

Faculty Senate Minutes
February 7, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 4:11 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Government & Political Affairs and Physics.

I. Minutes of the January 17, 2006 meeting

The minutes of the January 17, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as amended to correct name misspellings.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Dr. Börger-Greco reminded Senators that elections are coming up for the following departments: Art, Biology, Communications and Theater, Counseling and Human Development, Educational Foundations, English, Geography, Industry and Technology, and Library. She also noted that the latest ACE program recommendations from the ACE Task Force will be forwarded to Senators by e-mail soon. Finally, she urged Senators to watch the Governor's address tomorrow regarding budget issues.

The following curriculum changes have received administrative approval:

- 1) BSE in ESCI: credit reduction from 129 to 126 hours.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

None

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Association

Graduate Student Association Representative Meaghan Shirk reported that they will be hosting an activity tomorrow in Byerly to promote the GSA. They also plan to hold another event in McComsey later this semester. The GSA is also making arrangements to sponsor a speaker on time management. She also noted that they are helping with development of an orientation guide for new graduate students.

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips noted that the group addressing the role of Academic Theme plans to report to Senate once the final presentation by Cognitive Marketing has been made later this month.

VI. Educator of the Year Award

Dr. Sepi Yalda was delayed in arriving. A Kevorkian/Blazer motion to retain special order for discussion of the Educator of the Year Award at the next meeting was approved without dissent.

When Dr. Yalda arrived, discussion was held regarding several issues in the proposal that had been previously approved by Senate. [see Attachment #1] A Blazer/DeCaria motion to amend the number of awards to one per year selected from across campus was passed with one dissenting vote. A Blazer/Mowrey motion to amend eligibility for the award to include all full-time regular tenure-track and permanent part-time faculty was approved with one dissenting vote.

Further discussion was held regarding the composition of the selection committee. One suggestion was that winners be asked to serve the next year. It may also be useful to create a Senate standing committee to oversee implementation of the award, including the make up of the selection committee. A DeCaria/Skinner motion to continue discussion of implementation of the Educator of the Year Award at the next meeting in the special order already approved was passed without dissent.

VII. Faculty Emeritus

None

VIII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

UCPRC/GCPRC

Dr. Rebecca Mowrey and Dr. Janet White distributed copies of a new combined Course Proposal Form. [see Attachment #2] The revised form now has check boxes to allow its use for both graduate and undergraduate level courses and has been modified to clarify use of the check column only to indicate any amendments made to the proposal during the approval process. The revised form also accommodates use of new 6-digit Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) codes. These numbers more accurately reflect the nature and level of courses than the old 4-digit system and should be available from departmental chairpersons. Dr. Mowrey noted that the Academic Proposal Form has also been updated to include the CIP numbering. She requested that all forthcoming proposals use these modified forms (revised 1/25/06) which are available on the Senate website.

General Education Review Committee

Dr. John Ward distributed a document outlining recommendations from GERC regarding the motivation for departmental responses to the survey under consideration. [see Attachment #3] He also reminded Senators to return a survey for their department by February 21. He reviewed the importance of dialogue about issues on the survey, the role

of GERC as a supporting committee to bring resources to Senate for development and final review, and the plan to have the entire faculty vote on the final proposal on a ballot also including the option to keep the current program.

Discussion was held regarding whether student input will shape the final proposal, if a super majority would be beneficial and whether including the old system on a final ballot would discourage change of the General Education program. It was noted that the current system was presented alongside the other proposals for consideration. Several questions were raised including what the role is for objectives for General Education and how the results of the survey will be communicated. Senators expressed agreement with GERC that the final vote be presented to the entire faculty for final approval as this did not happen when the current program was implemented.

Dr. Rebecca Mowrey shared with Senate concerns from Wellness & Sports Science regarding the process of developing curriculum proposals. The Chair will distribute a letter expressing these concerns as well as a requested response from her.

A Mowrey/Edeh motion to close General Education discussion at 5:15 to return to discussion of the Educator of the Year Award was approved without dissent.

IX. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

None

X. Proposed Courses and Programs

(1) CHANGE IN DELIVERY FORMAT

CHEM110: Request for Distance Learning designation. Dr. Aimee Miller presented a proposal from Chemistry to adopt an online format. Since the alternate mechanism for these approvals is not yet in place, she requested that Senate consider the proposal via the usual two meeting process.

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 Kevorkian/Blazer motion to retain special order for discussion of the Educator of the Year Award at the next meeting was approved without dissent.

A Blazer/DeCaria motion to amend the number of awards to one per year selected from across campus was passed with one dissenting vote. A Blazer/Mowrey motion to amend eligibility for the award to include all full-time regular tenure-track and permanent part-time faculty was approved with one dissenting vote.

A DeCaria/Skinner motion to continue discussion of implementation of the Educator of the Year Award at the next meeting in the special order already approved was passed without dissent.

A Mowrey/Edeh motion to close General Education discussion at 5:15 to return to discussion of the Educator of the Year Award was approved without dissent.

FINAL DRAFT

Millersville University Educator of the Year Award

The award to be given annually to four faculty members (one from each school and one non-school) in recognition of sustained outstanding teaching to include counseling, mentoring, and advising of the undergraduate and graduate students at Millersville University.

Award Details:

1. Faculty members can receive this award no more frequently than once every ten years.
2. There will be no monetary reward associated with this award.
3. The award will consist of a plaque along with the faculty member's picture displayed in a common area, and a plaque given to the faculty member.
4. The award will be presented annually at the May commencement ceremony or during a separate ceremony with press coverage. The award can be publicized on television through programs such as Channel 8's Learning Matters.
5. The recipient would be asked to share expertise and knowledge with other faculty members (e.g., maybe a special session at the Scholarship Social or a special session through the Center for Academic Excellence, participation at the New Faculty Orientation).
6. A call for nominations would be sent to the university community through E-mail and campus mail. Departments and program directors will be involved in announcing the call for nominations to their students and faculty members.

Eligibility for the Award:

All full-time regular tenure-track and permanent part-time faculties are eligible for this award.

Award Selection Committee:

The Chair of the Faculty Senate will notify the Senate of a slate of nominees for the selection committee. The selection committee will consist of seven members (including students, alumni and emeriti) whose affiliations are distributed throughout the four divisions. The committee will be selected by a Faculty Senate standing committee. The members of the committee will select a chair from among the membership

Selection Criteria:

The Award Selection Committee will make its selection based on the materials provided by the nominators (supporting letter), along with other materials provided by the nominees and their respective department chairs or program directors.

Nominations:

Any member of the university, including faculty, staff, administration, and students, may submit a nomination for this award. The nominations may also come from a School Council. The nominations will be accepted at the beginning of the fall semester. The deadline for nominations is **November 1**. All nominations must use the nominations form, and include a supporting letter from the nominator. The letter should specifically address the following.

1. Does the nominee involve students actively in the learning process?
2. Does the nominee synthesize complex concepts and bodies of knowledge into well-communicated material?
3. Is the nominee approachable to students through fostering an environment of personal and professional concern?
4. Does the nominee serve as a role model to both students and fellow faculty members at the departmental, programmatic and University levels and with the larger communities with which he/she comes into contact in scholarly, personal, and professional efforts?
5. Is the nominee committed to what is going on not only within his/her department, but also throughout the University, thereby helping students take advantage of all available opportunities for students?

Nominees and their respective department chairs and/or program directors will be notified before the end of the fall semester (so as to allow the nominee ample time to provide supporting materials). The nominee and the respective department chair will be asked at this time to provide supporting materials. The supporting materials can include, but are not limited to, student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching, testimonials from current and former students, and any instructional materials developed by the nominee. The deadline for submission of the supporting materials will be February 20.

Committee's Recommendation:

The committee will announce its decision to Senate by the last meeting in March of the year the award is to be presented.

Announcement of the Award

The award will be announced at the May commencement ceremony or a separate ceremony.

Millersville University Educator of the Year Award

Criteria for Selection

Outstanding teaching and advising comes in many forms and thus it is difficult to list all the characteristics that would be worthy of an award. The criteria listed here are intended to be suggestions. The nominations should describe the outstanding characteristics and achievements of the nominee as appropriate.

Outstanding Educator of the Year

- Instill intellectual curiosity, a desire to learn and the importance of life-long learning.
- Stimulate learning through teaching, advising and/or counseling, modeling of scholarship, involving students in the learning process, expressing genuine concern for the student as a whole, setting of high standards, enthusiastic and passionate about their field.
- Demonstrate success and excellence through reference to the achievements of students.
- Encourage and demonstrate ethical behavior, integrated view of life, personal responsibility and integrity, leadership, clear and critical thinking and civic engagement.
- Influence on the way other colleagues teach, advise and/or counsel.
- Have an effect beyond the Millersville University community.
- Serious about academic excellence and meaningful life experiences of the students.
- Available to students, making them feel welcome and respected.
- Skillful in encouraging problem-solving techniques by helping students to think through issues and make decisions.

Millersville University Educator of the Year Award
Nomination Form

Deadline for Submission: November 1

Nominee's Name: _____

Nominee's Department: _____

Your Name: _____

**Your Department/Major/
Minor/Certificate Program:** _____

Your Year in School: _____

Your Position: _____

Please provide a response for the questions in a manner that is concise but detailed. Specific examples of teaching and mentoring are most helpful to the selection committee. Please keep in mind that your submission, properly understood, is an argument for honoring your nominee for this award.

- 1. How does your nominee serve as a role model to students and/or other faculty members?**
- 2. How does your nominee generate enthusiasm for and inspire increased interest in his/her discipline? How does your nominee engage and hold student interest?**
- 3. How does your nominee distinguish him/herself from other colleagues? What is it about your nominee that makes him/her so exceptional that he/she merits the description of educator of the year?**
- 4. How does your nominee demonstrate an understanding for students' needs and a commitment to the university community?**

**ACADEMIC PROPOSAL
Millersville University**

This cover page must be used for all academic proposals except the proposal of new courses and the labeling of existing courses; it must be attached to all copies of the proposal through all approval stages.

PROGRAMS new change deletion moratorium

Classification of Instructional Program (6-digit CIP) Code: _____ (necessary for new program/option/minor)

[Note: All course proposals associated with program additions or changes should be submitted together with this proposal as one package.]

Departmental major: _____ Interdepartmental major: _____
 Departmental minor: _____ Interdepartmental minor: _____
 Option: _____ Other: _____

POLICIES FOR MAJORS MINORS : new change deletion

Admission to _____ Retention in _____
 Completion of _____

CHANGES IN COURSES

OTHER

This change is MINOR MAJOR [For policy on determination of whether a change is major or minor, see *Governance Manual*.]
 What students may be affected by this change?

Proposed implementation date: ____/____/____ If retroactive approval is requested, provide details:

PROPOSER:	Dept.:	Ext.:
------------------	---------------	--------------

Approval Log: Note it is the proposer's responsibility after each approval to deliver the proposal to the next committee.

COMMITTEE	CHAIRPERSON	PHONE	DATE RECEIVED	DATE APPROVED	AMENDED?
School Curriculum Committee					
Teacher Education Council (if applicable)					
<input type="checkbox"/> UCPRC* <input type="checkbox"/> GCPRC*					
Faculty Senate*					

* — Not required for minor change.

Attach the following supporting documentation to this form (incomplete forms will be returned to the proposer):

1. If applicable, copy of current program/policy.
2. Explanation, rationale, and evidence of need for proposed changes.
3. If applicable, copy of current DARS printout and DARS copy reflecting proposed changes.

4. If applicable, Course Approval Forms for all associated course changes.

COURSE PROPOSAL Millersville University

This cover page must be attached to ALL copies of the proposal through all approval stages. Please see the Guidelines for Course Approval available on the Faculty Senate Web Page to avoid delays in the process.

Undergraduate Course Graduate Course

6 digit CIP Code:	Subject/Course Number:	Course Title:		
Can Title Vary?	Can Course Be Taken More Than Once for Credit?	If Repeatable for Credit, What is the Limit?	Min Credit Hours:	Max Credit Hours:
Contact Hrs (Lec):	Contact Hrs (Lab):	Contact Hrs (Other – please specify):		
Prerequisites/Corequisites:				
Grading Options:		Equivalent Course at MU (Student Could Not Take Both for Credit)		
Proposer:			Phone:	
Department:	Notes:			

Status of Course: existing non-GenEd course existing GenEd course new course
 List major(s), minor(s), option(s), etc., if any, for which this course is required or will be required:

General Education Labels, if any, for which approval is requested:
G1 G2 G3 L W MATH P AW WELL

Proposal for Distance Learning (MU OnLine):
Web Teleconference Other _____

Course Scheduling:
 Semester offered as experimental course, if any: FA20__ SP20__ ____ 20__
 Semester to be first offered, if approved: FA20__ SP20__ ____ 20__
 Anticipated number of sections per year = _____

Dean's Resource Implications Form

_____ Date of delivery of proposal and Resource Implications Form to School Dean
 _____ Date of receipt of Dean's Resource Implications Analysis

Approval Log:

COMMITTEE	CHAIRPERSON	PHONE	DATE RECEIVED	DATE APPROVED	AMENDED?
School Curriculum Committee					
Teacher Education Council (if applicable)					
<input type="checkbox"/> UCPRC* <input type="checkbox"/> GCPRC*					

COMMITTEE	CHAIRPERSON	PHONE	DATE RECEIVED APPROVED	DATE	AMENDED?
Faculty Senate*					

Attachment #3

General Education Review Committee Process Recommendations

Principles that guide the reform process (adopted by Senate):

Principle A: Reform will reflect what the faculty believe in and can teach with passion, commitment, and purpose.

Principle B: Change will be incremental, based on campus-wide dialogue, and well understood by the University community.

Principle C: The reform will build on and maintain current MU strengths.

Principle D Reform of Gen Ed will be balanced by the curricular needs of major programs of study, especially as they are impacted by State mandates and/or disciplinary accreditation.

Principle E: Reform will be accompanied by sufficient faculty, administrative, and resource support.

Principle F: The reform process will be guided by meaningful evaluation.

Reminder - Surveys due to Senate February 21st – you may send surveys to John Ward early if desired. The purpose of the survey is to:

1. Encourage campus-wide dialogue on elements of proposals (Principle B)
2. Inform Senators about their department's beliefs. (Principle A)

Report: A Gen Ed cost study group has been formed by Carol Philips. (Principle E)

1. The purpose of the group is to estimate costs / complement issues of the current Gen Ed system in comparison to proposals. Vilas Prabhu emphasizes the need for cost neutral reform.
2. Members of the group include: Carol Phillips, Joe Revelt, Ed Shane, Bob Smith, John Ward, Mike Gumper, Candae Deen, Jo An Vitale, John Sicotte.

Recommendations

1. Final proposals for Gen Ed curriculum reform should be voted on by the entire faculty.
2. The focus of action / decision-making regarding the form of a final proposal that would be voted on by faculty should be with Senate.
3. The role of the GERC should be to support the process by developing proposals for Senate to discuss, debate, and amend, in preparation for a faculty vote.
4. Senate should begin to consider guidelines for a faculty vote. GERC suggests that:
 - o the ballot should contain a choice between the present system and the final proposal(s).
 - o a super-majority rule should be adopted. For example, a 55% vote of faculty would be needed to adopt a change in curriculum. Likewise, a 55% endorsement of the present system would be needed to end the reform process.

Recommendations for Next Steps

1. Results of the survey will be tabulated and distributed to senators by Feb. 23.
2. GERC will work to narrow the seven proposals to one or two and will present these proposals to senate for discussion, debate, and amendment. GERC will invite representatives from the Working Groups (Fred Foster-Clark, Lynn Marquez, Len Litowitz, Steve Centola, Scott Schaffer, Barb Stengel, and John McLarnon) to meetings while this work is undertaken.
3. Senate should then use these proposals as the basis for discussion, debate, and amendment.