

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**March 21, 2006**

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Business Administration, Educational Foundations, Library, Nursing and Physics.

I. Minutes of the March 7, 2006 meeting

The minutes of the March 7, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as presented.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

None

III. Report of the Student Senate President

Student Senate President Fayth Balsam commented on the meetings regarding the Academic Bill of Rights taking place on campus this Wednesday and Thursday. She invited Senators to attend.

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Association

Graduate Student Association Representative Meaghan Shirk reported that the GSA is working on a handbook for incoming graduate students.

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

**Provost Prabhu**

Provost Prabhu commented that Dr. McNairy would be addressing the Academic Bill of Rights committee on campus this week. The meetings begin tomorrow at noon in Gordinier and continue on Thursday morning. Persons from other universities will be also be attending. Presenters will include two area professors, Dr. April Kelly-Woessner and Dr. Matthew Woessner, who have conducted related research and Dr. Frank Bremer. Dr. Prabhu also noted that an upcoming faculty forum is planned to address the new format for student orientation to be implemented in the fall of 2007.

VI. Faculty Emeritus

None

## VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

### UCPRC

#### First Reading

##### (1) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Changes to the Economics Minor

### GERC

Dr. Fred Foster-Clark brought comments in Dr. Ward's absence regarding the next Senate meeting that will be dedicated to Gen Ed discussion. He noted that survey responses requested at the last meeting are available in addition to the summaries circulated by e-mail. He also distributed a timeline highlighting key events in the Gen Ed program since the last major revision in 1988. He indicated that the April 4 meeting will be focused on discussion of major issues related to the curriculum proposal included in the GERC report brought to Senate on March 7. Questions were raised about the impetus for Gen Ed reform and what specific problems with the current program we are trying to address. It was noted that development of a curriculum plan was an integral part of the Ashville Institute on General Education attended by MU representatives in 2002. Another issue raised was a need to show assessment of our Gen Ed curriculum. Dr. Prabhu pointed out that regular review must be built into Gen Ed to meet accreditation requirements for Middle States. Discussion was held regarding a feeling that recent work relating to Gen Ed has lacked a sense of context or direction. It was noted that there is a need for a focused summary to communicate to faculty about the major issues. Dr. Foster-Clark responded that the intention for the April 4 meeting is to address a limited set of issues with the hope of building consensus. He also noted that information regarding assessment of the current program is available on the Gen Ed website. A concern was raised regarding a lack of correlation between the curriculum plan presented in the March 7, 2006 GERC report and the GETF "spokes and wheel" model presented in spring of 2005. Dr. Foster-Clark responded that the new proposal addresses information from the surveys like a lack of support for themed courses but strong support for counting a variety of first-year seminars but also overlapped the "spokes and wheel" model in four major points. Concerns were raised that Senate never completed consideration of the objectives for Gen Ed and that we are now trying to build a curriculum plan without clarity about the overall goals. Dr. Phillips recalled that Senate was hesitant to pass objectives that might dictate curriculum.

Dr. Börger-Greco distributed a proposal for ground rules to apply to the April 4 Senate meeting. A question was raised about the ability to extend the proposed 15-minute maximum to continue productive discussions. A Schaffer/DeCaria motion that up to three 5-minute extensions be allowed for each issue to be decided by the majority of senators upon immediate motion and vote was approved without dissent. Another question raised was whether the list of issues to be discussed would be distributed to Senate in advance of the meeting to allow for garnering departmental guidance. Dr. Foster-Clark indicated

that these would be distributed following the GERC meeting on March 28. It was also asked whether the responses from the April 4 meeting would be returned to Senate prior to a new proposal from GERC. Senator Kruse commented that it is critical that Gen Ed not be so tightly integrated that transfer students encounter difficulty meeting the requirements. Dr. Foster-Clark responded that this is not expected to be a major issue with the proposals under consideration. A West/Schaffer motion to adopt the ground rules for the April 4 meeting of Faculty Senate as amended was approved without dissent. Dr. Börger-Greco noted that an invitation to the April 4 meeting would be sent across campus this week and that Senators should encourage colleagues to attend.

### Academic Policies

Senator West previously presented proposed changes to language in the Governance Manual regarding the Distance Learning Course Approval Process. A question was raised regarding how the specified maximum 33% face-to-face time for Blended Courses was established. The concern was that up to 66% of coursework could be shifted to online formats without being addressed as distance learning. It was noted that this value was determined by the MU Online Advisory Group and is not under Senate review. However, the issue at hand is for the Governance Manual to reflect current practice.

Additional discussion was held regarding whether UCPRC/GCPRC is the best format for reviewing these proposals. Senator White commented that UCPRC/GCPRC have been charged with serving this role for one year after which the approach will be reconsidered. She noted that these committees have representation from across the schools and that the burden is on members to be aware of issues of approval across their school. It was also noted that members of these committees generally include at least one with expertise in the area of distance learning. A Igyor/Bookmiller motion to approve the changes to the Distance Learning Approval Process was approved with one dissenting vote.

### VIII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

None

### IX. Proposed Courses and Programs

#### Second Readings

##### (1) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ART 368: Collage, 3 credits.

This proposal relates only to ART 368 and not ART 568 as was indicated on the distributed documentation. The proposal passed without dissent.

## (2) NEW GRADUATE COURSES

EM 601: Principles & Practices of Emergency Management, 3 credits  
EM 603: Technical & Professional Writing for EM Personnel, 3 credits  
EM 605: Social Dimensions of Disaster, 3 credits  
EM 607: Emergency Mental Health & Trauma, 3 credits  
EM 614: Natural Hazards Primer, 3 credits  
EM 615: Emergency Preparedness for Industry, 3 credits  
EM 653: Theoretical Perspectives & Methods Applied to EM, 3 credits  
EM 693: Field Experience Practicum, 3 credits  
EM 616: Terrorism, WMD & Homeland Security, 3 credits  
EM 617: EM Issues in Communication & Mass Media, 3 credits  
EM 618: Humanitarian Responses to International Disasters, 3 credits  
EM 629-632: Special Topics Course, 3 credits  
EM 689: Independent Study, 1-3 credits

Discussion of these courses focused on mechanisms of ensuring integrity in dissemination of an entirely online degree. Dr. Fischer responded that these issues are relevant regardless of instructional format. He commented that persons expected to enroll in this program are likely to be employed in EM fields and that completion of the degree will require significant commitment. It was noted that there are safety nets that faculty can use to evaluate work submitted online. Also, it was pointed out that instructors would be interacting with students enough to identify red flags. Dr. DeSantis commented that the Graduate Studies admission process involves significant review of the applicant. It was suggested that inclusion of at least some face-to-face experiences would be beneficial for students as well as address some of these concerns. Dr. Fischer responded that although these experiences are valuable, they represent a significant financial hurdle. A DeCaria/Saunders motion to approve all the proposed EM courses simultaneously was approved without dissent.

## (3) NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM

Master of Science in Emergency Management including 24 required credits (EM 601, 603, 605, 607, 614, 615, 653 and 693) and 6 elective credits (EM 616, 617, 618, 639-632, 689). The proposed program was approved without dissent.

## X. Report on Institutional Review Board

Dr. Inese Wheeler shared with Senate that formation of the Millersville University Institutional Review Board (MUIRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects was undertaken to ensure that Millersville meets national standards. Information is now available online and board members are willing to speak to research methods courses. All research involving humans must come to the IRB through the Graduate Studies office. She noted that anonymous surveys that do not address any sensitive issues could be excepted. Dr. Wheeler requested that individual departments forward any area-specific guidelines to be linked to the MUIRB website. It was confirmed that function of the

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) remains unchanged. Additional discussion was held regarding student research and work completed prior to the MUIRB formation.

Dr. DeSantis noted that the MUIRB is intended to be protective of faculty and Millersville. He also reminded Senate of the recent appointment of Ryan Sauder as Director of Grants and Sponsored Research to assist faculty with academic grant writing. He further informed Senators of an upcoming forum on research practices to be held May 5.

XI. Other/New Business

Senator Schaffer announced an upcoming symposium to be held April 11-12 regarding internment of Japanese Americans and Japanese Canadians during World War II. In addition, students taking Social Justice and Public Policy will be presenting at a public discussion series on The Demands of Social Justice. He invited faculty to join in these events and encourage student attendance as well.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller  
Faculty Senate Secretary

Action Summary:

A Schaffer/DeCaria motion that up to three 5-minute extensions be allowed for each issue to be decided by the majority of senators upon immediate motion and vote was approved without dissent. A West/Schaffer motion to adopt the ground rules for the April 4 meeting of Faculty Senate as amended was approved without dissent

A Igyor/Bookmiller motion to approve the changes to the Distance Learning Approval Process was approved with one dissenting vote.

A DeCaria/Saunders motion to approve all the proposed EM courses simultaneously was approved without dissent.

## Attachment #1

**Meeting Goal:** to begin discussions and to frame the key issues that must be decided at later meetings before Senate might be in a position to endorse a ballot for faculty. If it is clear that there is not support within Senate for key changes in the present system, then there would be no need to endorse a ballot for faculty.

### Issues (see pages 5 and 6)

1. Change to a 3-3-3 G-Block distribution with Math as an additional Foundations course in order to provide Free Elective courses and to allow a variety of Freshman Seminars to count toward Gen Ed?
  - Straw vote: should all forms of Freshman Seminar count toward Gen Ed?
  - Straw vote: should we have one or more elective courses (not required and not part of blocks)?
  - Straw vote: should we move to a 3-3-3 G-Block with Math as an additional Foundations course?
2. Straw vote: Should we allow capstone courses to count in place of perspectives?
3. Straw vote: Should we change the number of credits required for Gen Ed from 51 to 48?
4. Straw vote: Should Wellness be required for all students?

### Time

Each issue will be discussed for 10 to 15 minutes. Senate may choose to extend discussion for up to 5 minutes three times for an additional 15 minutes.

### Straw Votes

Straw (non-binding) votes will be taken at the end of each discussion in order to establish the relative strength or weakness of support for each of the issues. Only voting members of Senate may vote. All of these issues are complex and there is an expectation that no change would be endorsed without significant additional discussion in future meetings.

### **Background for Discussion of Gen Ed Proposals for April 4, 2006**

“The best General Education program is not based simply on choosing specific goals or finding the perfect model. The best program is one that is aligned with the learning needs of students on a specific campus and that the faculty of that campus believe in and teach with passion, commitment, and intentionality – only then can they help students engage fully with its purposes and opportunities.” (Ann Ferren, June 2002, Presentation at the Asheville Institute for General Education).

### **Middle States Standard 12**

#### General Education

The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including oral and written communication, scientific and

quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

### **Principles to Guide the Restructuring of General Education at Millersville (Revised 11/15/2005)**

The following principles, together with the revised statement of purpose and learning objectives, are intended to provide a framework for re-visioning General Education at Millersville and for guiding the development of changes to the curricular structure. They grow out of the recommendations of the General Education Task Force and have subsequently been reviewed and revised by Faculty Senate and the Gen Ed Review Committee. It is understood that the statement of purpose and learning objectives will continue to undergo refinement as work on the restructuring of Gen Ed continues.

#### **Principles that guide the process of reform:**

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.

#### **Characteristics of a Reformulated Gen Ed Program**

Characteristic 1: Clear Purpose, that is well understood by all members of the university community and that is consistent with the MU mission and the specific learning needs of MU students.

Characteristic 2: Intentional Alignment of the objectives, curricular structure, and assessment with the purpose of Gen Ed, the mission of this University, and the learning needs of our students.

Characteristic 3: Coherence and connections between Gen Ed and majors without being overly prescriptive.

Characteristic 4: Intellectual Richness, setting appropriately high expectations for students' engagement that develop as students progress through their academic programs.

Characteristic 5: Academic Community Reaching beyond the Classroom, fostering interactions between and among students, faculty, and the larger University community.

Characteristic 6: Simplicity and flexibility, promoting ease of understanding and greater choice in meeting the Gen Ed requirements.

## **Outline of GERC Curriculum Proposal (In-Progress)**

### **Foundations – 9 credits**

- ❑ Composition
- ❑ Math
- ❑ Speech

### **Explore and More 15 credits**

- ❑ 9 credits “Explore”
  - First Year Seminars (FYS) are strongly encouraged and can count for up to 3 of these 9 credits. FYS include 1 credit FYE, 3 credit “passion” courses, 1, 2, or 3 credit Major-based seminars, and new forms that develop and are typically integrated into a Learning Community. Maximum 25 students for most seminar formats.
  - Except for Freshman Seminars, all Explore credits must come from programs outside the student’s major. BSE students may not count required education courses as Explore courses.
  - All Wellness courses count toward Explore credits. All types of Wellness courses should count, including 1 credit sports courses.
- ❑ Advanced writing – encourage English to develop discipline specific sections linked with major courses.
- ❑ Perspectives and / or Capstone.

### **Liberal Arts – 27 credits minimum**

- ❑ 3 courses in Math / Science (1 lab science)
- ❑ 3 courses in Social Studies
- ❑ 3 courses in Humanities

### **Skills across the curriculum:**

- ❑ The W course system would be maintained, but we are still considering a proposal to move to 3 required W courses with a maximum 25 students and moving back to the old requirement that a W course must include writing with revision.
- ❑ D courses. It is vital for our students to grow in their understanding of diversity. It is important that this occurs in extra-curricular and extra-curricular activities, as well as in coursework. We recommend the creation of a D designation for courses and recommend that advisors and students use this designation during the advisement process. We do not recommend requiring a specific number of D courses. Because “diversity” has many different meanings, we recommend requiring a short statement about what the D designation means for each course. We have not finished work on a recommendation for how courses would receive a D designation.

**Eliminate:** the current requirement that: *Exactly* two courses must be taken from one department within G1, G2, and G3. No more than two courses can be taken from one department within G1, G2, or G3, but two courses from two different departments is acceptable.



**Advisement recommendations** – There are many important goals for Gen Ed that are not represented by a specific course. Instead we recommend the development of advisement guidelines to help students and faculty make decisions that best meet these goals for each student. One draft of such guidelines would be:

“Please consider each student’s individual needs, interests, and skills when making the following recommendations. Most students at Millersville should:

- ❑ Take multiple challenging courses. Although this may include several 300 level courses outside the major, course numbering is not always the best indicator of challenge.
- ❑ Be encouraged to take sequenced courses outside the major.
- ❑ Take a course with a significant wellness / physical fitness component. Examples of courses may be 1 credit sports courses, the current 3 credit “Wellness” courses, or other courses such as coaching or nutrition.
- ❑ A variety of courses that emphasize diversity in its many forms. Development of foreign language competency should be considered as one component of diversity.
- ❑ Take courses that emphasize information literacy, critical thinking, and the meaningful use of technology.
- ❑ Take courses that include a major speaking with feedback component. These courses should build upon Comm 100, but they can also include other communication courses and other Gen Ed and major courses.
- ❑ Courses (especially those that involve service learning) and/or co-curricular and extracurricular activities that encourage civic engagement.
- ❑ Students and advisors should consider courses in literature, music, art and other areas that may help broaden the student’s areas of interest.”

#### 4 Issues and Alternatives selected from the Gen Ed Proposal for discussion at April 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Proposal Element	Rationale	Possible alternatives	Effect of the alternative on the overall proposal
<p>Restructure the distributional system:            1) Modify the G1, G2, G3 blocks by moving Math to foundations, and reducing the number of courses in each block from 4 to 3.            2) Create an “Explore” block where any non-major course may count.            3) Freshman seminar to count (including 1, 2, 3 credit options and those sponsored by majors) as Exploratory credit.</p>	<p>This move provides more flexibility by creating “free elective” credits. These electives allow students to explore more areas of interest, make it easier for students to minor, allow students to more easily count credit for study abroad, and in general create more openings for innovative programming. Aligned with Principle D and Characteristic 6.</p>	<p>Keep the current requirements for 4 courses in each of the G Blocks.</p>	<p>If this choice is made the number of Exploratory courses would be reduced by 2.</p>
		<p>Reduce all G Blocks to 3 courses, but don’t move math to foundations because the proposal seems unfairly tilted to Math and Science.</p>	<p>This would allow an extra free elective (i.e., Exploratory course).             Yes, the proposal does “protect” the credits for Math Science, but in the end we believe that the great majority of students would not choose to use free electives for Math and Science courses. Humanities and Social Sciences would get the bulk of offerings from the 3 free electives and in the seminars. Moving to a 3-3-3 system including a required math course would most likely reduce science Gen Ed by one third to one half (keep in mind BSE students must take 2 math courses).</p>
	<p>This move provides more flexibility by creating “free elective” credits. These electives allow students to explore more areas of interest, make it easier for students to minor, allow students to more easily count credit for study abroad, and in general create more openings for innovative programming. Aligned with Principle D and Characteristic 6.</p>		<p>Size of this block depends upon freeing up credits via changes to the Liberal Arts core (G1, G2, G3) and Foundations area and upon the total credits allocated to Gen Ed. To meaningfully contribute to enhanced flexibility, 9-credits seems to be an appropriate minimum.</p>
	<p>There is a growing body of evidence that Freshman seminars increase retention. There are several successful models that have been implemented on campus – each with a different purpose and serving a different student group. We don’t need a one size fits all model, but we do need to count these credits toward Gen Ed. Aligned with Principles A &amp; C and Characteristics 4 &amp; 5.</p>	<p>Only allow 3 credit courses with significant content outside the major to count.             Count these seminars in the G1, G2, G3 blocks.             Require all students to take a Freshman Seminar (strong minority opinion in GERC).</p>	<p>Current seminars offered for undecided students and seminars offered by the majors wouldn’t count anywhere in the Gen Ed system or in the major.             Requiring that seminars count toward the G1, G2, G3 distribution would take away from Humanities and Social Science if the 3-3-3 G distribution model is adopted.             The majority sentiment was that if we require all students to take a Freshman Seminar, some departments may be forced to develop seminars that they don’t really believe in. Requiring seminars would likely decrease their</p>

			effectiveness.
--	--	--	----------------

Proposal Element	Rationale	Possible alternatives	Effect of the alternative on the overall proposal
Keep the total number of Gen Ed credits at 51.	The GERC recommendations provides some of the breathing room that the 120 credit rule requires by allowing capstones to substitute for Perspectives, by allowing Freshman Seminars in the major to count, and by allowing up to three non-major (but potentially Required Related) courses to count as Exploratory credits.	Decrease the credits to 48 (the minimum allowed by SSHE).	If this choice is made the number of Exploratory cour would be reduced by 1.  Changing to 48 credits would provide further flexibili for programs facing accreditation requirements.
Allow any capstone course (including major-related) to count in place of the Perspectives course.	This element provides more flexibility by creating options for majors to offer capstone experiences that fulfill some of the purposes of the original Perspectives courses but allowing the course to also count in the major. It also creates more openings for innovative programming. Aligned with Principle D and Characteristics 3, 4 & 6.	Maintain current Perspectives course requirement for all students.	This choice would reduce some of the flexibility of th proposal, thereby continuing some of the difficulties : programs have had adhering to the 120-credit mandat
Make Wellness an elective course. Count it within Exploratory credits. Encourage students to take Wellness through advisement.	GERC was split on whether Wellness is an “essential” course that should be required for all students. <b>Majority Reasoning:</b> The majority felt that a Wellness course was important, but not essential for all students. Wellness was not considered generative in the same sense as composition and mathematics. Other areas such as Civics, Music, Art, Literature, and Diversity are also very important to a well-rounded education, yet are not required. The majority also noted that Wellness is not listed as part of the Middle States standard 12 and that there was not an explicit relationship to the university mission statement. <b>Minority reasoning:</b> Others saw Wellness as unique in that none of the other disciplines deal with physical wellness in the same way. Wellness was considered essential for a well-rounded and holistic education. There are few areas more important than health and wellness, especially in today’s society. All agreed that more flexibility in Wellness offerings should be considered. Several members of the group felt that 1-credit sports courses would benefit students. Wellness has a variety of courses that should count toward Gen Ed. In addition, providing 3 electives would	Keep the current Wellness course as is.	If this choice is made the number of Exploratory cour would be reduced by 1.
		Require that all students take a Wellness course, but allow more options such as other Wellness courses or 1 credit sports courses.	This choice would guarantee that all students take wellness, and would increase options. If this choice is made the number of Exploratory courses would be reduced by 1.

	allow students more flexibility to minor in Athletic Coaching. Aligned with Principle D and Characteristic 6.		
--	---	--	--

## Distance Learning (DL) Course Approval Process

### Purpose of Distance Learning Course (DL)

To enrich and to increase the availability of the course offerings while maintaining quality educational experiences for students learning in a distance environment.

### Millersville University Definition of Distance Learning (DL)

Distance learning takes place when students and faculty members are separated from each other by location or time. DL courses usually have little or no requirement for “live” meetings – whether in a physical location or across the Internet. However, an instructor may require meetings throughout the semester. This definition is consistent with CBA Article 42 B.1.a.

### Distance Learning Formats

- I. Online - Millersville University defines an online course as one that meets completely online via online courseware system (i.e. Blackboard, eCollege or WebCT).
- II. Blended - Millersville University defines a blended course as a distance learning course that blends online learning with face-to-face meetings. The face-to-face meetings (including fieldwork and on-site labs) cannot exceed 33% of the entire course. The remainder of the course must be taught online.

### Technical and Instructional Support

The University shall assure the availability of technical support personnel and materials appropriate to the principal technology and consistent with the faculty member’s prior training and experience.

- I. Faculty member has been provided with appropriate training and technical support.
- II. Faculty member has access to appropriate technical infrastructure.
- III. Qualified instructional designers have an appropriate role in course development.

### Course Approval Process

- I. New credit bearing courses must be approved through the existing course approval procedure at the University. Method of DL (video conferencing, e-mail, online, blended, etc.) must be clearly stated.
- II. Existing credit bearing courses shall be reviewed by the department and a University curriculum committee (UCPRC/GCPRC), which shall each provide its recommendation to the President or his/her designee. This review should be completed within thirty (30) days of receipt of the course proposal.

### Course Approval Criteria

In approving distance education courses, the following criteria shall be applicable:

- I. Course content, outcomes, practice, and assessment are consistent and clearly stated in the course proposal and in the materials distributed to students.
  - A. Minimum technology and skills required for the course are clearly stated.
  - B. Learning outcomes/competencies are clearly stated using action verbs to communicate what learners will know and be able to do as a result of the learning experience.
  - C. Suitable opportunities for interaction between instructor and student are provided.
    1. Instructors provide clear guidelines for interaction with students.

2. Learning activities are developed to foster instructor-student, student-content, and where appropriate, student-student interaction.
  3. Instructors are encouraged to provide two types of feedback: information feedback (related to content) and acknowledgment feedback (confirmation of receipt).
- D. Suitable assessment of student achievement is evident.
1. Assessment methods are designed to measure the competencies stated in learning outcomes and are appropriate for distance learning.
  2. Faculty working with departmental and school curriculum committees, in consultation with instructional design specialists, have developed methods of assessment that protect the integrity of the distance learning course.
  3. Course syllabus clearly states that students must adhere to MU Academic Integrity Policy.
- II. Technological tools used for distance learning assure student fulfillment of learning outcomes.
- A. Minimum technology competencies expected of students are clearly indicated in course materials.
  - B. Assistance with technology, including orientation and testing, is made available to students.
  - C. A contingency plan has been developed in the event of a technology failure.
- III. Course resources assure student fulfillment of learning outcomes.
- A. Course resources are accessible to the learners, including on-line access to library materials.
  - B. Course resources are developed in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and may include such accommodations as are typically offered to non-distance education students through learning services and by course instructors.
  - C. Instructions are included on the site for those with disabilities explaining how to access all course resources.
- IV. Methods for course evaluation and maintenance are evident.
- A. An appropriate student evaluation instrument shall be developed and implemented in compliance with CBA Article 42. F. 2.
  - B. The faculty member shall write an evaluation of his/her experience in the distance education course and suggest measures, which may be taken to improve the quality of distance education in the future (CBA Article 42.G).
    1. Student perceptions regarding learning through distance education should be included in the report.
    2. The evaluation should be submitted to the department chairperson, the department offering the course, and the appropriate Dean/management supervisor.

**Millersville University  
General Education Task Force  
General Education Timeline (Rev. 3/20/06)**

<b>Fall 1988</b>	<b>Major Gen Ed revision implemented</b>
May 1996	First Gen Ed Program Review
Fall 1997	Modification of Gen Ed Requirements as result of Task Force on General Education Curriculum and Its Resources
<b>May 1999</b>	<b>Revised Gen Ed Objectives approved by Faculty Senate</b>
January 2001	Gen Ed Coordinator (1/4 release) begins
Fall 2001	FYE Undecided Program begins
<b>June 2002</b>	<b>MU team attends Asheville Institute for General Education</b>
November 2002	Faculty Senate creates Gen Ed Task Force (GETF)
February 2003	First meeting of GETF
Fall 2003	Initial round of GETF Focus Group meetings
Fall 2003	Elimination of G4 Gen Ed Elective becomes effective
January 2004	Report to Deans' Council and to Faculty Senate
Spring 2004	Second round of GETF Focus Group meetings
April 2004	External Reviewer (Steve Briggs) visits
June 2004	MU team attends Learning Communities Summer Institute (LCSI)
July 2004	Second Gen Ed Program Review
<b>January 2005</b>	<b>Final recommendations of GETF to Faculty Senate</b>
Spring 2005	Campus-wide forums & Third round of GETF Focus Group meetings
Spring – Fall 2005	Consideration by Senate of Principles & Characteristics of Gen Ed Reform
April 2005	Aborted Faculty Vote on Principles, Purpose & Objectives
Fall 2005	Pilot-test of First-Year Learning Communities Initiative
<b>November 2005</b>	<b>Presentation of Curriculum Working Groups to Faculty Senate Plus</b>
<b>Dec 05 – Feb 06</b>	<b>Discussions &amp; Voting by Departments on Gen Ed Reform Survey</b>
<b>Feb - Mar 2006</b>	<b>Development of “Synthesis” Proposal by GERC &amp; Curr Working Groups</b>
March 2006	LCSI Resource Faculty visit MU
Fall 2006 – Spr 2007	Extension of pilot-test of First-Year Learning Communities Initiative