Faculty Senate Minutes
May 1, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Government & Political Affairs.

I.   Minutes of previous meetings

      The minutes of the April 17, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

II.   Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

      Chairperson Börger-Greco reported that the General Education Proposal was approved by the faculty vote last week. She urged faculty members to attend graduation on May 12 in regalia. Dr. Börger-Greco also reminded senators of the summer meeting of Faculty Senate scheduled for Tuesday, June 26 and noted the earlier time of 3:00 p.m. Finally, she thanked Mr. Andrew Moyer for his service as Student Senate President during the last year.

      A question was raised on the status of the vote on the Honor Code Proposal. Dr. Börger-Greco responded that she was not yet certain but would report on this soon. She noted that if the proposal passed, senators should review the full proposal for discussion in the fall. A concern was raised that some faculty members were not able to vote on some issues because of confusion over the different voting schedule for different issues. It was reported that some poll workers mistakenly indicated that voting on all items would be possible on Thursday.

      Dr. Prabhu noted that APSCUF at the state level reported that the Strike Authorization vote passed.

III.   Report of the Student Senate President

      Student Senate President Andrew Moyer expressed appreciation for support from Faculty Senate for student initiatives.

IV.   Report of the Graduate Student Association

      None

V.   Report of the Administrative Officers

Provost

Provost Prabhu encouraged faculty in their efforts finishing up the semester. He also noted that no comments may be made regarding the federal lawsuit filed against Millersville due to FERPA regulations. However, he stressed that the Administration is committed to supporting the academic standards and policies set by the Faculty. When questioned about the charge, Dr. Prabhu indicated that some information is available publicly via the Federal Court or in the media. He emphasized that only the student's viewpoint has been presented since Millersville is not able to comment on the case. He noted that Millersville has issued a statement denying all allegations. Dr. Prabhu also highlighted that implementation of the revised General Education program is proposed for Fall 2008 and related issues will be coming up soon.

A question was raised about whether review is necessary for EDWs offered in DL format. Dr. Burns responded that if the EDW was originally approved as DL, no further review is needed but that his office is able to clarify this issue for specific courses if requested.

Associate Provost for Academic Administration

Associate Provost Burns reported that he is meeting individually with chairs regarding the Transfer Articulation legislation. He also encouraged faculty interested in the FYE Program and Learning Communities to attend the May 3 workshop.

Interim Assistant Provost Redmond

Interim Assistant Provost Redmond from the Division of Academic Support Programs and Learning Services noted that an outside consultant has looked into our AIM for Success program. An advisory committee made up of representatives from the three schools will be recommending and reviewing courses and delivery of services for spring and summer of 2008.

VI.   Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

AOAC

Senator White requested that senators remind department chairs to return responses to the technical assessment information survey.

UCPRC

Senator White shared that the timeline for course proposal reviews set out and supported by Senate worked well this year. She noted that online courses to be approved for next winter session should be submitted soon.

First Readings

(1) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
GEOG 395: Advanced Geographic Information Systems, 4 credits. Proposal to create a course to provide advanced experience with GIS concepts and software.

(2) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
ITEC 281: Processing Metallic Materials. Proposal to revise course description, objectives and outline.

(3) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
ITEC 382(486): Computer Numerical Control (CNC) Machining. Proposal to change the course number from ITEC 486 and to revise course description, objectives and outline.

(4) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
ITEC 483: Computer-Aided Manufacturing (CAM), 3 credits. Proposal to create a course investigating the form of automation that creates the link between computer-aided design and automated production systems.

(5) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
ITEC 485: Advanced Manufacturing Systems. Proposal to revise course description, objectives and outline.

(6) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
BS ITEC, Manufacturing Technology and General Industrial Technology options. Proposal to change required and elective courses.

(7) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
AT ITEC, Manufacturing Technology and Mechanical Technology options. Proposal to change required and elective courses.

(8) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
ITEC minor, Manufacturing Technology and General Industrial Technology options. Proposal to change elective courses.

(9) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
BSE EDTE. Proposal to change elective courses.

APC

Senator West distributed a proposal related to the PASSHE commonality issues for a minor refinement in the credits that determine classification of academic progress and standing.

GCPRC

Senator Mowrey distributed a proposal to specify membership of GCPRC as Graduate Degree Program Coordinators rather than Graduate Program Coordinators in light of the increasing number of total graduate programs. A question was raised about adequate representation of these programs. Dr. Mowrey responded that GCPRC is concerned that all programs have a voice and be appropriately represented and suggested formation of a broader group for that. She noted that separate graduate activities related to recognition of honors students and certification students are being implemented. Dr. Prabhu suggested the inclusion of an At-Large member representing Post-Baccalaureate and Certification programs. It was noted, however, that there is no collective meeting of this group and it is unclear how best to represent their interests effectively. It was pointed out that some members of GCPRC are very aware of needs of these students but that a workable approach for representation is needed.

GERC

Senator Warmkessel thanked Senate for the support and feedback that went into the revision of the General Education curriculum. She also gave special recognition to the hard work of GenEd Task Force members, GERC members and Dr. Frederick Foster-Clark. She distributed a report from the Implementation Sub-Committee with the recommendation that APC oversee this. Dr. Foster-Clark highlighted the expedited review process proposed for approval of W and D courses in light of the revised GenEd curriculum. He also pointed out the proposed periodic review of W, D and P courses to ensure that courses continue to meet objectives. He noted that UCPRC sub-committees including members with expertise in writing would do the review of W courses, UCPRC would make the final approval and Senate would be informed without needing to vote on each course. He mentioned that First-Year Perspective (FYP) courses would also be handled similarly with representation from the FYE program. However, persons proposing an FYP course would meet with FYE representatives to present their course. Dr. Foster-Clark pointed out the schedule proposed for departments to undergo review of W and D courses over the next two years and for recertification of W, D and P courses that will coincide with the regular 5-year Program Review cycle. A Warmkessel/Edeh Herr motion to forward the Implementation Proposal to Academic Policies Committee was approved with one dissenting vote.

VII.   Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

Ad Hoc Bylaws Committee

Senator Mowrey also distributed changes to the Graduate Faculty Status proposed by Dr. Phillips as part of the revision and reformatting the Governance Manual. It was pointed out that some issues considered minor by the administration, like the change of "guidelines" to "qualifications" could potentially be very significant. Dr. Prabhu commented that the Governance Manual online is currently out of date. Dr. A. Miller acknowledged the need for updates but expressed concern that proposed changes to these documents be considered carefully and approved appropriately by faculty before being put online. It was noted that the proposed documents also include approval dates that are not accurate. Dr. Burns responded that the documents are being transitioned from an html

format to a Word/PDF document and that the dates were included as placeholders. He indicated that the new format will allow for a searchable index that can be readily linked and updated. Dr. Mowrey noted that the proposed recommendation to separate out smaller sections of information like the graduate faculty status out of GCPRC also creates a potential for a loss of organization over time. She suggested that links would allow searches to be directed to appropriate information wherever it is within the Governance Manual. A request was made for the administration to post the current, approved language perhaps with a note that it is under review.

VIII.   Proposed Courses and Programs

(1) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
ENGL 445: The Short Story: Its History, Development, and Genres, 3 credits, G1. Proposal to create a course to explore development of the short story genre that counts towards the Genre requirement in the major was approved without dissent.

(2) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
BA GEOG, Applied option. Proposal to add 4 credits of calculus or pre-calculus to the Required Related courses.

It was noted that some credit inconsistencies on the accompanying major curriculum sheet. A Mollah/Kevorkian motion to approve the change to the BA GEOG, Applied option contingent on correction of the program credits listed was approved without dissent.

(3) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
MATH 393: Number Theory. Proposal to change the prerequisite from MATH 322: Linear Algebra to the more appropriate MATH 310: Math Proof was approved without dissent.

(1) NEW GRADUATE COURSE
ENGL 645: The Short Story: Its History, Development, and Genres, 3 credits. Proposal to create a course to explore development of the short story genre was approved without dissent.

The ITEC proposal to recognize OSEH and ITEC/EDTE as separate departments for the purpose of counting General Education courses was approved by a vote of 11 yes, 11 no and a tie-breaking yes vote from Senate Chair.

IX.   Faculty Emeritus

        A DeCaria/Igyor motion that Dr. Yin Soong be granted the honorary title of Professor of
        Earth Sciences (Oceanography) Emeritus was approved without dissent.

X.   Other/New Business

        None

XI.   Adjournment

        The meeting was adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller
Faculty Senate Secretary

Action Summary:

The minutes of the April 17, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as corrected.

A Warmkessel/Edeh Herr motion to forward the Implementation Proposal to Academic Policies Committee was approved with one dissenting vote.

A Mollah/Kevorkian motion to approve the change to the BA GEOG, Applied option contingent on correction of the program credits listed was approved without dissent.

The ITEC proposal to recognize OSEH and ITEC/EDTE as separate departments for the purpose of counting General Education courses was approved by a vote of 11 yes, 11 no and a tie-breaking yes vote from Senate Chair.

A DeCaria/Igyor motion that Dr. Yin Soong be granted the honorary title of Professor of Earth Sciences (Oceanography) Emeritus was approved without dissent.

To: **Faculty Senate**
From: **Lillie West, Chair of Academic Policies**
Date: **April 30, 2007**
Subject: **Revision of Academic Progress and Standing**

As recommended by Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Campus Management all universities will use the same breakdown for progress classification.

Class Standing	Current Policy	Recommended Policy Based on Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Campus Management Approved Actions
Freshman	0 to 29.5	Less than 30
Sophomore	30 to 59.5	30 or greater and less than 60
Junior	60 to 89.5	60 or greater and less than 90
Senior	90 or more	90 or greater

Section 1: University Structure & Governance
Faculty Participation in University Governance
Contract Committees, Judicial Committee and Amending Procedures

Faculty Senate/Curriculum Committee

Graduate Course and Program Review Committee

1. **Membership**

   a. The Graduate Course and Program Review Committee is composed of the Graduate Degree Program Coordinators from each school and two graduate student representatives elected by the Graduate Students' Organization. In addition, a chairperson is elected by the Faculty Senate from the Senate membership at the first Senate meeting of the fall semester for a three-year term, provided he/she retains Senate membership and graduate faculty status. The terms of the chair and members begin in September and end in August of the appropriate year.

   b. The provost and vice president for academic affairs and the dean of graduate studies or their designees are non-voting ex officio members of the committee.

2. **Functions**

   a. The Graduate Course and Program Review Committee reviews proposed changes in the graduate curriculum and programs as received from the appropriate school committee and reports its recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

   It also serves as a forum for matters pertaining to the graduate studies program.

   b. The Graduate Course and Program Review Committee reviews all proposed changes in academic policies, regulations, structure, and related matters at the graduate level and reports its recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

3. **Graduate Faculty**

   To promote the ideals of graduate study, the graduate faculty must demonstrate a continuing professional interest and competence.

   Graduate faculty are involved in graduate curriculum development, departmental decision-making, teaching, and advisement of graduate students.

   Faculty are appointed to the graduate faculty by the Graduate Committee on the recommendation of the department. Individual departments determine the relevant specifications for membership based on these guidelines.

   a. Relevant or appropriate academic credentials such as the earned doctorate or acceptable terminal degree. Each department shall specify the credentials requisite to its discipline.

b. Scholarly productivity as demonstrated by publications, research, or recognized creative work. Each department shall specify the quality and quantity of scholarly productivity it deems appropriate to its discipline.

c. Evaluated teaching performance when available. Each department shall specify the evaluative criteria it uses for graduate teaching (e.g., student evaluations, course syllabi, peer evaluation, etc.)

d. Areas of demonstrated expertise and interest with respect to the needs of the graduate program. Each department shall specify the evidence it requires to identify such expertise and interest (e.g., doctoral level course work, publications, post-doctoral research, etc.)

Report of the GERC Implementation Sub-Committee
March 2007 (Revised 4/27/07)
Sub-committee members: Janet White, Jeff Wimer, Fred Foster-Clark, and Thomas Burns

The "W" label
Expedited Initial Certification Process

Rationale for an Expedited Initial Certification Process for currently "W" labeled courses-

Due to the proposed change in the requirements for courses to be labeled with the Writing ("W") designation, processes will be required for any course that possesses a "W" label under the current General Education curriculum to undergo an expedited review to retain the "W" label. With an anticipated implementation date of Fall 2008, we believe that an expedited review process is necessary and would suggest an expedited phase-in that would require some courses to be "certified" by Fall 2008 with any remaining "current W" courses "certified" by Fall 2009. This would leave a year of adjustment/overlap with the old W requirements.

Description of the expedited initial certification process for existing courses currently possessing a "W" label

1) For each course that wants to retain the "W" label, the course would need to demonstrate how it will meet each of the specific criteria (word/page limit, revised prose, etc.). We propose that this be done through the completion of a brief (one-page?) self-evaluation form, which would be available electronically (as are all other UCPRC forms), accompanied by the course syllabus and any supporting documentation the instructor/department feels is needed to support the self-evaluation.

2) A sub-committee of UCPRC would be created to review any course submitted for the initial certification.

    a) The sub-committee would consist of two current voting members of UCPRC, two additional faculty members, and the Associate Provost for Academic Administration or his/her designee. It will be the responsibility of the Chair of UCPRC to maintain representation among the Schools on the sub-committee.

    b) The sub-committee would review the proposals and advise UCPRC about whether the course, as judged by the self-evaluation form, met the expectations of the new "W" label or not.

        i. This process *would not* require individual presentations to either the sub-committee or to the full UCPRC.

        ii. Any questions, concerns, or other issues based on the information in the self-evaluation would be noted and shared with the chair of UCPRC

        iii. The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and decision.

    c) Approval Process- One of three actions result from the review by the sub-committee or UCPRC:

        i. Approval of the proposal as presented.

     ii. Approval subject to certain amendments agreed to by the spokesperson & deemed as minor changes. Such amendments shall appear at each stage as attachments to the original proposal unless they are purely editorial.

     iii. Disapproval. Reasons for disapproval must be clearly stated in writing to the proposal spokesperson. Revised proposals must undergo the complete expedited initial certification process.

3) The individual course self-evaluation forms completed by departments would be submitted to the chair of UCPRC who would then distribute proposals to the sub-committee for their review.

4) The chair of UCPRC would communicate final decisions regarding each course to the proposer. In addition, the chair of UCPRC would advise the Faculty Senate at each full Faculty Senate meeting of courses that have been approved to meet the new "W" requirements.

We are recommending the following phase-in schedule for initial certification of existing "W" courses that want to retain the "W" label:

Departments that underwent five-year review during **2004-05, 2005-06, or 2006-07** should complete the initial certification process during the fall 2007 for implementation in the fall 2008.

Departments that are scheduled to undergo the five-year review during **2007-08 and 2008-09** should complete the initial certification process during the fall 2008 for implementation in the fall 2009.

During the phase-in process the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration would contact each department scheduled to undergo the initial certification process and alert them to the need to complete self-evaluations for each of the "W" labeled courses. This letter would be sent to the Department Chair and would provide instructions for the process (where to find the forms, etc.), a list of the courses to be evaluated, and the timeline for the process.

After this two year phase-in process, the process would shift to the recertification process described below. Courses that had previously been labeled with a "W" but had not been taken through the initial certification process would NOT retain the "W" label. Such courses would need to follow the process for adding a General Education label to an existing course should they desire to add the "W" label after the initial certification process.

GERC Implementation Proposal

Recertification process for W courses

On-going recertification process (every 5 years)- We recommend that each course possessing a "W" label be reviewed by UCPRC every five (5) years to recertify that it continues to meet the standards of the "W" label. The five (5) year recertification process would be done at the same time that each department/program goes through the mandated five (5) year review. Our recommendation is that this process be completed during the fall semester of the academic year. *(Note: Departments that completed the expedited initial certification described above and underwent five-year reviews in the 2004-05 and 2005-06 academic years will not need to go through the below recertification process at their five-year review in 2009-10 or 2010-11.*)

1) We propose that this be done through the completion of a brief (one-page?) self-evaluation form which would be available electronically (as are all other UCPRC forms). This form would be very similar to that used for the "initial certification" process described above.

2) For each "W" course, the self-evaluation would need to demonstrate how the course meets each of the specific criteria (word/page limit, revised prose, etc.) for the "W" label.

3) Each August, the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration would contact each department scheduled to undergo the five (5) year review and alert them to the need to complete self-evaluations for each of the "W" labeled courses. This letter would be sent to the Department Chair and would provide instructions for the process (where to find the forms, etc.), a list of the courses to be evaluated, and the timeline for the process.

4) A sub-committee of UCPRC would be created to review any course submitted for the initial certification.

   a. The sub-committee would consist of two current voting members of UCPRC, two additional faculty members, and the Associate Provost for Academic Administration, or his/her designee. It will be the responsibility of the Chair of UCPRC to maintain representation among the Schools on the sub-committee.

   b. The sub-committee would review the proposals and advise UCPRC about whether the course, as judged by the self-evaluation form, met the expectations of the new "W" label or not.

      i. This process would not require individual presentations to either the sub-committee or to the full UCPRC.

      ii. Any questions, concerns, or other issues based on the information in the self-evaluation would be noted and shared with the chair of UCPRC

      iii. The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and decision.

        c. One of three actions result from the review by the sub-committee or
          UCPRC:
               i. Approval of the proposal as presented.
               ii. Approval subject to certain amendments agreed to by the
                 spokesperson & deemed as minor changes. Such amendments shall
                 appear at each stage as attachments to the original proposal unless
                 they are purely editorial.
               iii. Disapproval. Reasons for disapproval must be clearly stated in
                 writing to the proposal spokesperson. Revised proposals must
                 undergo the complete recertification process.
5) The individual course self-evaluation forms completed by departments would
    be submitted to the chair of UCPRC and then distributed the sub-committee
    for their review.
6) The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation
    to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and
    decision.
7) The chair of UCPRC would communicate final decisions regarding each course
    to the proposer. In addition, the chair of UCPRC would advise the Faculty
    Senate at each full Faculty Senate meeting of courses that have been approved
    to meet the new "W" requirements.

**What about existing courses that do not possess a "W" label but wish to add the
"W" label?** This process would occur as it currently does for any course that wants to
add a General Education label where one did not exist before.

The "P" label

Since the "P" labels (description/requirements) are not being changed by the current
GERC proposal, these is no need for a expedited initial certification process- all current
"P" courses could continue to be "P" courses. Any existing course that wishes to add a
"P" label would need to follow the current, prescribed procedure for the addition of a Gen
Ed label.

On-going recertification process (every 5 years)- We recommend that each course
possessing a "P" label be reviewed by UCPRC every five (5) years to recertify that it
continues to meet the standards of the "P" label. The five (5) year recertification process
would be done at the same time that each department/program goes through the mandated
five (5) year review. Our recommendation is that this process be completed during the
fall semester of the academic year.
1) We propose that this be done through the completion of a brief self-evaluation
    form which would be available electronically (as are all other UCPRC forms).
    This form would be very similar to that used for the "initial certification"
    process described above.
2) For each "P" course, the self-evaluation would need to demonstrate how the
    course meets each of the specific criteria for the "P" label.

3) Each August, the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration would contact each department scheduled to undergo the five (5) year review and alert them to the need to complete self-evaluations for each of the "P" labeled courses. This letter would be sent to the Department Chair and would provide instructions for the process (where to find the forms, etc.), a list of the courses to be evaluated, and the timeline for the process.

4) A sub-committee of UCPRC would be created to review any course submitted for recertification.

   a. The sub-committee would consist of two current voting members of UCPRC, two additional faculty members, and the Associate Provost for Academic Administration, or his/her designee. It will be the responsibility of the Chair of UCPRC to maintain representation among the Schools on the sub-committee.

   b. The sub-committee would review the proposals and advise UCPRC about whether the course, as judged by the self-evaluation form, met the expectations of the "P" label or not.

      i. This process would not require individual presentations to either the sub-committee or to the full UCPRC.

      ii. Any questions, concerns, or other issues based on the information in the self-evaluation would be noted and shared with the chair of UCPRC

      iii. The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and decision.

   c. One of three actions result from the review by the sub-committee or UCPRC:

      i. Approval of the proposal as presented.

      ii. Approval subject to certain amendments agreed to by the spokesperson & deemed as minor changes. Such amendments shall appear at each stage as attachments to the original proposal unless they are purely editorial.

      iii. Disapproval. Reasons for disapproval must be clearly stated in writing to the proposal spokesperson. Revised proposals must undergo the complete approval process.

5) The individual course self-evaluation forms completed by departments would be submitted to the chair of UCPRC and then distributed the sub-committee for their review.

6) The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and decision.

7) The chair of UCPRC would communicate final decisions regarding each course to the proposer. In addition, the chair of UCPRC would advise the Faculty Senate at each full Faculty Senate meeting of courses that have been approved to meet the "P" requirements.

The "D" label

With the approval of the proposed Diversity requirement, a new process will need to be created to associate courses with this label. To be consistent with the processes for the "W" and "P" labels above, we recommend:

Expedited Initial Certification Process

Rationale for an Expedited Initial Certification Process for adding "D" labels to Existing Courses-

The addition of the "Diversity" requirement to the General Education curriculum, a new process must be created to quickly add the "D" label to existing courses. With an anticipated implementation date of Fall 2008, we believe that an expedited review process is necessary and would suggest an expedited phase-in that would require some courses to be certified by Fall 2008 and others by Fall 2009.

Description of the expedited initial certification process for existing courses adding the "D" label

1) For each course that wants to add the "D" label, the course would need to demonstrate how it will meet the specific criteria for the diversity courses. We propose that this be done through the completion of a brief self-evaluation form, which would be available electronically (as are all other UCPRC forms), accompanied by the course syllabus and any supporting documentation the instructor/department feels is needed to support the self-evaluation.

2) A sub-committee of UCPRC would be created to review any course submitted for the initial certification.

   a. The sub-committee would consist of two current voting members of UCPRC, two additional faculty members, and the Associate Provost for Academic Administration or his/her designee. It will be the responsibility of the Chair of UCPRC to maintain representation among the Schools on the sub-committee.

   b. The sub-committee would review the proposals and advise UCPRC about whether the course, as judged by the self-evaluation form, met the expectations of the new "D" label or not.

       i. This process would not require individual presentations to either the sub-committee or to the full UCPRC.

       ii. Any questions, concerns, or other issues based on the information in the self-evaluation would be noted and shared with the chair of UCPRC

       iii. The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and decision

c. One of three actions result from the review by the sub-committee or UCPRC:

    i. Approval of the proposal as presented.

    ii. Approval subject to certain amendments agreed to by the spokesperson & deemed as minor changes. Such amendments shall appear at each stage as attachments to the original proposal unless they are purely editorial.

    iii. Disapproval. Reasons for disapproval must be clearly stated in writing to the proposal spokesperson. Revised proposals must undergo the complete expedited initial certification process

3) The individual course self-evaluation forms completed by departments would be submitted to the chair of UCPRC who would then distribute proposals to the sub-committee for their review.

4) The chair of UCPRC would communicate final decisions regarding each course to the proposer. In addition, the chair of UCPRC would advise the Faculty Senate at each full Faculty Senate meeting of courses that have been approved to meet the new "D" requirements.

We are recommending the following phase-in schedule for initial certification of existing courses that want to add the "D" label:

Departments that underwent five-year review during **2004-05, 2005-06, or 2006-07** should complete the initial certification process during the fall 2007 for implementation in the fall 2008.

Departments that are scheduled to undergo the five-year review during **2007-08 and 2008-09** should complete the initial certification process during the fall 2008 for implementation in the fall 2009.

During the phase-in process the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration would contact each department scheduled to undergo the initial certification process and alert them to the need to complete self-evaluations for each of course to which the "D" label would be added. This letter would be sent to the Department Chair and would provide instructions for the process (where to find the forms, etc.), and timeline.

After this two year phase-in process, the process would shift to the recertification process described below.

Recertification process for "D" courses

On-going recertification process (every 5 years)- We recommend that each course possessing a "D" label be reviewed by UCPRC every five (5) years to recertify that it continues to meet the standards of the "D" label. The five (5) year recertification process would be done at the same time that each department/program goes through the mandated

five (5) year review. Our recommendation is that this process be completed during the fall semester of the academic year.

1) We propose that this be done through the completion of a brief (one-page?) self-evaluation form which would be available electronically (as are all other UCPRC forms). This form would be very similar to that used for the "initial certification" process described above.

2) For each "D" course, the self-evaluation would need to demonstrate how the course meets each of the specific criteria (word/page limit, revised prose, etc.) for the "D" label.

3) Each August, the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration would contact each department scheduled to undergo the five (5) year review and alert them to the need to complete self-evaluations for each of the "D" labeled courses. This letter would be sent to the Department Chair and would provide instructions for the process (where to find the forms, etc.), a list of the courses to be evaluated, and the timeline for the process.

4) A sub-committee of UCPRC would be created to review any course submitted for the initial certification.

   a. The sub-committee would consist of two current voting members of UCPRC, two additional faculty members, and the Associate Provost for Academic Administration or his/her designee. It will be the responsibility of the Chair of UCPRC to maintain representation among the Schools on the sub-committee.

   b. The sub-committee would review the proposals and advise UCPRC about whether the course, as judged by the self-evaluation form, met the expectations of the new "D" label or not.

      i. This process would not require individual presentations to either the sub-committee or to the full UCPRC.

      ii. Any questions, concerns, or other issues based on the information in the self-evaluation would be noted and shared with the chair of UCPRC

      iii. The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and decision.

   c. One of three actions result from the review by the sub-committee or UCPRC:

      i. Approval of the proposal as presented.

      ii. Approval subject to certain amendments agreed to by the spokesperson & deemed as minor changes. Such amendments shall appear at each stage as attachments to the original proposal unless they are purely editorial.

      iii. Disapproval. Reasons for disapproval must be clearly stated in writing to the proposal spokesperson. Revised proposals must undergo the complete recertification process.

5) The individual course self-evaluation forms completed by departments would be submitted to the chair of UCPRC and then distributed the sub-committee for their review.

6) The sub-committee would forward recommendations for each self-evaluation to the chair of UCPRC for distribution to the full UCPRC for their review and decision.
7) The chair of UCPRC would communicate final decisions regarding each course to the proposer. In addition, the chair of UCPRC would advise the Faculty Senate at each full Faculty Senate meeting of courses that have been approved to meet the "D" requirements.

What about existing courses that do not possess a "D" label but wish to add the "D" label after the initial certification process? This would occur as it currently does for any course that wants to add a General Education label where one did not exist before

First-Year Perspectives courses (UNIV 179)

Due to the creation of First-Year Perspectives (FYP) courses that differ from the original proposal for UNIV 179 courses that was approved by Faculty Senate, we propose that all existing UNIV 179 courses that wish to become FYP courses must undergo a certification process to determine if they meet the requirements for courses to be labeled as FYP. Given the relatively small number of existing UNIV 179 courses and the anticipated implementation date of Fall 2008, we believe that it is possible to have all existing UNIV 179 courses converted to meet the requirements of the FYP courses by Fall 2008 and we propose that the certification process follow that of the general course approval process for FYP courses as proposed below.

Description of the certification/approval/re-approval process for FYP courses
1) Each existing UNIV 179 course that intends to convert to an FYP course would need to demonstrate how it will meet each of the specific criteria for FYP courses. We propose that this be done through the completion of a FYP course proposal form (would be available electronically) accompanied by the course syllabus and any supporting documentation the instructor/department feels are needed to support the proposal.
2) New proposals for FYP courses would need to demonstrate how it will meet each of the specific criteria for FYP courses. Proposals must include a completed FYP course proposal form (would be available electronically) including the course syllabus and any supporting documentation the instructor/department feels are needed to support the proposal.
3) FYP courses may be proposed by individual faculty members, departments, or other units (including non-instructional units, pending special approval of Faculty Senate for such courses).
4) Approval Process- Each proposal would require the review and approval of the faculty member's department and a sub-committee of UCPRC. The proposer presents the proposal first to their department, then, upon notification of the appropriate school dean, to the UCPRC sub-committee. One of three actions results at each stage:
   a. Approval of the proposal as presented.

   b. Approval subject to certain amendments agreed to by the spokesperson & deemed as minor changes. Such amendments shall appear at each stage as attachments to the original proposal unless they are purely editorial.

   c. Disapproval. Reasons for disapproval must be clearly stated in writing to the proposal spokesperson. Revised proposals must undergo the complete approval process.
5) A sub-committee of UCPRC would be created to review any course submitted for the initial certification.
   a. The sub-committee would consist of seven members- two (2) current members of the General Education Review Committee (GERC), two (2) current members of the First-Year Experience (FYE) Committee, two (2) current voting members of UCPRC, and the Coordinator of the First-Year Experience Program. The Coordinator of the First- Year Experience program will serve as the Chair of the sub-committee. It will be the responsibility of the Chair of UCPRC to maintain representation among the Schools on the sub-committee.
   b. The sub-committee would review the proposals and advise UCPRC about whether the course, as judged by the proposal and presentation to the sub-committee, met the expectations of FYP courses.
      i. This process *would* require individual presentations to the sub-committee.
      ii. Any questions, concerns, or other issues based on the information in the proposal and presentation would be noted and shared with the proposer.
      iii. Proposers would have the opportunity to address these concerns before the sub-committee voted on the proposal.

    iv. The sub-committee would forward their decision for each FYP course proposal to the chair of UCPRC.

6) Each FYP proposal must be submitted to the chair of UCPRC. The chair of UCPRC will then distribute the proposal to the sub-committee chair.

7) The chair of UCPRC would communicate final decisions regarding each course to the proposer. In addition, the chair of UCPRC would advise the Faculty Senate at each full Faculty Senate meeting of courses that have been approved as FYP courses.

Re-approval Process- We recommend that all FYP courses be re-approved by a sub-committee of UCPRC every five (5) years to recertify that each course continues to meet the standards of the FYP course. The five (5) year recertification process would be based on the date of approval of the FYP course. Our recommendation is that this re-approval process be completed during the fall semester of the academic year. Rather than an expedited recertification process, we propose that this re-approval process exactly match the initial approval process for these FYP courses (completion of FYP proposal form, approval at both levels, including a presentation to the sub-committee). In addition, each August, the Coordinator of the First Year Experience program, assisted by the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration, would contact each department in which an FYP course was to undergo the five (5) year review and alert them to the need to complete certification process for those courses. This letter would be sent to the Department Chair and would provide instructions for the process (where to find the forms, etc.), a list of the courses, and the timeline for the process.

Proposed Steps for the Review/Approval of Writing, Diversity, Perspectives and FYP Courses#

General Education Label		Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7
		Full proposal	1 page self evaluation form	Department approval	Dean notification	UCPRC chair	UCPRC subcommittee for review and recommendation	UCPRC for decision	UCPRC chair communicates decision to proposer	UCPRC chair communicates decision to Senate
Writing Courses	IC		X			X	X* Proposal No Presentation	X	X	X
	5 yr									
Diversity Courses	IC		X			X	X* Proposal No Presentation	X	X	X
	5 yr									
Perspectives Courses	5 yr		X			X	X* Proposal No Presentation	X	X	X
UNIV: FYP	IC	X		X	X	X	X** Proposal AND Presentation	X	X	X
	5 yr									

IC = Initial Certification

5 yr = 5 year review process

Notes:

This review and approval process is for existing courses that want to be certified or re-certified (5-yr. review) for the appropriate Gen Ed label.

*5-member committee comprised of 2 UCPRC members; 2 additional faculty; Associate Provost or designee (ex officio) – membership from each school (as possible)

**7-member committee: comprised of 2 members from UCPRC, GERC, FYE, and Director of FYE – membership from each school (as possible)

School	Department	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
APAS	African-American Studies		X W D P					X W D P		
HMSS	Art	W D		X P					X W D P	
SCMA	Biology	X	W D				X W D P			
HMSS	Business Administration	W D		X P					X W D P	
SCMA	Chemistry	W D				X W D P				
HMSS	Communication and Theatre		X W D P					X W D P		
SCMA	Computer Science		X W D P					X W D P		
SCMA	Earth Sciences	W D				X W D P				
HMSS	Economics	W D			X P					X W D P
EDUC	Educational Foundations	W D				X W D P				
EDUC	Elementary and Early Childhood	X	W D				X W D P			
HMSS	English		X W D P					X W D P		
HMSS	Foreign Languages	X	W D				X W D P			
HMSS	Geography	W D			X P					X W D P
HMSS	Government and Political Affairs	W D			X P					X W D P
HMSS	History	W D				X W D P				
EDUC	Industry and Technology		X W D P					X W D P		
HMSS	Latino/a Studies		X W D P					X W D P		
SCMA	Mathematics	W D				X W D P				
HMSS	Music	W D				X W D P				
SCMA	Nursing	X	W D				X W D P			
HMSS	Philosophy	W D		X P					X W D P	
SCMA	Physics	W D			X P					X W D P
EDUC	Psychology	W D		X P					X W D P	
EDUC	Special Education	W D		X P					X W D P	
HMSS	Social Work	X	W D				X W D P			
HMSS	Sociology/Anthropology		X W D P					X W D P		
EDUC	Wellness and Sport Sciences	W D			X P					X W D P
HMSS	Women's Studies	W D		X P					X W D P	

X = regular 5-year Program Review cycle

W = any current W course wanting to retain W label

D = any course wanting to adopt (2007-09) or retain (20011-?) D label

P = any current course wanting to retain P lablel

5981

Millersville University <mark>Governance & Policies</mark>

Effective: October 1997

Faculty Policy <mark>(Proposed)</mark>
GRADUATE FACULTY STATUS

Approved: October 1997
Revised: April 2007
MU/APSCUF-MU Meet & Discuss

To promote the ideals of graduate study, the graduate faculty must demonstrate a continuing professional interest and competence. Graduate faculty are involved in curriculum development and departmental decision-making regarding graduate programs, and the teaching and advisement of graduate students.

Faculty members are appointed to the graduate faculty by the Graduate Course and Program Review Committee on the recommendation of their respective department.

Qualifications for Graduate Faculty Status

Individual departments determine the relevant specifications for graduate faculty status based on these guidelines:

1. Relevant or appropriate academic credentials such as the earned doctorate or acceptable terminal degree. Each department shall specify the credentials requisite to its discipline.

2. Scholarly productivity as demonstrated by publications, research, or recognized creative work. Each department shall specify the quality and quantity of recent scholarly productivity it deems appropriate to its discipline.

3. Evaluated teaching performance when available. Each department shall specify the evaluative criteria it uses for graduate teaching (e.g., student evaluations, course syllabi, peer evaluation, etc.).

4. Areas of demonstrated expertise and interest with respect to the needs of the graduate program. Each department shall specify the evidence it requires to identify such expertise and interest (e.g., doctoral level course work, publications, post-doctoral research, etc.).

<mark>Language is currently reflected in the GCPRC committee guidelines in Faculty Senate. Pulling it out as a separate document that can be accessed under "Graduate Faculty Status" and listed with faculty policies makes it readily accessible to all.</mark>

Attachment #5

From: Department of Earth Sciences Faculty
To: Millersville University Faculty Senate

RESOLUTION FOR FACULTY EMERITUS STATUS
FOR
DR. YIN SOONG

Whereas Dr. Yin Soong is retiring in June, 2007 after 30 years of service to Millersville University in the Department of Earth Sciences; and

Whereas Dr. Soong has advised and mentored numerous students, many of whom have advanced to graduate school on graduation from Millersville University, including one student who received the Secretary of the Navy Scholarship for graduate studies; and

Whereas Dr. Soong was instrumental in the design of the curriculum for the oceanography program that has been used since 1980 at Millersville University, which included tracks in biological, chemical, geological and physical oceanography, and again was instrumental in the design of the recently revised and updated curriculum in Ocean and Marine Sciences that reflects the current and forecast future needs of students in the marine science disciplines; and

Whereas Dr. Soong has not only taught in and supported the Ocean and Marine Sciences curriculum, but has also been a significant contributor to the Meteorology program at Millersville University by developing and teaching several required and elective courses for both meteorology and ocean and marine sciences majors, including: ESCI 282 – *FORTRAN Programming for Earth Sciences Applications*; ESCI 386 – *IDL Programming for Advanced Earth Sciences Applications*; and ESCI 380 – *Remote Sensing*; and

Whereas Dr. Soong was key in initiating and designing the oceanography and remote sensing laboratories, for which he acquired and built a research grade rotating table, oversaw the building and installation of a wave tank, and was principle investigator on a successful grant from the National Science Foundation which equipped the department's remote sensing laboratory with hardware and software; and

Whereas Dr. Soong carried out research that included being the first oceanographer to discover a cold-core eddy in the South China Sea, for which he was lead author on a cover article in *EOS – Transactions of the American Geophysical Union*, and was also the principle investigator on a grant for the first university-owned direct satellite receiving station at the National Taiwan Ocean University; and

Whereas Dr. Soong was a constant advocate for state-of-the-art research facilities and equipment for students, and as such served as Millersville University's representative on the board of directors and vice-president of research for the Marine Science Consortium at NASA's Wallops Island facility, and as principle investigator for a National Science Foundation grant to equip the research vessel R/V Parker with high precision research-grade instruments for use by students and faculty;

Therefore be it resolved that Dr. Yin Soong be granted the honorary title of Professor of Earth Sciences (Oceanography) Emeritus.