's Commission

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS Dr. Charles G. Denlinger, Professor of Mathematics, passionately served Millersville University, the Department of Mathematics, Millersville University students and the Millersville community--of which he has been a member in the truest sense of the word-- for 41 years with honor and distinction, and

WHEREAS Dr. Charles G. Denlinger served tirelessly on major University faculty committees, most notably the Search Committee for the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Services, the Search Committee for the Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Graduate and Undergraduate Course and Program Approval Committees, the Academic Planning Committee, the Facilities Master Plan Committee, the 150th Anniversary History Team, the Academic Affairs Master Planning Committee and the Downtown Program Advisory Board, and

WHEREAS Dr. Charles G. Denlinger faithfully, effectively and without seeking recognition, either served on or chaired a large number of departmental committees, most notably the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum Committees, the Departmental Honors Committee, numerous Staff Search Committees and numerous personnel review committees, and

WHEREAS Dr. Charles G. Denlinger contributed conscientiously in the classroom for 41 years to the mathematical education of Mathematics majors and non-majors alike, and

WHEREAS Dr. Charles G. Denlinger, while maintaining high academic standards, effectively discharged his teaching duties in a wide range of undergraduate and graduate Mathematics courses, and

WHEREAS Dr. Charles G. Denlinger distinguished himself as a scholar through the development of his Real Analysis textbook, publication of three coauthored textbooks and numerous abstracts related to his research in Functional Analysis, and through numerous presentations to local and regional audiences, and

WHEREAS Dr. Charles G. Denlinger faithfully served the Department of Mathematics as Chair for 12 years and Assistant Chair for 5 years, and was involved in hiring nearly everyone currently in the department,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Dr. Charles G. Denlinger be granted the honorary title of Professor of Mathematics Emeritus

Course Prerequisite Proposal

Academic Policies Committee proposes to add a policy to clarify course prerequisites. The following statement would be added to the Undergraduate catalog on page 49 following *Grade Changes*.

Course Prerequisites

Courses may have a series of prerequisites (satisfactory completion of a prior course, minimum GPA or earned credits, placement test scores, etc.). Students who do not meet the stated prerequisite(s) may be removed from a course at the discretion of the professor.

Academic Policies Committee proposes to modify the section *Taking Less Advanced Course* to allow students to retake a less advanced course to improve their GPA to meet minimum competency requirements, or to satisfy graduation requirements. Modifications would keep this policy and the repeat policy consistent.

Taking a Less Advanced Course

Students do not receive credit for a less advanced course if they have already demonstrated competency by passing a more advanced course. For example, MATH 100 and 101 may not be taken for credit after MATH 161, and FREN 201 may not be taken for credit after FREN 202. Students who wish to review less advanced material may do so on an audit basis. *However, a less advanced course may be retaken to improve the GPA, to meet minimum competency requirements, or to satisfy graduation requirements.*

**GERC Updated Progress Report
April 17th, 2006**

Results / Interpretation of April 4th Senate meeting:

Interpretation of the meeting process:

1. The meeting was highly productive. Several issues that were previously unresolved were clarified. There is now a much clearer direction for the overall proposal.
2. The quality of discussion was high. A large number of people participated in the discussion, the discussion was focused, and various viewpoints were expressed.
3. Several factors contributed to the quality of discussion and should be used again in future meetings devoted to shaping a proposal. An introduction from the Provost, time limits and a method for extending time for discussion, focused questions, straw votes, and the room itself all contributed to the quality of discussion.

Overall interpretation of discussion and votes:

1. The strong vote in favor of elective / exploratory courses was taken as an endorsement for continuation of the reform process. At each major milestone of this process, straw votes have indicated substantial support for changes that are significant and that warrant a thoughtful, thorough approach to reform.
2. This vote reinforced earlier findings from Task Force focus groups, the Fall Senate meeting, and the survey that simplicity and flexibility are key concerns of faculty.
3. At the same time, there was strong endorsement of the value of General Education. While the previous survey indicated strong support for Freshman Seminars, concerns were raised about giving majors free reign in creating seminars in the major that count toward Gen Ed. Likewise, despite the pressures from accreditation groups, there was a strong endorsement of Perspective courses.

Specific Issues

1.A. Should all forms of Freshman Seminar count toward Gen Ed? (straw vote, 10 yes, 15 no). Discussion about the piloted "Passion" seminars was positive. Most of the discussion focused on the very broad nature of the straw vote question and concerns that Freshman Seminars that count for Gen Ed should clearly meet Gen Ed goals. A clear set of criteria should be developed by GERC for approval by Senate. Seminar proposals seeking Gen Ed credit should be required to demonstrate how the criteria are met. In addition, concerns were raised that seminars offered in majors might meet criteria on paper, but after implementation might change into courses with weak relation to Gen Ed. This concern indicates a need for periodic review of major seminars that seek Gen Ed credit from an outside committee such as the Freshman Seminar committee, GERC, or UCPRC.

1.B. Should we have one or more elective courses? (straw vote, 20 yes, 4 no, 2 abstentions) and 1.C. should we move to a 3-3-3 G-Block with Math as an additional Foundations course? (16 yes, 6 no, 2 abstentions). The vote was taken as a strong endorsement of the general concept.

There are still many issues related to implementation that must be developed. These issues are highly related to other issues and ultimately must be revisited as the proposal is further developed and refined.

2. *Should we allow capstone courses to count in place of perspectives? (vote 3 yes, 23 no).* This was an extremely strong re-endorsement of the current Perspectives requirement. The overall theme of the discussion was perhaps captured best by the statement that Perspective courses are designed to broaden perspective, while capstone courses are meant to deepen perspective.

3. *Should we change the number of credits required for Gen Ed from 51 to 48? (straw vote 13 yes, 12 no).* This vote was too close to set a clear direction. In addition, this issue is highly related to the first issue and GERC's interpretation is that many of the votes on both sides were difficult for Senators to make without seeing how decisions on other issues would combine with this one. With that said, the discussion indicated that there is a need, especially in some departments, for relief from 120 restrictions, but at the same time, there is strong sentiment for maintaining the strength of Gen Ed and not reducing credits. Overall, this issue will need to be revisited as the proposal develops further.

4. *Should Wellness be required for all students? (straw vote 16 yes, 4 no, 4 abstentions).* This vote was a strong endorsement of a 3-credit Wellness course. Discussion indicated support not only for a Wellness requirement in general, but also for the current conceptualization of a course that integrates mind – body – spirit in a single course, as opposed to other models such as 1-credit sports courses.

GERC's Recommendations for Next Steps in the Process

Progress to date:

Last spring, Senate, GERC, and the General Education Task Force sponsored a ballot focusing on the goals and objectives of General Education with curriculum decisions to be made at a later date. The ballot was withdrawn partially because of concerns that once goals and objectives were agreed to, a curriculum that faculty did not support would be pre-determined. The process this year has focused primarily on the broad outlines of the curriculum. GERC believes that the broad outlines of the proposed curriculum are approaching clarity and that it is now time to begin development of a full proposal

Recommended Next steps:

1. Decision-making on key issues should be centered in Senate. GERC, working with Senate, should continue to facilitate campus-wide discussion of key issues.
2. Begin the in-depth development of a full proposal with greatest emphasis next on development of goals and objectives. {Summer 06, Fall 06}
3. After objectives are agreed upon, final decisions about the curriculum will need to be made. {Fall 06}
4. Potential Faculty Ballot: {Spring 07}