

# MINUTES FACULTY SENATE MEETING

## 25 February 1997

---

Chairperson D. Eidam called the special meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. in Chryst Hall, Room 210. All departmental senators except those from the Art, Educational Foundations, History, Music, Nursing, Political Science, and Sociology and Anthropology Departments attended.

### Business

#### Report of the Task Force on the General Education Curriculum and Academic Resources

The only business of today's special meeting concerned the report of the Task Force on the General Education Curriculum and Academic Resources (see Attachment A of the 19 November 1996 minutes, pages 4122-4126). Senate's General Education Review Committee reported on the Task Force's report at the 4 and 18 February 1997 senate meetings (see Attachment A, pages 4155-4156, of the 4 February 1997 senate minutes and Attachment B of the 18 February 1997 senate minutes). At the 18 February 1997 senate meeting, chairperson D. Eidam recognized senator J. McCade. McCade placed on the table in Chryst 210 four written motions regarding the report of the General Education Review Task Force (see Attachment A of the 18 February 1997 senate meeting). He asked to make the motions one at a time at that meeting.

At the 18 February meeting, senate passed McCade's first and second motions but defeated his third motion. Before it voted on the fourth motion, it decided to vote on six motions from the GERC report (Attachment A of the 4 February 1997 senate minutes). Senate approved motions 1 and 2 and an amended motion 3 from the GERC report. It postponed debate on motion 4 until today's special meeting.

Senate resumed debate on the GERC's motion 4: "That items in group 2 (The minor changes group: items 1, 2, and 6 under phase 1) be sent to the GERC for rewriting and clarification, in consultation with members of the task force, after which they will be brought back to senate for approval or disapproval as individual items. That we recommend that these items not be included in the package to be approved or disapproved as a whole by the entire faculty."

Chairperson D. Eidam recognized senator C. Stameshkin, chairperson of the GERC committee, to discuss motion 4. Stameshkin discussed the "Write to Learn" handout from B. Duncan (see Attachment A of today's minutes). She said the "Write to Learn" proposal might be a replacement for item 6 ("Keep the four W requirement without the 10-page revised prose requirement. Etc."). While not approved by the English Department, the "Write to Learn" proposal has been discussed there.

Senator M. Rosenthal said the English Department did discuss the proposal at its last meeting. She said the English Department was not so concerned with the specifics as with the continued ability and responsibility of instructors teaching W courses to carry out the intent. The Department would prefer this statement, "In principle, the Department supports the original intent and the original enrollment figures for W labeled courses." She said the English Department had not approved the "Write to Learn" document.

Senator D. Hutchens said several people he knew discussed motion 4 and its rationale. They proposed the following: Return the items back to the task force and senate will simply vote on them. Senator C. Stameshkin said her committee had made editorial changes to the items. The task force does not adequately describe the rationale for items 1 and 2. If the faculty is to vote on it, the rationales needs to be expanded for everyone to see.

Parliamentarian C. Scharnberger pointed out that we have an odd situation if senate passes the motion. The administration (and APSCUF leadership) bilaterally made two changes in general education. They reduced the number of required Perspectives courses from two to one and removed the ten pages of revised prose W requirement. Would the faculty endorse the changes? The changes are in items 1, 2, and 6. The task force added other things along the way. The core issue the process was supposed to deal with was whether the faculty as a whole was or was not endorsing the APSCUF and administration's action with regard to P and W courses. Senate short circuits the whole process if it does not submit the changes to the faculty.

After considerable additional discussion, senate defeated motion 4. Senate began discussion of motion 5. Senator C. Stameshkin said she was withdrawing motion 5 given the defeat of motion 4. Finally, senate agreed that motion 6 was not on the floor.

Senate returned to senator J. McCade's Motion #4 "(That senate) discuss the specific recommendations one (group) by one (group), limit the discussion of each to no more than 30 minutes and entertain motions on concept at no later than the 25 minute mark." Chairperson D. Eidam recognized senator J. McCade to speak to the motion. McCade said senate needed to create limits and provide structure for its discussion. The most productive approach is to start with a motion and deal with it. If senate says it has only X number of hours, it will not get to the important issues. Senator D. Hutchens said senate needed a plan to proceed. Eidam reminded senate that it had already agreed to discuss the items in three groups.

J. McCade/S. Peters moved motion 4. There would be three groups and each would cover 30 minutes. Senate would complete the discussion of all groups in no more than 90 minutes. Parliamentarian C. Scharnberger interpreted the motion to mean senate was limiting debate. A motion to limit debate requires a two-thirds majority vote. McCade said he wanted senate to vote on the outstanding motions at the end of the time limit. Senator C. Stameshkin said there were really only two groups (2 and 3) not three. She asked that senators be allowed to make motions any time during the allotted minutes. The original motion was amended to discuss two groups in two forty-five minute periods. The motion to amend passed. The amended original motion passed also.

Parliamentarian C. Scharnberger said he was uncomfortable with a procedure that left motions "hanging in the air" until a last minute vote. Scharnberger said deliberative bodies deal with motions one at a time as a basic principle of parliamentary procedure. No new motion should be introduced unless an older motion was disposed of in some way. Senate voted to approve the Scharnberger interpretation.

Senate proceeded to discuss Group 2 (items 1,2, and 6 of Phase 1). Chairperson D. Eidam said the 45 minute clock was starting. Senator R. Wismer spoke to item 6 of phase 1. He said he did not object at all to B. Duncan's proposal. However, the proposal was not the intent of what the task force was after. The task force's intent for Phase 1 was to say the changes were interim measures. The idea was to plug current holes with interim measures.

W. Dorman moved that senate request the task force to express the interim nature of Phase 1, item 6, in their final report. The motion carried. A J. McCade/W. Dorman motion to request the task force to include the language of B. Duncan in her "Write to Learn" document with regard to Phase 1, item 6, carried. A D. Hutchens/J. McCade motion to request the task force to include information about the history and/or historical nature of item 6 also passed.

Senators C. Stameshkin and R. Kerper said that item 2, Phase 1, was unclear. Kerper wanted a clarification of the G4 part of the liberal arts core. A R. Kerper/C. McLeod motion to recommend that the task force clarify the difference between the liberal arts core and other similar terms such as the general education curriculum passed. The motion's intent is for the task force to suggest some appropriate language to senate.

Senate then began to discuss item 1 of Phase 1. Senator R. Kerper discussed problems the School of Education has with item 1. M. Warmkessel/D. Hutchens moved to request that the task force eliminate part a of the rationale for item 1 of Phase 1. A motion to amend the Warmkessel/Hutchens motion by replacing the word "eliminate" with "clarify" passed. Senate then passed the amended motion.

Senate began the discussion of Group 3, the major change group that includes items 3, 4, and 5 under Phase 1 and items 3 and 4 under Phase 2. Senator D. Hutchens said that the Computer Science Department opposes item 4 of phase 1 (Drop the QARC label but require that every student take at least one MATH or CSCI course). He said the CS Department does not want CS101 flooded by students avoiding a mathematics course.

At this point senate agreed to stop the clock and stopped further discussion of group 3 items. Instead it heard a presentation that included an example of the linkage between a statement of institutional purpose, departmental/program intended outcomes/objectives, and assessment criteria at MU (see Attachment B). When senate meets on Tuesday, 4 March 1997, it will resume discussion of group 3 items with 40 minutes remaining on the clock.

**Administrative Approvals** (See Attachment C).

Senate adjourned at 5:45 PM. The next meeting will be Tuesday, 4 March 1997, from 4:05 - 5:45 p.m. in Chryst 210.

Respectfully submitted,

Marvin Margolis, Secretary  
Faculty Senate

## **Action Summary**

25 February 1997

---

### 1. Motions Concerning the Report of the Task Force on the General Education Curriculum and Academic Resources

Senate agreed to discuss the specific recommendations of groups 2 and 3, limit the discussion of each group to no more than 45 minutes, and entertain motions at any time during the 45 minutes. Senate is to take action on one motion before moving to a second motion. At the end of the 45 minutes allotted for a group, senate must vote on any outstanding motion.

Senate recommended that the task force express the interim nature of Phase 1, item 6, in their final report.

Senate requested that the task force include the language of B. Duncan's "Write to Learn" document with regard to Phase 1, item 6. It also requested the task force to include information about the history and/or historical nature of item 6.

Senate requested that the task force clarify in item 2, Phase 1, the difference between the liberal arts core and other similar terms such as the general education curriculum.

Senate requested the task force to clarify part a of the rationale for item 1 of Phase 1.

**Attachment A**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**19 November 1996**

---

**TASK FORCE ON THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM  
AND ACADEMIC RESOURCES**

**I. Composition of the Task Force**

The Task Force shall consist of 10 members to be selected in the following manner:

1. Four faculty members appointed by the APSCUF President
2. Four faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate,
3. Two non-voting members serving in an ex-officio capacity appointed by the President.

The chairperson shall be a faculty member from this group appointed by the APSCUF President.

**II. The Charge to the Task Force**

The Task Force shall consider reports submitted by the three task forces created by the Provost, the General Education Review committee, various administrative and faculty bodies, and individual faculty members, and following an analysis of these finds, the Task Force will issue a report consisting of specific recommendations regarding the interim curriculum measures as well as any other matters pertaining to general education specifically and/or to the university curriculum in general.

**III. Methodology**

The Task Force will hold hearings in schools, solicit recommendations from departments, individual faculty, and the administration, and review data submitted by the Faculty Senate's General Education Review Committee and the Provost's appointed task forces.

**IV. Process**

The Task Force will submit its report to the Faculty Senate by the end of the spring

1996 semester. After receiving the recommendations of the Task Force, the Faculty Senate will deliberate and send any revisions and/or recommendations back to the Task Force by October 1, 1996. The Task Force will consider the suggestions of the Faculty Senate and submit its final report to the Faculty Senate for an "up or down" vote by November 1, 1996. The APSCUF President will send the Task Force report along with the Faculty Senate endorsement or rejection to the full faculty for a referendum by December 1, 1996.

Rev. 2/14/96

---

## **GENERAL EDUCATION REVISION PLAN**

**11/13/96**

### **Task Force on General Education Curriculum and Academic Resources**

#### **Historical Background**

Three factors led to the formation of this task force:

1. The shrinking support from the Commonwealth for public higher education.
2. The consensus that budgets will continue to shrink in the foreseeable future.
3. The realization that the existing curriculum can be made more cost effective.

This recommendation on General Education is an attempt to address these issues. We have tried to preserve the goals and philosophy of General Education at Millersville University. We feel that this is preferable to the administration imposing a solution or to other outside parties dictating remedies to us. We welcome your comments.

#### **Rationale for why we want/need to revise the General Education Program:**

- Simplify the General Education Program for the student and for the university. A simpler program will help with the planning of seat needs in the schedule, will reduce the number of curricular exceptions currently being processed, and will make advisement less of a number counting activity and allow advisor and advisee to focus on meeting the educational goals of the student. Furthermore, streamlining makes it more feasible for students to graduate in a timely fashion.
- 1.

#### **Quality and cost**

- In order to enhance quality and reduce costs, it is necessary to streamline and increase the efficiency of the current curriculum. This can be accomplished by using University resources more effectively to maintain small sections at the advanced undergraduate level while increasing class size at the introductory undergraduate level in certain
- 2.

identified courses. Certain curriculum requirements in the General Education portion of the curriculum can be eliminated and/or modified in such a way as to ensure quality, but bring about important cost savings.

Need to develop a process for demonstrating to ourselves, our students, their parents, and other constituencies that the general education program does, indeed, deliver what it claims to deliver.

3. The goals of the General Education Program are not stated in a measurable form. The way in which we currently show that students have met the objectives of general education is simply by verifying, before graduation, that they have taken the required number of labels. This is not sufficient to demonstrate that they have, in fact, acquired the skills which our general education program purports to deliver.

**Time frame:** Phase 1 will be developed and implemented by Fall 1997, Phase 2 by Fall 1999.

## PHASE 1

Keep the current general education curriculum of 54 hours. Blocks G1, G2, and G3 remain the same. Create a Block G4 in which ENGL 100, COMM 100, AW, HPE and one P course and one Elective are required (18 s.h.)

1. **Rationale:**
  - a. This provides a place for existing P courses from the School of Education.
  - b. The elective in G4 may be a second P course or it may be a course normally counted in Blocks G1, G2, or G3. It should be useful for the hundreds of students who are undeclared or who change majors.

Consistent with past practice, up to four courses from the list of "Required Related" courses for a major may be counted in the Gen. Ed. Curriculum. One of these four may

2. be counted as the elective in Block G4, in which case, only three may be counted in Block G1, G2, or G3.  
**Rationale:** This will provide more flexibility for the student.

Drop all C and Q labels from the requirements for all students enrolled in Fall 1997 and thereafter.

3. **Rationale:** Very few students have difficulty satisfying the CQ requirement. Many students take more courses with these labels than required. The committee believes that removing the requirement will not diminish the enrollment in these types of courses and students will continue to take the same number of CQ courses even without the requirement. This will assist in meeting our goal of simplifying the curriculum.

4. Drop the QARC label but require that every student take at least one MATH or CSCI course.

**Rationale:** This is viewed as a basic liberal arts requirement in the same sense as ENGL 110, COMM 100 and HPE. The current QARC requirement is really a MATH/CSCI requirement and dropping this obscure label will simplify/clarify the requirement.

Reduce the requirement of four 200-level courses in gen. ed. to three.

**Rationale:**

5.
  - a. This is intended to reduce the number of requirements for graduation and to increase the probability of graduating in four years.
  - b. This should make room for some large enrollment 100-level courses and thus address Rationale #2.

Keep the four W requirement without the 10-page revised prose requirement. Faculty teaching W courses will be encouraged to fulfill the W requirement in a variety of ways. The workshops in Writing Across the Curriculum given by Dr. Centola and Dr. Tim Miller provide dozens of ways and means to introduce writing activities. These alternatives may include short papers, essays exams, and in-class writing exercises. Each instructor can select an appropriate combination for his/her course.

6.

**Rationale:** This is in response to the increased class size in W courses.

## PHASE 2

**Preamble:** The Task Force members felt that an alternative approach to fulfilling the goals of General Education is worth considering. The course labels of W, C, Q and QARC were intended to ensure that certain kinds of learning experiences took place for all students.

A criticism leveled at the current General Education curriculum is that it is too prescriptive, too inflexible, and too complex to cope with. It presents difficulties for students and advisors who are trying to negotiate it and it presents difficult staffing and scheduling problems in a time when resources are scarce.

Members of this task force have extensive teaching experience and they have participated in the course approval process at several stages in hundreds of cases. We came to the realization that any general education course is likely to have its own unique combination of W, C, and Q components. As an alternative to designating courses as either W, C, or Q, courses may possess these components in some combination.

The steps recommended below are **not** intended as major changes in the overall purposes of Gen. Ed. They are intended to make approval of Gen. Ed. courses easier.

There is a second task we are trying to deal with via this process. MU must undergo a Middle States accreditation in the next three years and Middle States has mandated that institutions implement an outcomes based assessment program.

1. The Faculty Senate, by whatever means it deems appropriate, shall review and revise



the mission and goals of general education, and create objectives which are stated in a measurable form. Accompanying these goals shall be a compilation of ways to write Gen. Ed. course proposals and descriptions. This shall include ways to incorporate W, C, and Q components. Faculty Senate shall develop an assessment program which will evaluate whether the General Education Program is meeting its intended outcomes.

**Rationale:** These goals have not been reviewed since the mid-1980's. The Middle States accrediting agency has mandated the outcomes assessment process.

Once the goals of general education have been restated, each department shall review its approved general education courses and restate their objectives. These restatements shall be reviewed and approved by Faculty Senate or by a committee designated or established by Faculty Senate. Departments will be encouraged to

2. propose additional courses for inclusion in the General Education Program, and to consider whether some courses should be dropped from the approved list.

**Rationale:** This is intended to be a relatively simple process for existing courses. Emphasis will be on the General Education goals and how they are addressed in each course.

Departments will be encouraged to develop courses that take advantage of the new, broader criteria for gen. ed. courses. Departments also will be encouraged to develop additional courses that fulfill the AW requirement.

3. **Rationale:** This should provide more options for student and more opportunities for faculty. If departments develop AW offerings, it should provide some relief for the staffing pressures in the English Department.

Drop the requirements connected with C, Q, W and QARC. Retain the labels for course approval, advisement, and assessment purposes.

4. **Rationale:** This will relieve students and advisors of the onerous task of satisfying gen. ed. requirements in their present form. At the same time, the course designations will preserve the overall goals of gen. ed. Furthermore, we can identify where and how gen. ed. goals are achieved.

5. Other existing rules of General Education will remain in place.

#### **PROPOSED CURRICULUM:**

<b>12 credits</b>	<b>12 credits</b>	<b>12 credits</b>	<b>18 credits</b>
<b>G1 - Hum &amp; Fine Arts</b>	<b>G2 - Science/Math</b>	<b>G3 - Social Sciences</b>	<b>G4 - Fundamentals and Electives</b>
Art	Biology	Anthropology	ENGL 110
Comm. & Theatre	Chemistry	Business	COMM 100

English	Computer Science	Economics	AW*
Foreign Language	Earth Science	Geography	1 Perspective
Humanities	Mathematics	Gerontology	HPED
Music	Nursing	History	1 Elective (may be a P)
Philosophy	Physics	Political Science	
		Psychology	
		Social Work	
		Sociology	*AW courses in English or an elective if AW req. is satisfied in the major

### **Task Force on General Education Curriculum**

Dr. James Sheridan, Chair	Mr. Colin McLeod
Dr. William Dorman	Dr. Alice Meckley
Dr. Albert Hoffman	Dr. Charles Scharnberger
Dr. Terry Madonna	Dr. James Stager
Dr. Joseph McCade	Ms. Dawn White
	Dr. Robert Wismer

**Attachment A**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**4 February 1997**

---

Second Response to Task Force Recommendations

by the General Education Review Committee

The position of the GERC is that the general education task force was put in the impossible position of being asked to recommend changes to improve the present general education curriculum without having available a clear and adequate account of the objectives of the system within the university. Without such objectives, there is no reasonably objective way of setting priorities, nor of deciding how to balance the costs and benefits of possible changes.

Over the last couple of months, our committee has had several opportunities to discuss the task force recommendations and we have received considerable input from both individuals and departments. Virtually all of this input has been negative. This second response, therefore, represents the committee's more considered opinion about the recommendations:

**A. Overall, we find the recommendations to be premature, and in some cases, ill-considered.** The task force does not offer support for its claims that any of these changes will actually save **any** money, which was its original charge. Further, it seems possible that some of these changes might have a **negative impact** on the quality of the general education program, and the committee offers no evidence to the contrary. Neither common senses nor empirical studies back up these recommendations, nor did the task force consult knowledgeable individuals and departments who could have provided them with information they lacked. For example, they did not ascertain the original rationale for C and Q courses, they did not consult the English Department about the rationale for its teaching advanced composition courses, nor did they check the catalogue to test their assumption that all QARC courses are math and computer science courses.

Some of their recommended changes would undoubtedly simplify advising students, in the long run, assuming that they were adopted on a long term basis and not likely to be changed again in the near future. Even these, however, would temporarily make things less simple for advisors, just by virtue of representing changes from the present system.

B. Phase 1:

**RECOMMENDATION: The committee is generally opposed to making any immediate changes in the curriculum**, other than those which represent continuing already functioning modifications of the curriculum on an ad hoc basis. (Such modifications include deleting the 10 pages of revised prose requirement from "w" courses, premitting students to replace one "p" course with another gen ed course, and permitting up to four required related courses to count in the gen ed blocks.)

The GERC has been, and will continue working on the task of revising the goals and objectives of general education, as part of the university's move towards outcomes assessment, as mandated by the SSHE and Middle States. Within the next two years, this task must be completed to a significant degree, and will clearly result in a number of recommendations regarding how the general education curriculum should be altered to meet these revised goals and objectives. For this reason, any changes implemented by the faculty and administration in the next year may end up being in conflict with curriculum modifications eventually agreed to as part of the outcomes assessment effort; **any substantial changes made at this point, then, are likely to lead to at least some, and perhaps a significant amount of, wasted effort and money.**

C. Phase 2:

**RECOMMENDATION: The committee believes it is especially ill-advised at this point to attempt to tie the hands of those working on modifying the general education curriculum as part of the outcomes based assessment effort.** While we have no problems with general guidelines for change being formulated by the task force, faculty senate, administration, or faculty as a whole, it seems premature at this time for us to mandate any specific recommendations, such as "Eliminate labels!" or "Farm out advanced composition courses to departments." What would be in order would be recommendations such as, "Let us find a way that doesn't involve the use of the cumbersome label system?" or "Costs must be considered when recommending curricular changes. We must find ways to reduce the cost of the average general education class."

In conclusion, Millersville University presently lacks the knowledge necessary to make specific recommendations regarding changes in general education. With its completion of the Performance Review of General Education, the GERC has begun the process of obtaining some of the required knowledge, and members of the committee have accumulated some expertise. As reformulating general education objectives and stipulating how our general education curriculum achieves, or fails to achieve these objectives, is precisely the task on which our committee is now working, it stands to reason that it is unrealistic to attempt any real reform of our system, large or small, until this task is complete.

**RECOMMENDATION: We recommend voting against the task force recommendations at this time.**

## Attachment B

### Faculty Senate Minutes

### 18 February 1997

---

General Education Review Committee

Motions for the Senate's Consideration

#### **Procedural Motions:**

Motion #1. Divide the 11 items under phase 1 and phase 2 of the task force recommendations into three groups: **1. Outcomes assessment group**, items 1 and 2 under phase 2; **2. Minor changes group**, items 1, 2 and 6 under phase 1; and **3. Major changes group**, items 3, 4, and 5 under phase 1 and items 3 and 4 under phase 2.

Rationale: **Items in group 1.** recommended a procedure that has already begun, and, is not really in question because it is mandated by our administration and the SSHE, and previously approved by faculty senate, except for some details. It is our contention that these 2 items do not require a vote by the whole faculty, nor even the senate, at least at this time, and to include them as part of a package that could be voted down would create a lot of unnecessary confusion and uncertainty. Separation of these items would allow senate to discuss them on their own merits, if we so desire, or simply allow the process to continue as at present. **Items in group 2.** need to be revised to make it clearer exactly what they are trying to do, and why, (especially the second part of item 1 and all of item 6) but it is our committee's contention that, especially if presented as ad hoc changes rather than as formal, permanent changes, these should be construed as minor changes of the curriculum. Such minor changes can and should be made by the faculty senate, and do not need to be presented to the entire faculty for ratification. Indeed, as with 1. above, presenting these changes as part of a total package which might be rejected could be counter-productive because rejection of the package could make it difficult to put through any part of the package later. **Items in group 3.** It is our committee's contention that these all represent major changes and would require a faculty vote to approve. These are also the most controversial items.

Motion #2. Senate should first discuss group 1, then group 2, then group 3 (assuming Motion #1 has passed.)

Rationale: If senate begins with the least controversial, we can probably move very quickly on these. This would also allow us to schedule the most contested items for specific later meetings, which would allow individuals and departments who wish to testify regarding

specific items to know approximately when they need to be present. It would also give the task force a chance to meet prior to discussions of the more contested items and withdraw any item they wished to prior to discussion.

Motion #3. That we not submit items in group 1. to the faculty as part of the task force recommendations package, but instead discuss and resolve this issue within faculty senate.

Motion #4. That items in group 2 be sent to the GERC for rewriting and clarification, in consultation with members of the task force, after which they will be brought back to senate for approval or disapproval as individual items. That we recommend that these items not be included in the package to be approved or disapproved as a whole by the entire faculty.

Rationale for #3 and #4: See rationale for Motion #1

Motion #5 That we discuss items #3 and 4 under phase 1 and item #4 under phase 2 together.

Rationale: all relate to the abolition of labels.

Substantive Motions (More to follow)

Motion #6. That senate recommend to the task force that it withdraw item 3 from the package.

Rationale: see the English Department's arguments.

**Attachment A**  
**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**18 February 1997**

---

Motions Regarding the General Education Review Task force

Advanced Writing Requirement

**1: The task force should completely withdraw both its reference to the English department and the statement about the advanced writing requirement.**

Controlling Cost

One of the three reports the task force considered was a cost analysis. Very few conclusions could be reached with certainty. Was the new general education curriculum contributing significantly to higher costs? One cost increase seemed to be the movement away from large, entry level courses. This is why some of the committee recommendations are aimed at allowing a controlled migration to larger 100 level sections. Were P courses costing a lot of money? No--the average class size of P courses was greater than that of most courses. Other than these and a few additional conclusions, it became obvious that a good way of determining cost was not in place. Additionally, what happened to the task force on controlling administrative costs?

**2: The task force should devise a strategy to assess cost or at least begin planning such a strategy.** An acceptable method of assessing cost is needed just as much as the assessment piece for curriculum. Otherwise, we will not be able to do cost benefit analysis.

**3: The task force should accept responsibility to look into cost dsavings on the administrative side.** When the recommendations return to the senate they should include a plan for the investigation of administrative cost savings. One order of business should be to obtain a report from the task force on controlling administrative cost.

Senate's Response to the Task force's Recommendations

The senate should respond to the task force report issue by issue, not line by line. Let's get the concepts and leave the editing to the task force. I will move that we proceed to **4: discuss the specific recommendations one by one, limit the discussion of each to no more than 30 minutes and entertain motions on concept at no later than the 25 minute mark.** This schedule can be adjusted by appropriate action if needed; at least it gives us



some direction and some hope of getting through this in a reasonable time frame.

Joe McCade

# Attachment A

## Faculty Senate Minutes

### 4 February 1997

---

Second Response to Task Force Recommendations

by the General Education Review Committee

The position of the GERC is that the general education task force was put in the impossible position of being asked to recommend changes to improve the present general education curriculum without having available a clear and adequate account of the objectives of the system within the university. Without such objectives, there is no reasonably objective way of setting priorities, nor of deciding how to balance the costs and benefits of possible changes.

Over the last couple of months, our committee has had several opportunities to discuss the task force recommendations and we have received considerable input from both individuals and departments. Virtually all of this input has been negative. This second response, therefore, represents the committee's more considered opinion about the recommendations:

**A. Overall, we find the recommendations to be premature, and in some cases, ill-considered.** The task force does not offer support for its claims that any of these changes will actually save **any** money, which was its original charge. Further, it seems possible that some of these changes might have a **negative impact** on the quality of the general education program, and the committee offers no evidence to the contrary. Neither common senses nor empirical studies back up these recommendations, nor did the task force consult knowledgeable individuals and departments who could have provided them with information they lacked. For example, they did not ascertain the original rationale for C and Q courses, they did not consult the English Department about the rationale for its teaching advanced composition courses, nor did they check the catalogue to test their assumption that all QARC courses are math and computer science courses.

Some of their recommended changes would undoubtedly simplify advising students, in the long run, assuming that they were adopted on a long term basis and not likely to be changed again in the near future. Even these, however, would temporarily make things less simple for advisors, just by virtue of representing changes from the present system.

B. Phase 1:

**RECOMMENDATION: The committee is generally opposed to making any immediate changes in the curriculum,** other than those which represent continuing already functioning modifications of the curriculum on an ad hoc basis. (Such modifications include deleting the 10 pages of revised prose requirement from "w" courses, premitting students to replace one "p" course with another gen ed course, and permitting up to four required related courses to count in the gen ed blocks.)

The GERC has been, and will continue working on the task of revising the goals and objectives of general education, as part of the university's move towards outcomes assessment, as mandated by the SSHE and Middle States. Within the next two years, this task must be completed to a significant degree, and will clearly result in a number of recommendations regarding how the general education curriculum should be altered to meet these revised goals and objectives. For this reason, any changes implemented by the faculty and administration in the next year may end up being in conflict with curriculum modifications eventually agreed to as part of the outcomes assessment effort; **any substantial changes made at this point, then, are likely to lead to at least some, and perhaps a significant amount of, wasted effort and money.**

C. Phase 2:

**RECOMMENDATION: The committee believes it is especially ill-advised at this point to attempt to tie the hands of those working on modifying the general education curriculum as part of the outcomes based assessment effort.** While we have no problems with general guidelines for change being formulated by the task force, faculty senate, administration, or faculty as a whole, it seems premature at this time for us to mandate any specific recommendations, such as "Eliminate labels!" or "Farm out advanced composition courses to departments." What would be in order would be recommendations such as, "Let us find a way that doesn't involve the use of the cumbersome label system?" or "Costs must be considered when recommending curricular changes. We must find ways to reduce the cost of the average general education class."

In conclusion, Millersville University presently lacks the knowledge necessary to make specific recommendations regarding changes in general education. With its completion of the Performance Review of General Education, the GERC has begun the process of obtaining some of the required knowledge, and members of the committee have accumulated some expertise. As reformulating general education objectives and stipulating how our general education curriculum achieves, or fails to achieve these objectives, is precisely the task on which our committee is now working, it stands to reason that it is unrealistic to attempt any real reform of our system, large or small, until this task is complete.

**RECOMMENDATION: We recommend voting against the task force recommendations at this time.**

## **Attachment A**

### **Faculty Senate Minutes**

### **25 February 1997**

---

#### **Write To Learn:**

The goal of the writing focus in the W and P courses is to enable writing-to-learn to happen. There are options for writing-to-learn in W/P classes; some of these strategies may include, but are not limited to, the following proven methods of increasing students' analytical and subject area skills.

Traditional term paper (particularly when multiple drafting, peer review, and other developmental feedback encourage the development of ideation).

Shorter papers sequenced toward a larger writing project, as this creates a similar feedback loop.

Literature Reviews, book reports, precisés of newspaper articles, etc., particularly as these are actively discussed and shared with others in the class.

Portfolios that encourage the student, peers, and professor to focus on the development of an aggregate body of work.

Shared interactive writing such as internet discussion groups.

Group writing projects such as web pages, writing with a public service component, etc.

Other writing-to-learn assignments in which meaning is negotiated and constructed by individuals in communities and in the larger society.

**Rationale:** Clarifying the description of W and P label courses provides more flexibility for faculty and encourages a greater range of student writing involvements. Currently, there are no tracking of writing-to-learn objectives in W courses. These suggestions are being made to assist faculty in developing and teaching writing-to-learn curricula. Class sizes need to be kept sufficiently small to effect these pedagogies.

**Attachment B  
Faculty Senate Minutes  
25 February 1997**

---

3-column model

Nichols' estimate of Middle States current expectations

**Undergraduate English Program**

Example of Linkage between Expanded Statement of

Institutional Purpose, Departmental/Program Intended

Ourcomes/Objectives, and Assessment Criteria at Our University

**Expanded Statement  
of Institutional  
Purpose**

**Departmental/Program  
Intended  
Outcomes/Objectives**

**Assessment  
Criteria  
& Procedures**

Mission Statement

The principal focus of Our University's curricular program is undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences combined with a number of directly career related and preprofessional fields.

1. Students completing the baccalaureate program in English will compare very favorably in their knowledge of literature with those students completing a similar program nationally.

1a. The average score of the graduates of the baccalaureate program in English on the "Literature in English" MFAT subject test (which they will be required to take shortly before graduation) will be at or near the 50th percentile compared to national results.  
1b. Ninety percent of the English baccalaureate program will "agree" or "strongly agree" with the statement "In the field of literature I feel as well prepared as the majority of individuals nationwide who have completed a similar degree during the past year."

Goal Statements:

Each graduate of Our University will be treated as an individual, and all graduates of baccalaureate-level programs at the University will have developed a depth of understanding in their major field and been afforded the opportunity to prepare for a career of profession following graduation.

2. Graduates will be able to critique a brief draft essay, pointing out the grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors and offering appropriate suggestions for correction of the deficiencies.

3. Students completing the baccalaureate program will be capable of writing an acceptable journal article and having it published.

2a. As part of a "capstone course" during the students' final semester prior to graduation, they will critique a short draft essay; identify grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors; and offer suggestions for correction of the deficiencies. Eighty percent of the program's graduates will identify and offer appropriate suggestions for remediation of 90% of the errors in the draft essay.

3a. All graduates of the baccalaureate level program in English will prepare a journal article for submission and forward it to the English department.

3b. Eighty percent of those journal articles submitted will be judged acceptable for publication by a jury of English department faculty from an institution comparable to Our University.

3c. Twenty percent of those articles submitted will be published in student or other publications.

---

5-column model

Not good at keeping documentation in order.--see ff.

Figure 22

Undergraduate English Program

Example of Linkage between Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose,  
Departmental/Program Intended

Outcomes/Objectives, Assessment Criteria and Procedures, Results, and Use of Results at  
Our University

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Departmental/Program Intended Outcomes/Objectives	Assessment Criteria & Procedures	Assessment Results	Use of Results
<p>Mission Statement: The principal focus of Our University's curricular program is undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences combined with a number of directly career related and preprofessional fields.</p>	<p>1. Students completing the baccalaureate program in English will compare very favorably in their knowledge of literature with those students completing a similar program nationally.</p>	<p>1a. The average score of the graduates of the baccalaureate program in English on the "Literature in English" MFAT subject test (which they will be required to take shortly before graduation) will be at or near the 50th percentile compared to national results. 1b. Ninety percent of the English baccalaureate program will "agree" or "strongly agree" with the statement "In the field of literature I feel as well prepared as the majority of individuals nationwide who have completed a similar degree</p>	<p>1a. MFAT score for this year's graduates (18) found to be at 37th percentile primarily due to the 23rd percentile score on "American Literature" scale. 1b. Ninety-three percent responded "agree" or "strongly agree."</p>	<p>1a. Course offerings in "American Literature" being reviewed for consistency with MFAT technical description and items. 1b. No action required.</p>



Goal Statements:  
 Each graduate of  
 Our University  
 will be treated as  
 an individual,  
 and all graduates  
 of baccalaureate-  
 level programs  
 at the University  
 will have  
 developed a  
 depth of  
 understanding in  
 their major field  
 and been  
 afforded the  
 opportunity to  
 prepare for a  
 career of  
 profession  
 following  
 graduation.

2. Graduates will be able  
 to critique a brief draft  
 essay, pointing out the  
 grammatical, spelling, and  
 punctuation errors and  
 offering appropriate  
 suggestions for correction  
 of the deficiencies.

3. Students completing  
 the baccalaureate  
 program will be capable  
 of writing an acceptable  
 journal article and having  
 it published.

during the past  
 year."

2a. As part of a  
 departmental  
 comprehensive  
 examination  
 administered  
 during the  
 students' final  
 semester prior  
 to graduation,  
 they will  
 critique a short  
 draft essay,  
 identify  
 grammatical,  
 spelling, and  
 punctuation  
 errors; and offer  
 suggestions for  
 correction of the  
 deficiencies.  
 Eighty percent  
 of the program's  
 graduates will  
 identify and  
 offer  
 suggestions for  
 remediation of  
 90% of the  
 errors in the  
 draft essay.

3a. All graduates  
 of the  
 baccalaureate  
 level program in  
 English will  
 prepare a  
 journal article  
 for submission  
 and forward it  
 to the English  
 department.

2a. Ninety-  
 two percent  
 of graduates  
 identified  
 87% of  
 errors.  
 However,  
 grammatical  
 conventions  
 regarding  
 capitalization  
 were not  
 consistently  
 applied.

3a. Article  
 received from  
 all (18)  
 graduates.  
 3b. Fifty-five  
 percent of  
 articles  
 reviewed  
 were found  
 acceptable for  
 publication.

2a. Faculty  
 use of  
 commonly  
 accepted  
 conventions  
 regarding  
 capitalization  
 in reviewing  
 upper  
 division  
 papers is  
 being  
 emphasized.

3a. No action  
 required.  
 3b. English  
 407  
 (advanced  
 writing) is  
 being  
 modified to  
 include  
 journal article  
 exercises.

3b. Eighty percent of those journal articles submitted will be judged acceptable for publication by a jury of English department faculty from an institution comparable to Our University.

3c. Twenty percent of those articles submitted will be published in student or other publications.

3c. Thirty percent of articles were published.

3c. No action required.