

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 3, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Government & Political Affairs and Social Work.

I. Minutes of previous meeting

A GCPRC motion to amend the September 19, 2006 minutes to specify an implementation date of Fall 2007 for the approved GCPRC motion regarding transfer credits was approved without dissent.

The minutes of the September 19, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Dr. Börger-Greco requested Senate hold elections at an earlier point in the agenda. A Blazer/Warmkessel motion to move elections to item VI in the agenda was approved without dissent.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

Student Senate President Andrew Moyer commented that Student Senate is evaluating the implications of the upcoming departure from MU by Dr. Thomas. He indicated that students willing to be nominated for the search committee for Dr. Thomas' replacement attend the Thursday meeting of Student Senate.

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Association

Graduate Dean DeSantis introduced Stephanie Ensminger as the new representative to Senate from the GSA. Ms. Ensminger reported that the GSA would be electing officers this week.

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

Provost Prabhu

Provost Prabhu invited Registrar Candace Deen to share information with Senate about the upcoming release of online registration and scheduling. Ms. Deen indicated that demonstrations are being held around campus to give faculty a chance to preview the new system that replaces both the online Course Locator function and the paper version of the schedule. She emphasized that the new system will allow open access to a single source of updated course information. She expressed openness to hearing feedback and suggestions from faculty about functionality of the system. She noted that the new format

includes notes about courses that more easily define related pre-requisites or other requirements and can be modified as needed.

Dr. Prabhu shared that a major concern is that students might try to print out entire copies of the course schedule. Questions raised included how the system would show open seats and how the information at the front of the course schedule would be available. Ms. Deen reported that the Registrar's website will be updated soon to include links to all this information and would have a complete pdf that would be updated periodically. Ms. Deen also indicated that the Registrar's Office would be willing to visit groups to give a demo on using the system. Several faculty members expressed a desire to have a limited number of hard copies available as they are useful for faculty members, particularly when working with advisees. Ms. Deen noted that there would be a few printed versions this fall but the hope is to eliminate the need for these in the future.

Associate Provost for Academic Administration

Associate Provost Burns indicated that the University Theme Committee is welcoming faculty to submit ideas for a theme by October 23. He suggested they be broad concepts that could be relevant in multiple ways across disciplines.

VI. Committee Elections

Nominations were accepted for open Senate committee positions. A Mowrey/Edeh motion to close nominations and cast a unanimous vote for all unopposed candidates was passed without dissent.

As three election ballots had been completed, nominations for At-Large members were accepted for all remaining open seats. A Mowrey/Warmkessel motion to close At-Large nominations and cast a unanimous vote for all unopposed candidates was passed without dissent.

VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

GERC

Senator Warmkessel distributed documents relating to the October 31 meeting planned to address General Education issues. Dr. Börger-Greco encouraged all senators to attend. Dr. Warmkessel noted that discussion would be centered around three topics, that discussion of each topic would be limited to 15 minutes at a time with the option to extend in 5-minute increments and that each topic would be concluded with a non-binding straw vote by senators. Dr. Warmkessel requested that senators review the topics with their departments and bring comments and input to the meeting.

GERC then addressed their proposal that Senate endorse continuation of UNIV179 courses within learning communities in the 2007-2008 academic year. This extension is needed since the General Education curriculum has not yet been modified to adopt this

program. A question was raised regarding the faculty complement for teaching these courses. Dr. Prabhu noted that many departments are absorbing the complement and that, in some cases, the Provost's Office has applied contingency complement to support offering these courses. He emphasized the success of the program in raising retention of students involved in UNIV179 courses. It was noted that this will need to be addressed in the future when the final position of UNIV179 in the General Education Curriculum is determined. Dr. Michelle White commented on behalf of Dr. Ralph Anttonen in support of using these courses to retain exploratory students who are at risk for dropping out of college programs. The GERC proposal to endorse continuation of the pilot-testing of UNIV179 Seminars (15-20 sections) linked with Fundamentals courses in a learning community through the 2007-2008 academic year was approved without dissent.

Additional discussion arose from a suggestion from the English Department that the Fundamentals courses mirror the theme of UNIV179 sections to which they are linked. It was noted that the extent to which this happens depends on the faculty members involved. An additional comment highlighted the fact that course assignments are not always made soon enough to allow for adequate cooperation. The recommendation was that plans for next year be made in a timely fashion to allow faculty sufficient time to effectively make this connection for these courses.

The GERC proposal to continue granting General Education equivalence for UNIV179 was approved without dissent.

The GERC proposal to continue the provisional authority granted to GERC to approve topics and General Education block designation for proposed sections of UNIV179, to be followed by review in the appropriate School Curriculum Committee for review and approval of General Education designation before counting for General Education credit, was approved without dissent.

Academic Outcomes and Assessment

Senator White expressed thanks and excitement about the attendance of 42 persons at the luncheon on General Education assessment.

UCPRC/GCPRC

Senators White and Mowrey distributed a memo to Senate regarding their findings in reviewing the progression of approval processes for DL format in MU courses. They concluded that, prior to the Local Meet and Discuss agreement shared with Faculty Senate on March 21, 2006, MU courses could be changed to a DL format based solely on review by the department in which they were taught. They recommended that any courses first taught as DL in any semester prior to Summer I 2006 would need to present evidence of approval by the department or could be voluntarily submitted to the current review policy, but course changes made after that point would be subject to the terms of the expedited approval process implemented by Meet and Discuss. Dr. Prabhu responded that the CBA contains a two-level review specification, allowing for each institution to

establish its own implementation process. He expressed concern that the department-only approach did not meet this CBA policy that had been in place. A comment was made that periodic review would help ensure that quality is maintained. It was also mentioned that these policies should not be enforced retroactively. Dr. Burns noted that the previous CBA contained similar language regarding DL approval. It was recommended that discussion of this issue should move to Meet and Discuss.

GCPRC

Senator Mowrey distributed a proposal for review from GCPRC addressing the academic standing of graduate students receiving 2 C grades or an F grade. Dr. Mowrey also referenced the Governance Manual charge to GCPRC to name the Graduate Faculty and distributed the 2006-2007 list of Graduate Faculty at Millersville University.

VIII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

Dr. Kathleen Schreiber requested that any additional questions or comments regarding the recommended establishment of an Honor Code Council be submitted for review by the Ad Hoc Honor Code Committee.

IX. Proposed Courses and Programs

None

X. Faculty Emeritus

None

XI. University Planning Council

UPC visited Senate to share a draft of Millersville's Vision Statement. The UPC was charged with creating a vision statement, strategic directions for meeting that vision and related outcomes assessments. This was initiated using information from the research conducted last year on vision and identity on campus and in the broader community. UPC purposely developed the vision statement independently of current strategic plans on campus with the intention of reviewing these in light of the new Vision Statement.

Dr. Prabhu introduced the members in attendance. Dr. Frank Bremer noted inclusion of comments from the online survey completed by faculty regarding our vision as well as identity information from external input. UPC now plans to present the draft statement across campus for feedback. He emphasized the need for the Vision Statement to reflect MU to a wide range of audiences. Specifically, he highlighted commitment to excellence, passion for learning, diversity and stewardship as reflecting common themes from faculty although not consensus. He also commented that the committee debated over a statement that is sufficiently visionary and that there needed to be a path somewhere between "as is with improvements" and a "whole new reality." Furthermore, he noted that there should

be ways to test our commitments since performance indicates a concrete reality needed to achieve the vision.

Dr. Jim Fenwick noted that the committee would now like to get faculty feedback on the vision statement and strategic directions. He noted that comments could be sent to Maureen Feller or shared with committee members. Discussion followed indicating that the drafted statement appears to be active but might benefit by elimination of mechanistic statements. Another issue was that use of the word “region” seemed limiting. Dr. Bremer noted that the intended region is large, citing perhaps the Mid-Atlantic or East Coast. He noted purposeful deletion of reference to the PASSHE system. A question was raised regarding whether departments would be specifically reviewed. Dr. Prabhu noted that the vision should provide more in the way of direction and framework. Dr. Bremer commented that this should also help us see the big picture of why our current evaluative processes are in place.

The UPC was asked which single sentence they felt could not be removed from the statement. It was noted that some of the statement helps to define what is meant by terms like “commitment to excellence” and “service to the Commonwealth.” The UPC was encouraged to consider further distilling the statement to more succinct phrasing.

XII. 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 GCPRC motion to amend the September 19, 2006 minutes to specify an implementation date of Fall 2007 for the approved GCPRC motion regarding transfer credits was approved without dissent.

The minutes of the September 19, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

A Blazer/Warmkessel motion to move elections to item VI in the agenda was approved without dissent.

A Mowrey/Edeh motion to close nominations and cast a unanimous vote for all unopposed candidates was passed without dissent.

A Mowrey/Warmkessel motion to close At-Large nominations and cast a unanimous vote for all unopposed candidates was passed without dissent.

The GERC proposal to endorse continuation of the pilot-testing of UNIV179 Seminars (15-20 sections) linked with Fundamentals courses in a learning community through the 2007-2008 academic year was approved without dissent.

The GERC proposal to continue granting General Education equivalence for UNIV179 was approved without dissent.

The GERC proposal to continue the provisional authority granted to GERC to approve topics and General Education block designation for proposed sections of UNIV179, to be followed by review in the appropriate School Curriculum Committee for review and approval of General Education designation before counting for General Education credit, was approved without dissent.

Attachment #1

Continuation of Elements and Alternatives to the Gen Ed Proposal (10/03/06)

Proposal Element	Rationale	Possible alternatives
<p>Retain the W course designation but change the requirement from 4 to 3 courses with reinstatement of a class size limit of 25 and the original elements of the W designation.</p>	<p>There are few who would argue against the idea of writing-across-the-curriculum. Response to the Gen Ed Survey last spring overwhelmingly supported the retention of W courses and advocated changes to increase their effectiveness. For budgetary reasons in the late 1990s, class size limits for W courses were raised and the original elements for designation as a W course were made optional. Our proposal reinstates the original intentions of the W initiative and is expected to increase its effectiveness. Changing the number of W's required will preserve some measure of cost savings.</p>	<p>Keep the current 4 W course requirement with reinstated class size and required elements.</p>
<p>Add more explicit encouragement of diversity by creating a D designation for courses (similar to W writing courses) and encourage students to take these courses through advisement.</p>	<p>It is vital for our students to grow in their understanding of diversity. This is part of our University's mission. It is important that this occurs in co-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. While "diversity" has many different meanings, we recommend using the objective below to inform course designation. <u>Proposed diversity objective:</u> Students will grow in their engagement with peoples of diverse histories and communities, both inside and outside the United States. Aligned with Characteristic 2.</p>	<p>Add no specific course designations but encourage students to build diversity into their program of study through advisement.</p> <p>Create the D designation and require students to take at least one such course somewhere in their program of studies.</p>
<p>Eliminate the requirement that exactly two courses must be taken from a single department in each G block.</p>	<p>The "at least two but no more than two" rule was an effort to legislate depth while not sacrificing breadth, but it has caused excess complexity and confusion. With a commitment to increasing flexibility and simplicity (Characteristic 6) in a revised curriculum, these restrictions should be lifted. Breadth and depth are encouraged by good advisement, the distribution of courses into three academic blocks, P courses, and increased interdisciplinarity in the curriculum.</p>	<p>Keep the current requirement.</p>

Purpose and Objectives for General Education: (Gen Ed Review Committee 10/03/06)

Purpose

Consistent with Millersville University's mission to provide a liberal arts-based education, the purpose of General Education is to provide breadth of knowledge as a balance and complement to the depth provided by the major. This is necessary for the holistic development of Millersville graduates as responsible citizens.

General Education Objectives:

Students, working with advisors, and taking into consideration prior knowledge and experience, purposefully select courses in the General Education curriculum that work together with required courses, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, and courses in the major to achieve the following objectives:

Foundations for Critical Thinking

1. Students will think, speak and write clearly. This is evidenced by:
 - a) the clear presentation of ideas in formal spoken, written, and media forms.
 - b) the use of effective communication for ongoing dialogue.
 - c) the ability to find appropriate sources of information, evaluate that information, and integrate that information into a final product.

Critical Thinking in the Disciplines

2. In mathematics students will:
 - a) employ statistical methods to analyze and interpret data or employ techniques of calculus to solve problems.
 - b) formulate and solve problems from the real world using the symbolic language of mathematics with technology as appropriate.
3. In social sciences students will:
 - a) evaluate relationships among human behavior, social institutions, culture, and/or environment using the quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry of the social sciences and using technology as appropriate.
 - b) evaluate and apply social science data and theories in the course of participating as informed citizens in a democracy that exists within an increasingly complex global society.
4. In the sciences students will:
 - a) use the scientific method, laboratory study, appropriate technology, and mathematics to investigate and evaluate scientific concepts and theories.
 - b) evaluate and apply scientific data and theories.
5. In the humanities students will:
 - a) use critical analysis to respond thoughtfully to works of literature.
 - b) apply critical and creative methods of the arts and humanities using technology as appropriate.

Connections Within and Beyond The Classroom

6. Students will connect important ideas and methods of inquiry from different disciplines as a means of becoming holistic and responsible citizens; specifically students will:

- a) demonstrate civic and social responsibility.
- b) grow in their engagement with peoples of diverse histories and communities, both inside and outside the United States.
- c) build the foundation for a lifelong process of understanding, developing, and monitoring healthy lifestyle behaviors in all dimensions of wellness, including physical, social, emotional, intellectual, spiritual, and environmental wellness.
- d) gain personal enrichment by developing new interests that can be enjoyed throughout a lifetime.

Attachment #2

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 28, 2006

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rebecca Mowrey, Chair GCPRC;
Janet White, Chair UCPRC

RE: Findings re. the Progression of Approval Processes for DL delivery format courses at MU

I. Policy pertaining to all undergraduate and graduate DL delivery format courses taught at MU ***prior to February 2, 2006***:

approved through Senate – sent to Provost McNairy:

“...courses are approved through procedure set forth (date) – if an already existing course is to be taught in DL then the course only needs to be approved at the department level.”

II. The July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2007 CBA policy addresses DL delivery of courses:
Article 42, E.

2. New credit bearing courses, which may be offered through distance education, must be approved through the normal course approval procedure at the University.
3. Existing credit bearing courses, which may be offered through distance education shall be reviewed by the department and University curriculum committee, which shall each provide its recommendation to the President or his / her designee. Each University shall develop, at local meet and discuss, an expedited procedure to complete this review within thirty (30) days.

Although many suggestions and proposals were made to Senate between 1999 and 2006, no official action was taken until Spring 2006.

- III. MU Policy pertaining to all DL delivery format courses taught at MU *after February 3, 2006* (date of Local Meet and Discuss agreement re. DL course approval):

February 3, 2006 MU Meet and Discuss Agreement:

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.

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.

- IV. March 21, 2006: Local Meet and Discuss Agreement Shared with Faculty Senate re. the 30 day expedited DL Delivery Format Course Approval Process. APC also shares definition of “blended” DL courses. (March 21, 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes).

- V. University Curriculum Committee Chairs’ Findings:

Fall 2006: Departments offering DL courses through the Spring 2006 Semester, required approval of their Department only. Until February, 2006, University Policy (Governance Manual) only required the approval of the department in order for a course to be offered in the new format. Departments will provide documentation of department approval (department teaching schedules, or department meeting minutes, or course change approval forms) to administration as requested for DL courses taught prior to Summer Session I, 2006.

All courses taught in DL for the first time after February, 2006 (Summer I Semester, 2006) will follow the appropriate course approval process. New courses will complete the full course approval process as outlined in the Curriculum Proposal Process, and existing courses will follow the expedited Meet and Discuss approval process.

Observation Comment:

If course approval policies are changed, there is no known precedent that requires previously offered courses to be re-approved. Academic Administration approves all Department semester schedules prior to submitting them to the Office of the Registrar for printing and posting; therefore, Academic Administration is fully aware of course offerings and delivery formats for each department, each and every semester of the academic calendar.

Documentation of Related Faculty Senate Discussions / Actions:

Until

Dr. Roller will draft an administrative summary outlining the step-by-step process for approving courses for Distance Learning. The completed document will be shared with Faculty Senate for their review. (?)

Dec. 2, 2003:

“Proposal to Senate from Senator Wismer seeking clarification of DL policy: it should be handled as a minor change and therefore should also seek school curriculum committee approval. After some discussion, the proposal was sent to the Academic Policies Committee after a Mowrey/Wisner motion to refer it to the Committee passed. After discussion by the Academic Policies Committee, it is anticipated that the policy will be brought back to the Faculty Senate for further discussion and consideration.

Oct 5, 2004

Academic Policies Committee: Course and Program Procedures

Senator Rosenthal acted as the Chair for this discussion.

This proposal proposed course and program approval process for distance learning new courses and programs. A lengthy discussion of these issues took place:

If distance learning is considered a "pedagogical approach", no process for course and program approval beyond the department is needed.

Guidelines are needed for faculty proposing distance learning courses.

CBA has a process already delineated for existing courses being changed to distance learning.

Kerper/Rohena motion was passed to send the proposal to the Academic Policy Committee to review again in light of the new CBA procedures. It was unanimously approved.

De Caria/Bookmiller motion was passed to advise the Academic Policy Committee to develop guidelines for distance learning courses. It was approved with one dissenting vote from Senator Rohena.

July 18, 2005 – revised policy from Academic Policy Committee passes during summer Faculty Senate. Revisions do not appear in any University documents and not distributed to UCPRC. Revisions do not apply to GCPRC and graduate courses. Further complications: The revisions were never attached to Faculty Senate minutes during first or second reading and do not appear in Senate Minute archives; revisions do not appear in APC annual report; revised policy does not appear in Governance Manual. In essence - no policy and never implemented at UCPRC nor by Administration as Department teaching schedules continue to be approved by Administration / Deans.

March 21, 2006 Distance Learning (DL) Course Approval Process Revised:
Revisions were made to the definition of "blended courses." The proposal was approved by Faculty Senate on 3/21/2006 and appears in the minutes.

[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.

Attachment #3

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 28, 2006

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rebecca Mowrey, GCPRC Chairperson

RE: Addition to Academic Standing Policy Regarding Graduate Student Dismissal
for Grades of "C" or "F".

Background Information and Current Academic Standing Policy:

Currently, no comprehensive graduate academic standing policy exists at Millersville University to dismiss a student for earning multiple grades of "C" or below. Such policies are common among graduate institutions as a means of enforcing quality standards on graduate student academic performance, and such policies exist in selected MU graduate degree programs.

Under current policy, a Millersville graduate student may earn an unlimited number of "C" grades as long as they are offset by an appropriate number of "A" grades to keep a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or better. The Academic Standing Policy, found on page 22 of the MU Graduate Studies 2006-07 Catalog, reads as follows:

"Graduate degree students are required to maintain a B grade average. A student who fails to meet the scholarship standards may be dismissed from a degree or graduate level certification program. If a student falls below a 3.0 average, he/she will be placed on probation. Failure to raise the grade average to a minimum of 3.0 during the next semester in which the student is enrolled will result in dismissal from graduate studies at Millersville University. (Summer is considered a semester.)"

(Proposed Language to be Inserted Here)

"Individual departments may have scholarship requirements beyond this minimum level; students should consult their adviser and the *Academic Program* section of the catalog. Students may appeal dismissal to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research."

Proposed Language and Implementation:

The proposed addition to the Academic Standing Policy is based on language used by two of our sister PASSHE institutions (Shippensburg and West Chester). Should governance pass this policy change, the new language would be inserted between the current two paragraphs in the

Academic Standing Policy of the Graduate Catalogue, and this policy would take effect with the Fall 2007 Semester. Departments would be able to continue to hold an academic performance

standard that exceeds the proposed Graduate Student Dismissal Policy for “C” and “F” Grades through the enforcement of existing degree program standards, or by presenting a change of Degree Requirement proposal through the regular policy review process for Graduate Degrees.

Proposed Addition to the Graduate Student Academic Standing Policy:

“Students who earn two grades of “C” will receive an academic warning, regardless of GPA. Earning a third grade of “C” will result in academic dismissal, regardless of GPA. This includes any courses that have been repeated and replaced with a higher grade. A “C” grade earned at Millersville University may not be made up at another institution of higher learning for the same course.”

“A graduate student earning an “F” grade in any course will be dismissed from graduate study at Millersville University. An “F” grade earned at Millersville University may not be made up at another institution of higher learning for the same course.”

Addendum #1: Shippensburg University Policy

Dismissal for C Grades

You may earn only one C grade in any graduate course taken at Shippensburg University. This includes any courses which have been repeated and replaced with a higher grade. If you earn two C grades you will be dismissed from the university. A C grade earned at Shippensburg University may not be made up at another institution of higher learning for the same course.

Dismissal for F Grades

If you earn an F grade in any graduate course taken at Shippensburg University, you will be dismissed from the university. An F grade earned at Shippensburg University may not be made up at another institution of higher learning for the same course.

Addendum #2: West Chester University Policy

Students who receive two grades of C+ or below will receive an academic warning, regardless of GPA. Receipt of a third grade of C+ or below will result in academic dismissal, regardless of GPA.

A graduate student earning a D or an F grade in any course will be dismissed from the University. Exceptions may be made for a course outside the student's discipline upon the recommendation of the graduate coordinator and the approval of the graduate dean. A D or an F earned at West Chester University may not be made up at another institution of higher learning for the same course.

Grades earned during summer sessions count the same as grades earned during the academic year. All grades recorded determine the student's academic status, even if a student changes degree programs. Students dropped from a graduate program due to unsatisfactory work will not be permitted to take courses for credit towards a graduate degree in that department beyond the semester in which they are dropped.

Attachment #4

Millersville University 2006 – 2007 Graduate Faculty

Graduate Faculty in Art:

Robert Andriulli
Barbara Bensus
Shauna Frischkorn
Marianne Kerlavage
Nancy Rae Mata
Brigid O'Hanrahan
Jeri Robinson
Brant Schuller
Deborah Sigel
William W. Wolf

Graduate Faculty in Business Administration:

David Brady
Howard Ellis
J. Douglas Frazer
Joseph Galante
Gary Leinberger
Behnam Nakhai

Graduate Faculty in Biology:

Julie Ambler
Jean Boal
Judith Cebra-Thomas
James Cosentino
Dominique Dagit
Susan DiBartolomeis
David Dobbins
Christopher Hardy
Carol Hepfer
John Hoover
Timothy Ladd
Aimee Miller
James Mone
Joel Piperberg
Larry Reinking
Sandra Turchi
Ryan Wagner
John Wallace
LaVern Whisenton-Davidson
Daniel Yocom
David Zegers

Graduate Faculty in Educational Foundations:

Deborah Curry
Sandra Deemer
Cheryl Desmond
Nanette I. Marcum - Dietrich
Linda McDowell
Dominic Scott
E. Elliott Seda
Nancy Smith
Barbara Stengel
John Ward

**Graduate Faculty in El. Ed., Early
Childhood Ed., , and Language and
Literacy Ed..**

Christine Anthony
Lesley Colabucci

Graduate Faculty in Foreign Lang.

Marci Antolin
Margaret-Ana Borger - Greco

Mary Ann Gray – Schlegel
Kimberly Heilshorn
Persida Himmele
William Himmele
Sandra Hoffman
**Cont. Elementary Ed., Early Childhood Ed.,
and Language and Literacy Ed.**

Kazi Hossain
Yvonne King
Richard Kerper
Joseph Labant
Alice Meckley
Barbara Marinak
Marcia Nell
Jane Rudden
Donna Topping
James Valle
Judith Wenrich
Lillie West

Graduate Faculty in English:

Jane Alden
Robert Carballo
Steven Centola
Roberta Jill Craven
Frank Duba
Kerrie Farkas
Judith Halden – Sullivan
Alan Kelly
Timothy Mayers
Kimberly McCollum - Clark
Steven Miller
Timothy Miller
Melinda Rosenthal
Beverly Schneller
M. P.A. Sheaffer
Kenneth Shields
Duckhee Shin
Beverly Skinner
Martha Widmayer

Graduate Faculty in Nursing:

Christine Gaudry - Hudson
Leroy Hopkins
Andre Moine
Susanne Nimmrichter
Norma Rivera-Hernandez

Graduate Faculty in History:

Francis Bremer
Gloria Chuku
Dennis Downey
Ronald Frankum
David Fortin
Tanya Kevorkian
Clarence V. H. Maxwell
John McLarnon
Robert Sayre
Erin Shelor
Saulius Suziedelis
Tracey Weis

Graduate Faculty in Mathematics:

Dorothee Blum
J. Robert Buchanan
Antonia Cardwell
Ximena Catepillan
James Fenwick
Noel Heitman

Deborah Castellucci
Ruth Davis
C. Virginia Palmer
Barbara Zimmerman

Bruce Ikenaga
R. Kit Kittappa
Delray Schultz
Bernie Schroeder
Zhoude Shao
Lewis Shoemaker
Robert Smith
Hisaya Tsutsui
Ronald Umble
Janet White

Graduate Faculty in Psychology

Ruth Benms – Suter
Fred Foster – Clark
Shawn Gallagher
Nadine Garner
Katherine Green
Bea Gattuso Grosh
Claudia Haferkamp
David Hill
Mary Margaret Kelly
Amelia Lopez
Susan Luek
William Moyer
Helena Tuleya - Payne
Karena Rush
Rita Smith – Wade-El
Sandor Szollos
Elizabeth Thyrum
Debra Vredenburg
Tae Woo

Math. Continued:

Michael Wismer
Mingquan Zhan

Graduate Faculty in Social Work

Richard Fulmer
Ann Gantt
Heather Girvin
Kathryn Gregoire
Carol Heintzelman
Thomas Kruse

Graduate Faculty in Special Ed.

Barbara Beakley
Gwen Beegle
Ojoma Edeh
Ellen Long
Thomas Neuville
Anne Papalia-Berardi
Lucinda Ridley
Elba Rohena

Graduate Faculty in Wellness& Sport Sciences:

Mandi Dupain
Stanley Kabacinski
Daniel Keefer
Julie Lombardi
Rebecca Mowrey
Gordon Nesbitt
Jeffrey Wimer
Ying Wushanley

**Graduate Faculty in Industry and
Technolgy:**

Daniel Anna
Thomas Bell
Sharon Brusic
Barry David
Kenneth DeLucca
Perry Gemmill
Richard Johnson
George Kerkgyarto

James LaPorte
Keith Lauderbach
Len Litowitz
Joseph McCade
Mark Snyder
Paul Specht
Haig Vahradian
Scott Warner
John Wright



In this revision, the following one-paragraph statement comprises the vision statement. In an electronic format, the underlined concepts in the last sentence will provide links to the strategic directions that follow.

Our Vision Statement

A Millersville University education will empower students to make a difference in the places where they work and live. Looking to the future, the university embraces the liberal arts and sciences, and the pursuit of active, life-long learning through excellent undergraduate and graduate educational programming. We envision a future rooted in tradition while fueled by innovation that focuses on our commitment to excellence and service to the Commonwealth. This commitment will be reflected in academic programs of distinction, enhanced learning opportunities for students, faculty, and staff, and state-of-the-art educational facilities. Our student-centered community of learners will engage in free inquiry and intellectual development through an exemplary liberal arts-based education. As the University seeks out and maintains global connections, students, faculty, and staff will cultivate their understanding and appreciation of international communities, while also seeking to increase their engagement with local and regional communities. Millersville aspires to be the best public university in the region through nourishing undergraduate and graduate programs of distinction, a passion for learning, an appreciation of the liberal arts, openness to diversity of people and ideas, and responsible stewardship of our resources.

Links to Strategic Directions

Commitment to Excellence

Millersville commits to excellence in its service to students and the Commonwealth by improving and adding to our undergraduate and graduate educational programs of distinction and to our programs of civic engagement. We seek to insure that Millersville graduates will play ever greater roles in local and global communities. The University will expand its investment in strategic partnerships with a variety of public and private institutions and businesses in order to provide students with innovative learning opportunities and help them develop habits of civic engagement. Already recognized as one of the top public universities in the north, Millersville's commitment to excellence guarantees that we will continue to offer students the best value in higher education.

Passion for Learning

Central to Millersville University's vision for the future is an environment in which faculty and students are passionate about learning. As faculty continue to conduct scholarship, their research will expand the frontiers of knowledge and their insights will enrich student learning. In this environment, students become active life-long learners engaged in a variety of educational settings inside and outside the classroom. The University's vigilance and flexibility in supporting instruction and delivering services will guarantee free inquiry and ensure the quality of all undergraduate and graduate programs. As hallmarks of the Millersville experience, small class size, personalized instruction, and effective support services stimulate the future student's passion for learning.

Liberal Arts

Millersville University believes that a foundation in the liberal arts, combined with specialized content knowledge, is the best way to prepare students for their first jobs and to provide them with the skills for career flexibility that is critical in an age of rapid change. At Millersville Students will master the fundamentals of the liberal arts and of their major field of study, acquire real life experiences, and become productive citizens in a multicultural, global society. We envision a culture of free inquiry and self-reflective learning, in which the arts, humanities, sciences, and social sciences together foster the educationally mature personality.

Diversity and Equity

Millersville University will enhance the diversity of thought and perspective in our community because we believe diversity to be a source of enrichment and intellectual growth. Members of the community will be empowered by policies that promote fairness, justice, civility, and accessibility. The University will continually renew itself as a place where inquiry is encouraged, ideas are expressed openly, and the dignity and rights of individuals are protected.

Responsible Stewardship

Millersville University is committed to a future of effective stewardship with all its vested resources. Responsible stewardship requires flexibility to work within available resources and to expand resources in order to provide students with the best possible instruction and services, as well as provide faculty and staff with quality of life in the educational setting. As responsible stewards, all members of the University community will promote the important principles of civic engagement. We are committed to innovation to achieve our goals while preserving the traditions that make the University an excellent institution of learning.

Comments: Please mail or e-mail to:

Maureen Feller- Planning, Assessment, and Research

Dilworth 110

Maureen.Feller@millersville.edu Ph: x2390