

MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

19 November 1996

Chairperson D. Eidam called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. in Chryst Hall, Room 210. All departmental senators attended except Educational Foundations. Student Senate President P. Leahy, J. Ishler, K. McGinnis and S. Wong attended for Student Senate.

Minutes

Senate approved the 5 November 1996 meeting minutes without correction.

Reports

Chairperson's Report

Chairperson D. Eidam announced one correction to today's agenda: add the **Master of Education in Early Childhood Education**. Eidam introduced to senate the new senator from the History Department, C. Koslofsky.

Student Senate

Student Senate President P. Leahy said student senate will meet December 5, 1996. It last met on 14 November. Student senate is attempting to make students aware of the negotiations currently proceeding. It submitted a statement to the Snapper.

Administrative Officers

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs J. Stager said that if senators would view the message of the day, there is a message about the future of Marauder. There will also be notices sent to the faculty. MU has ordered a replacement for Marauder. The hope is that it will arrive and be installed during the break between the Fall and Spring Semesters. The new Marauder will be much faster and larger. It will rectify the current problems. Congestion on the current Marauder has arrived much faster than expected. Committee Reports

Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee

Undergraduate Course and Program Review Committee chairperson, R. Wismer, introduced a new course under the two meeting rule:

PHIL 327: Philosophy in Film, a new three credit hour, G1 General Education label course to be first offered in the Summer of 1997 if approved.

Wismer said there are three items for the next agenda:

BUAD Option in International Business

A Program Change for Geography Majors: A proposal to change the completion of the major policy for geography majors. Beginning with courses taken in the Spring 1997 semester, the Geography Department requires that in order to graduate with a BA or BSE degree in geography, each student must have a grade of C or better in each course taken to satisfy major requirements: geography courses and required related courses. To be implemented Spring Semester 1997 if approved.

Governance structure for the Women's Studies Program.

For Information purposes only, no senate action required:

ECON488: Seminar in Economics, an existing course to be added as a requirement for the major.

Cooperative Education Committee

Cooperative Education Committee chairperson, W. Dorman, said the committee met today and worked on a self study.

Joint Senate Conference Committee

Joint Senate Conference Committee chairperson, J. Piperberg, said the committee met last week about the four year contract with students. The committee will meet again next week.

Proposed Courses

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs J. Stager said that the courses listed under Proposed Courses and Programs under the two meeting rule on today's agenda should say "...to be first offered in Fall 1997 if approved."

Senate approved the **Master of Education Program in Early Childhood Education**. The program includes a new course and changes to existing courses: a renumbering and renaming.

Business

Departmental Handbook Policy Proposals

Acting Chairperson of the Academic Policies Committee, V. Hauck, although unable to attend today's meeting, moved a Departmental Handbook Policy (see Attachment B, page 4116, of the 5 November 1996 senate minutes). Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs J. Stager said that there is a lack of guidelines that speaks to the handbooks but there is not a problem with the existing handbooks. The handbooks elaborate on often tersely stated blue sheets or catalog descriptions. The handbooks should not go beyond the officially approved program of study for a major. The proposals put guidelines into the governance manual. Senate voted for the motions from the Academic Policy Committee.

Report of the General Education Task Force

The General Education Task Force reported to Senate (See Attachment A). Task Force chairperson J. Sheridan and senate chairperson D. Eidam have agreed that February 19, 1997, is the senate's deadline for submitting revisions or suggested recommendations. Senate has three meetings not including this one to discuss the Task Force Report. Senate could meet in the fourth Tuesday in January if senators felt it was necessary.

J. Sheridan reported that copies of the report will go out to the faculty through the senate minutes. The Task Force welcomes comments and recommendations from the faculty. The timeline is as follows. The Task Force hopes to have a document that the faculty can vote on at the University elections at the end of April of 1997. If senate replies to the Task Force by senate's second February 1997 meeting, then the Task Force can respond to senate by March. The Faculty can vote on the final document in April.

Sheridan noted that many members of the Task Force were attending today's senate meeting: C. Scharnberger, T. Madonna, W. Dorman, C. McLeod, J. Sheridan, J. McCade, and R. Wismer. Also attending were non-voting members: A. Hoffman and J. Stager.

Senator C. Stameshkin seriously objected to the way the report was presented to senate. She was told last year that senate's General Education Review Committee (GERC) would receive constant feedback on what was going on while the Task Force was deliberating. She said that had not happened except in the most general sense. Although she is the GERC chairperson, she did not see a copy of the report until this morning. She said that some of the proposed changes were substantive.

Her most serious objection was the sense of rushing and urgency that she felt was being forced on senate. The committee that brought our current General Education system into existence took their time. MU had many problems with that system and is still trying to fix them. Many people who tried to slow down the process at the time were called obstructionist. She said she wanted to show it to her department and that her committee would want to see it. She suggested that senate give the GERC a chance to review the report.

Senator and Task Force member J. McCade said that when the whole idea first came to senate, he voiced feelings that APSCUF was superseding the senate's authority. He said the Task Force document was a compromise. He shared many of Stameshkin's concerns. He said the Task Force had long and difficult deliberations. They tried to have minimum impact on the curriculum but still offer significant budget reductions for MU.

A R. Wismer/J. McCade motion to refer the report to the General Education Review Committee with the GERC to report back at the December 3, 1996, senate meeting passed.

Senate adjourned at 5:30 PM. The next meeting will be Tuesday, 3 December 1996, from 4:05-5:45 p.m. in Chryst 210. Respectfully submitted,

Marvin Margolis, Secretary
Faculty Senate

Action Summary

19 November 1996

1. Approval of Graduate Program

Master of Education in Early Childhood Education

2. Departmental Handbook Policy Proposal

Senate approved a Departmental Handbook Policy (see Attachment B, page 4116, of the 5 November 1996 senate minutes).

3. Report of the General Education Task Force

Senate approved the sending of the report of the General Education Task Force to the General Education Review Committee with a request that the committee report back to senate by the next senate meeting, 3 December 1996.

Attachment B

Faculty Senate Minutes

5 November 1996

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 1, 1996
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Verne Hauck, Acting Chair<="" td="">
RE: Departmental Handbook Policy

Current Policy

The *Governance Manual* nor the *College Catalog* address guidelines or procedures for Departmental Curriculum Committees to follow, for the development, maintenance, or approval, of Departmental "Handbooks" or "Guidebooks". There are no established standards to follow for the development of these support materials. This committee considers that the University Catalog is a vinding contract with the student.

Proposal

Departments should ensure that handbooks are consistent with the "Blue Sheet for Departmental Requirements" and the Catalog.
Recent changes to degree requirements not reflected in the catalog must have received proper approval in order to be viewed as supplemental to the binding contract.

Rationale

Faculty members in Academic Departments have found it beneficial to elaborate on curricular requirements and compile these requirements into the form of a handbook or guidebook. These detailed requirements are provided to the students and designed to be used as an advisement tool. Having an understanding that the curriculum is in a state of constant change, it becomes the responsibility of the Departmental Curriculum Committee to ensure that the handbook/guidebook is consistent with the *College Catalog*. Based on the small number of inconsistencies noted between the *Catalog* and departmental handbooks/guidebooks, no action is recommended at this time for a central screening process.

Attachment A

Faculty Senate Minutes

19 November 1996

TASK FORCE ON THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC RESOURCES

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

1. 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.

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 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.

2. 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.

2. 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 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.

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

4. **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.

6. 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.

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.

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

1. 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:

12 credits
G1 - Hum & Fine
Arts

Art
Comm. & Theatre
English
Foreign Language
Humanities
Music
Philosophy

12 credits
G2 -
Science/Math

Biology
Chemistry
Computer Science
Earth Science
Mathematics
Nursing
Physics

12 credits
G3 - Social
Sciences

Anthropology
Business
Economics
Geography
Gerontology
History
Political Science
Psychology
Social Work
Sociology

18 credits
G4 - Fundamentals and Electives

ENGL 110
COMM 100
AW*
1 Perspective
HPED
1 Elective
(may be a P)

*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