

MINUTES
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
February 5, 2002

Chairperson Piperberg called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM in Chryst 210. All departments were represented.

The Minutes of the December 4, 2001 meeting were approved as distributed.

Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Announcements

1. Dr. Heintzelman was thanked for volunteering to act as Secretary for today's meeting. Any volunteers for subsequent meetings this semester will be gratefully accepted.
2. A reminder will be sent to all Committee chairs about submitting annual reports for their committee by the May meeting. Once again electronic versions of the reports would be best, but hard copies would be acceptable if electronic copies are not practical. The format will be included in the reminder.
3. A new item has been added to the agenda after Senate Officer elections. Item XI will deal with Outcomes Assessment. Dr. Foster-Clark would like some feedback from the Senate. All subsequent items will follow in order after the new Item XI.
4. The June 11, 2002 meeting will be held in STB 210, the Armstrong Auditorium at 3 PM. Refreshments will be provided since there are no food restrictions in force in that room.
5. The two Communications Department proposals that were approved at the December meeting without the Decanal statement will now be delivered to the Provost. The statements were received last week.
6. Chairperson Piperberg will be unable to go to the Trustee's meetings in March, since he has to teach a course on Wednesday nights this semester. If anyone would be willing to go to either of the meetings in his place, please let him know. He has to give a brief report at the formal meeting which he will write and give to the volunteer if s/he would prefer. Dr. Rosenthal has been approached about doing this and a volunteer will only be needed if she is unable to attend the meetings.
7. Hard copies of the Committee Survey {see attachment} and information on teaching awards {see attachment} that has been e-mailed to us has been made available and will be attached to the Minutes. Committee chairs who have not yet turned in their surveys have been contacted and the survey will be updated when a few others are returned. The survey as distributed has an error that has been corrected in the version of the survey attached to the Minutes.

Report of the Student Senate President

President Danz presented three Student Senate Recommendations for the Current Add/Drop Schedule {see attachment}. Each proposal generated reactions from Faculty Senate. He also updated Faculty Senate on the progress of their fundraiser to raise money for the Student Senate.

Report of the Graduate Student Organization President No report.

Report of the Administrative Officers

Provost McNairy reported that the third Open House was held this past weekend and that 800 people attended. The next one will be held in March. Enrollment is solid. She also reported that the University is moving toward making the University Catalog available online. She asked the Senate what faculty might need to assist them. In response to a question about print versions of the Catalog, she said that hard copies with appropriate updates will be available as well. The Advancement Office and Information Technology have been asked to design possible new formats. Senators shared their reactions, comments and suggestions regarding this proposal.

Dr. Phillips thanked Faculty Senate for allowing the English Department to offer a second experimental course this semester with no special designation. She also reported that the implementation for the changed Add/Drop process was efficient. Friday afternoon of the first week of class, some faculty were not available to meet with students and sign cards. Thus, in the second week, some late students were added to classes. Ten students experienced legitimate problems that have been remedied.

Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

Dr. Wismer from UCPRC reported that there are 6 new proposals on the table for consideration:

HUMN 205H & HUMN 305H: (1) Seminar in Classical Mythology & (2) Seminar in Autobiography in the Greco-Roman World., 1 credit--new courses, electives in Classics Minor, G1 Honors courses that complement existing Honors courses HUMN 202 and HUMN 302.

MATH 105: Fundamentals of Math II, 3 credits, existing Gen Ed course will be required for Elementary Education and Special Education majors. Change in prerequisites to a minimum grade of C (2.00) in MATH 104 and a passing score on the Basic Skills Test from the prerequisite of a passing grade in MATH 104.

SOCY 301: Social Research Methods. Change to SOCY 305, 3 credits, required of Sociology majors and Sociology-Criminology option-major.

SOCY 303 (previously SOCY 401): Sociological theory, 3 credits, existing non-Gen Ed course. Proposal to change the course number from SOCY 401 to SOCY 303 and a change in prerequisites to SOCY 101 + 9 c. h. in Sociology for SOCY majors or the consent of the instructor; Sociology majors also need to take SOCY 250 prior to or concurrently with SOCY 303. The original prerequisites were 12 c. h. of Sociology.

SOCY 307: African-American Social Thought, 3 credits, new course, G3 General Education and Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (W) label.

WSTU 330: Feminist Theory, 3 credits, New Course, Perspectives– General Education label.

Reports of Faculty Senate Special Committees No reports.

Proposed Courses and Programs

(1) New Undergraduate Course

ESCI 349: Chemistry of the Atmosphere, a Perspectives (P) course, 3 credits, Effective Fall 2002. The proposal passed without dissent.

(2) Changes in Courses/Curricula

EDTE 391--Curriculum & Instruction in Technology Education, 3 credits, asking approval for a Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (W) label. Effective Spring 2002. The proposal passed without dissent.

A question was raised regarding the lack of a letter from the Chemistry Department about their reactions to ESCI 349. Several years ago, Faculty Senate had requested that impacted departments submit a letter along with a course proposal from another department that is offering a related course.

Another question was raised regarding the criteria for a writing (W) course to be considered a writing course.

Faculty Emeritus None.

Elections – Senate Officers

Dr. Rosenthal assumed the chair to conduct the election of the Chairperson. A Kerper/Dorman motion to nominate Dr. Piperberg passed. A Börger-Greco/Studdard motion was made to close nominations and to direct the Secretary to cast a unanimous ballot. Motion carried.

Dr. Piperberg resumed the Chair. A Sciarretta/Stengel motion was made to nominate Dr. Rosenthal for Assistant Chairperson. Motion carried. A Luek/Börger-Greco motion closed nominations and directed the Secretary to cast a unanimous ballot. Motion carried.

No nominations were received for Secretary. Volunteers are needed. This item will be on the next agenda.

General Education Outcomes Assessment

Dr. Foster-Clark updated the Faculty Senate on the status of Outcomes Assessment and responded to Faculty Senate concerns {see attachment}.

Approval of Revised Undergraduate and Graduate Course/Program Proposal Cover Sheets

A motion was made by Dorman/Wismer to approve the revised cover sheets. Due to several additional concerns raised by senators, a vote on the motion was postponed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Carol A. Heintzelman,
Acting Recorder

Action Summary

Proposed Courses and Programs:

(1) New Undergraduate Course

ESCI 349: Chemistry of the Atmosphere, a Perspectives (P) course, 3 credits, Effective Fall 2002. The proposal passed without dissent.

(2) Changes in Courses/Curricula

EDTE 391: Curriculum and Instruction in Technology Education, 3 credits, asking approval for a Writing-Across-The-Curriculum (W) label. The proposal passed without dissent.

Elections--Senate Officers

Dr. Rosenthal assumed the Chair to conduct the election of the Chairperson. A Kerper/Dorman motion to nominate Dr. Piperberg was made. Motion carried. A Borger-Greco/Studdard motion closed nominations and directed the Secretary to cast a unanimous ballot. Motion carried.

Dr. Piperberg resumed the Chair. A Sciarretta/Stengel motion nominated Dr. Rosenthal for Assistant Chairperson. Motion carried. A Luek/Borger-Greco motion closed nominations and directed the Secretary to cast a unanimous ballot. Motion carried.

Attachment #1

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Joel B. Piperberg

RE: Teaching Awards Information from the University of Nebraska and Franklin and Marshall

Teaching Awards at the University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Greetings Prof. Piperberg,

Jim McShane has asked me to respond to your inquiry regarding how Teaching Awards are handled at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, as I am Director of our Teaching and Learning Center, and have been involved with the selection processes over 25 years. Over that time we have had several kinds of award initiatives.

This campus began with Contributed funds to our Foundation that allowed us to recognize 2-6 outstanding college teachers annually. The contributors sometimes specified the area such as "Teaching in the Humanities". Typically nominations materials included a teaching schedule for the past three years and student evaluations; an abbreviated vita; a nominations letter; a seconding letter from a colleague and 3-6 letters from colleagues and 3-6 letters from students or former students. A committee at each level (dept. college, campus) made decisions of whether to forward the nominee or not and generally the campus-wide committee called the Teaching Council (12 faculty, 4 students, TLC Director, VCAA) made the final recommendation.

Our Contributed Foundation funds have been redirected; however our legislature has also allocated fifteen teaching awards of \$1500 each to each college to honor deserving teachers. These decisions are made at the college level and are honored at the annual Honors Convocation. Nominations materials are similar to those described above.

Foundations funds are now going to a "Systems level" Teaching Award which honors two teachers annually with recognition dinner plus a one-time stipend of \$5000. They can be from any of four campuses.

The Foundations also provide an annual \$25,000 award to the outstanding Teaching Department on any of the four campuses. UNL has received this a majority of the time. It requires a portfolio that describes how that dept. has developed a "Community of Teachers" so the culture is supportive of effective teachers.

Another kind of recognition is co-sponsored by the Teaching Council and the UNL Parents Association with the goal of stimulating positive discussions at home with parents/students. Parents are mailed a nominations form for someone who has made "a significant difference in the lives of their sons/daughters here at UNL." Each nominee gets a certificate in a reception/program in the spring with speakers from parents/students/teachers. When recognition has been achieved at intervals of 5 or 10 years, they get an additional gift such as paper-weight, etc. This is low-cost, but appreciated by faculty. Mailing is the big cost.

Finally, we have instituted an "Academy of Distinguished Teachers" which recognizes those who have made excellent contributions to teaching at UNL over a career. It is not available for those who are pre-tenure or has been here but a few years. They are expected to provide leadership in some way in teaching and to be available for ongoing service to teaching. They get a \$1000 addition to their base salary which goes on indefinitely. These individuals are selected on the basis of nominations from students/colleagues and must be supported by their depts. The Teaching Council as well as Academy members compose a sub-committee that selects two new members each year.

This is a short sketch of the variety of awards we provide at UNL. The tendency is away from awards toward the academy idea, but all of the academy members have formerly received a Teaching Award of some kind; that is a prerequisite.

If you are interested in specific guidelines on any of these, let me know.

Good luck.

Delivee Wright, Director
Teaching and Learning Center
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
121 Benton Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0623
(402) 472-3079

Franklin and Marshall's Lindback Awards

F & M gives two awards, one for teaching and one for research, each year. Nominations for each award are solicited from each department chair; the Provost can also make nominations. The nominees are submitted to the F & M tenure committee and dossiers are assembled for each nominee (teaching evaluations, peer observations, CVs, etc.). The Tenure committee goes through the dossiers and votes to determine the awardee. There are about 7 to 10 nominees per year for each award.

The awards are funded (at least partially) by the Lindback Foundation. They fund awards at a number of colleges and universities, including the University of Pennsylvania and Temple in addition to F & M. I spoke to a contact person at the Foundation (Bruce Pipes of F & M gave me her name). She said that we could apply to the Foundation for funding if we wished. No guarantees and she did say that they do not like to have clusters of awards in the same areas but, of course, Penn and Temple are both in Philadelphia.

Attachment #2

Student Senate Recommendations for the Current Drop/Add Schedule:

Dear Faculty Senators:

Throughout the last two weeks, many students have contacted me with concerns for the new drop/add policy adopted by the Faculty Senate. After carefully considering each one, the Student Senate has three suggestions for the Faculty Senate, based on students' experiences that we believe, will make the new drop/add policy more manageable for all students. Please consider the following recommendations:

- 1) With the drop and add period ending at the same time, it is possible (probable) that, say 6 students will want to add a MWF class on Wednesday, but the section will be full. Then, on Friday, 6 students enrolled in the class, waiting until the last minute, will drop the course. Now, there will be 6 empty spaces in that class for the rest of the semester that could have been filled. This problem did occur under the old system—but not with as great intensity—because students wanting to add a course, had a longer time to, and could thus wait longer to drop their old one. Seeing this, our recommendation is to:
Have Drop the first week of class, and Add the first week of class, and the Monday and Tuesday of the second week.
This will allow students wanting to add a course that was formerly full, to do so.
- 2) In the new Drop/Add system, students are heavily burdened by having to seek out signatures in half the time they had previously. Students are limited in *when* they can get these signatures by when the professor's office hours are. To save students from some of this stress, we have two recommendations. Either:
 - A) **Expand the amount of office hours each professor has during the first week of each semester so that they are more accessible for giving signatures and advices, or;**
 - B) **Have the chair of each department, or designee, available from 8:00 – 4:30 Monday through Friday during the first week of classes so that students know for certain that they will be able to drop or add a course throughout the week. This person would have the authority to add or drop students from any class within that department.**

3. Lastly, and I don't know if any technical problems would have to be overcome in doing this:

Make the drop/add period electronically based.

This way, whenever a student drops a course over MAX, that seat will immediately become open for the next person on the waiting list to get into that course. This would relieve most burden on both students *and* professors.

Thank you for considering these options. I believe that if one of these is adopted, the result will be a positive one for our new Drop/Add policy.

Thank you,
Brandon Danz,
President, Student Senate

Attachment #3

General Education Assessment at Millersville: A Status Report February 4, 2002

Though the roles of the General Education Review Committee (GERC) and the Coordinator of General Education are broader than simply conducting outcomes assessment for the Gen Ed program, these tasks are the major focus of our efforts at this point in time. Toward that end, GERC concluded a process of revising all the objectives for Gen Ed with Senate approval in May 1999. The revision of objectives was undertaken in order to increase both the currency and assessability of the objectives. Over the last two years, we have actively been designing and pilot-testing assessment strategies for several of the objectives.

As our experience has grown and the time for implementation of full-fledged assessment has drawn closer, we have faced two related issues on which we now seek the advice and counsel of Faculty Senate. They involve how to procure the involvement and participation of (1) the faculty and (2) the students. Clearly, an assessment process aimed at such a broad and integral part of the Millersville undergraduate experience deserves and demands widespread assistance from both parties (recall that Gen Ed does entail a minimum of 54 credits out of the 120 minimum credits for the Bachelor's Degree).

First, let me mention the issue of faculty participation. I see faculty participation in Gen Ed assessment needed on three levels. The first level is campus leadership, provided in large measure through service on the now combined GERC-AOAC committee and the various sub-committees and working groups that they have called together over the years. Many in Faculty Senate and throughout the University have responded at this level, but some of the difficulties of recruitment to this and other committees have been a topic of recent Senate discussions.

A second level of participation involves allowing access to appropriate classes and assignments for the purpose of conducting course-embedded assessments. It has been a conscious strategy of Gen Ed assessment to employ course-embedded assessment techniques whenever and wherever possible. These techniques allow minimal disruption of the routine of classroom learning and teaching, do not necessitate separate "assessment days" (getting students to come to a testing situation, or taking class time, just to meet the needs of outcomes assessment), and

have an inherent “face” validity since they are part of normal classroom assessment procedures.

The third level of participation lies in the scoring of course-embedded and other assessment procedures. We have already used and anticipate much additional use of faculty to grade tests/assignments/papers for purposes of outcomes assessment. This is akin to employing scoring panels for AP or other similar tests. Faculty are paid a stipend (from the assessment budget) to score previously collected materials, usually during the summer or over break periods.

Encouraging participation is not just an issue for faculty but for students as well. When assessment is not course-embedded, the need for securing the involvement of a representative group of students arises. This is the case currently with the planned testing of students’ critical reasoning abilities using the ETS Tasks in Critical Thinking. A variety of incentive strategies have been tried at various institutions to get students to both show up and take seriously testing outside of the classroom. We have proposed the use of an early registration incentive whereby students (e.g., a random sample of students having completed about 60 credits) are invited to participate and those who show up and complete the test are allowed to register for their next semester’s classes prior to the normal early registration period. Faculty input on this and other incentive procedures is hereby being sought.

Our overall goal is to foster a “culture of assessment” where the processes of collecting assessment data, reporting the results, and using them to enhance the curriculum, our programs, and our methods of teaching and learning becomes second nature to our system of undergraduate (and graduate) education. Until such a culture exists, we need to find ways to encourage faculty and student participation in the assessment activities I have outlined. It is through this participation and the subsequent effective use of the assessment results that a culture will be built. Your assistance with suggestions and with recruitment is vital to the success of our collective efforts.