

**Faculty Senate Minutes
December 6, 2005**

The meeting was called to order at 4:12 p.m. All departments were in attendance.

I. Minutes of previous meetings

The minutes of the November 15, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved.

The minutes of the November 29, 2005 special meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Dr. Börger-Greco welcomed Beverly Skinner as the new Representative to Senate from Interdisciplinary Studies. She also commented that faculty representation is needed for the December commencement ceremony.

She noted administrative approval for the following curriculum changes:

1) BIOL 291: Revised pre-requisite is BIOL 211 instead of pre-requisite BIOL 211 and co-requisite BIOL 221.

2) ESCI 227: Revised pre-requisite is ESCI 221 and pre-requisite or co-requisite is CHEM 112 instead of pre-requisites ESCI 221 and CHEM 112.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

None

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Organization

Graduate Student Organization Representative Meaghan Shirk reported that they conducted their first outreach event in Stayer to inform graduate students about the GSO. She indicated that similar events are planned for the spring in Byerly and McComsey.

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

President McNairy

Dr. McNairy expressed concern that so few faculty are scheduled to participate in winter commencement. She noted that Millersville students have great respect for their faculty and appreciate our presence at commencement. It is also a way of marking the importance of this accomplishment, particularly for our many first-generation and non-traditional students. Dr. McNairy also commented that the First Friday faculty gathering was successful this fall and is planned for two dates in the spring semester.

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips invited faculty to attend a special meeting on January 26 planned by the American Democracy Steering Committee. At this meeting, results will be presented from their audit of civic engagement. Dr. Phillips also reminded faculty that exam week is the 15th instructional week in the semester and that all classes must meet during this time.

VI. Faculty Emeritus

None

VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

UCPRC

First Reading

(1) CHANGE IN COURSE/CURRICULUM

B.A. PHYS Nanotechnology option: Proposal to introduce a Physics B.A. degree with an option in nanotechnology.

(2) CHANGE IN COURSE/CURRICULUM

B.S. CHEM Nanotechnology option: Proposal to introduce a Chemistry B.S. degree with an option in nanotechnology.

(3) CHANGE IN COURSE/CURRICULUM

BIOL Marine Biology option: Proposal to move BIOL375 Biometry from elective to required block.

An additional issue was brought to Senate by the UCPRC. A proposal submitted for online delivery of BUAD 452 during the winter session had already been approved by the department and school curriculum committee. However, it was necessary to act on this proposal immediately because the current CBA specifies a 30-day period for approval of distance learning proposals. A White/Edeh motion to approve BUAD 452 for online delivery as proposed passed without dissent.

Discussion followed regarding the need to address how to accommodate this short time frame for approval of distance learning proposals in the future. Several suggestions included UCPRC Chair providing an abbreviated review for Senate or electronic distribution of proposals to allow sufficient time for consideration. This issue will need to be addressed in Meet & Discuss so that an expedited approval process can be developed.

University Honors College

A proposal was distributed to Senate regarding the need to concretize the implementation of priority registration for University Honors College (UHC) students [see Attachment

#1]. Steve Miller commented that recently UHC registration has been assigned for the same time as general senior registration and after eligible senior athletes. The proposal that UHC registration begin prior to regular registration but not later than eligible senior athletes nor earlier than students with special needs identified by Learning Services was approved without dissent.

Some discussion was held regarding priority registration for UHC students. It was noted that this practice is necessary to enable these students to complete the UHC requirements that are largely General Education courses. It was also commented that this also serves as a reward for the commitment of the UHC students to high academic achievement at Millersville.

VIII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

None

IX. Proposed Courses and Programs

Second Readings

(1) CHANGE IN COURSE/CURRICULUM

B.A. in PHYS: Requirement for PHYS 266 Electronics, 3 credits. Proposal to include Electronics in all Physics B.A. degrees was approved without dissent.

X. General Education Task Force

John Ward distributed an analysis of the feedback from the special meeting and a survey for departmental consideration and response [see Attachment #2]. He presented the summary of results and common grounds of the various proposals. He noted that the survey is for departments to consider, come to a consensus response and return to Senate by February 21st.

Elementary and Early Childhood Education expressed concern that current PDE review would significantly impact their ability to adequately consider the General Education proposals. It was noted that all elementary education majors might soon be required to add 6 credits of special education courses to their requirements. A similar prospect for secondary education majors would add 12 credits of special education and TESL courses. It was noted that the mandate for 120 credits in any major may be circumvented to accommodate requirements from accrediting bodies which may address this issue.

Another concern raised was that the vision and mission statements for Millersville are currently being rewritten. It was noted that it would be difficult to review General Education proposals without that statement. However, Dr. Phillips commented that the core of the vision and mission statements should remain unchanged, allowing review of General Education to go forward.

XI. Other/New Business

Discussion was held regarding wasted paper used for Senate documents. It was noted that double-sided printing would reduce paper use. UCPRC already uses double-sided printing without a problem. It was noted that distribution of electronic files also reduces paper use. A Kevorkian/Blazer motion to recommend that documents printed for distribution to Senate be double-sided was approved without dissent.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller
Faculty Senate Secretary

Action Summary:

A White/Edeh motion to approve BUAD452 for online delivery as proposed passed without dissent.

A proposal that UHC registration begin prior to regular registration but not later than eligible senior athletes nor earlier than students with special needs identified by Learning Services was approved without dissent.

A Kevorkian/Blazer motion to recommend that documents printed for distribution to Senate be double-sided was approved without dissent.

Attachment #1

RATIONALE:

The attached Proposal seeks to clarify the order to be employed by the Registrar in scheduling priority registration for honors students.

Although Faculty Senate had approved priority registration for University Honors College (UHC) students by the mid-1990's, searches of on-line and Ganser Archive Faculty Senate Minutes have yielded no specific procedural guidelines for implementing UHC registration (searches have been conducted by past UHC Committee Chair, Dr. Marjorie Warmkessel, and current Office Manager, Ms. Barbara Erdman).

With the recent implementation of priority registration for eligible student athletes, it seems appropriate for UHC registration to be coordinated with Senate-specified guidelines for athletes and with registration for Learning Services' students with special needs, another important group that is mandated for priority registration. Recently UHC students have followed students with special needs and registered with seniors. In registration for Spring 2006, honors students were scheduled after eligible senior athletes and concurrently with the first day of general seniors. Thus senior UHC students were not scheduled "early," and all UHC students followed senior athletes, resulting in a mixed and unequal "priority."

As in the past, honors students need priority registration to balance their schedules among major, general education, and UHC requirements and prerequisites. The Honors College requires 30 credits of honors course work, most of which falls in general education categories. Priority registration is necessary for retention and recruitment of Honors College students and is practiced by all PASHHE honors programs & colleges.

PROPOSAL:

To clarify Priority Registration for University Honors College students, Faculty Senate approves that Honors College students be scheduled to begin registration after Learning Services' students with special needs and before seniors or other regular-registration students.

Thus Honors College students will begin to register no later than senior athletes eligible for priority registration but not earlier than students with special needs identified by Learning Services.

Attachment #2

General Education Reform Survey

Department _____ Senator _____

The questions on this survey are based on ideas represented in the curriculum working group proposals and the qualitative assessment of those proposals by Senate. The results of this survey will be used by Senate, the General Education Review Committee, and the curriculum working groups to develop a Gen Ed reform proposal that can eventually be presented to the full faculty for an official vote. **There will be one survey for each voting member of senate.** Because of the complexity and difficulty of the questions, departments are encouraged to devote substantial time at a future meeting to discuss this. Surveys will be turned in at the Senate meeting on February 21st.

1. Lynn Marquez, facilitator for the science curriculum working group, suggested developing community and coherence by thematically organizing courses from different schools and encouraging the ongoing growth of learning communities. The proposal was to use this approach with the current system, but it is also an idea that could be used with several of the other proposed reforms. Do you support the idea of increasing the number of thematically organized courses and learning communities?

- Yes
- No

2. The current Gen Ed system includes distributional credits in the form of G blocks in order to encourage both breadth and depth. Len Litowitz, a presenter from the Core, Explore, and More working group, proposed reducing the G1, G2, and G3 blocks to 3 courses each. Scott Schaffer, another presenter from the Core, Explore, and More working group, suggests that breadth and depth could be better achieved by requiring that non-education majors take two minors outside the G block of their major. Barb Stengel, facilitator of the Core, Explore, and More working group, suggests that breadth and depth can best be achieved by allowing students to take more electives of interest to them and by trusting students and advisors by giving them greater freedom in selecting courses. What role should distributional requirements play in a revised system?

- Distributional requirements should not be changed.
- There should be minor reductions in distributional requirements to provide more flexibility for majors, innovative curriculum, or electives.
- We should consider alternative approaches to the G Block system to encourage depth and breadth.

3. The Gen Ed Task Force found significant dissatisfaction with the current ability of students to register for the courses they select with their advisor. Len Litowitz echoed this frustration in his presentation and Barb Stengel suggested that we should commit to making sure that students can get what they and their advisors plan and suggested that demand scheduling as one way of achieving that goal. True demand scheduling means that students indicate the courses they want/need for the next semester (for example, during registration for Spring 06 students would indicate their needs for the Fall 06) with several alternates. Students would not have control over times and instructors in these pre-selections. Would you support increasing the role of demand scheduling in our registration system?

- Yes
- No

4. A basic principle of the Task Force proposal was that Gen Ed should be “vertically integrated” throughout a student’s academic career. For example, the Task Force proposed that a set of core courses be identified (either from existing courses or newly developed ones) in each of the disciplinary blocks to provide an Introduction to Critical Thinking in the Disciplines. The Task Force also proposed requirements for more upper-division, integrative courses including an option for a capstone near the end of the curriculum. Do you support a more “developmental” structure to Gen Ed?

- Yes
- No

5. The Task Force valued the role of the university in promoting civic engagement. Steve Centola, facilitator of the English curriculum working group, suggested that every student should take at least one literature course (including literature courses from departments other than English). Should we require literature and civics courses as part of distributional requirements?

- Every student should take a Civics course
- Every student should take a Literature course
- Every student should take both a Civics and Literature course
- These types of courses should be optional

6. The Task Force proposed requiring a “D” diversity course (that would be similar in concept to the current W courses). Scott Schaffer proposed that all students should take either a diversity course or a service learning course. Should diversity be intentionally designed into requirements of the Gen Ed system?

- Yes
- No

7. If a diversity requirement is included, how should that requirement be focused?

- On U.S. diversity only.
- On global diversity only.
- Both U.S. and global diversity should be required.
- Students should have option to choose either type of diversity.

8. Currently students take many forms of freshman seminars. One credit seminars do not count toward Gen Ed. Three credit “First Year Seminars” are being piloted and currently count toward distributional Gen Ed credit. Other students take freshman seminars that count toward the major and still others take freshman seminars that do not count toward either the major or toward Gen Ed requirements. In what way should credit for freshman seminars count in Gen Ed?

- A variety of Freshman Seminars formats should count toward Gen Ed credit as long as they substantially address Gen Ed goals and objectives.
- We should only count 3 credit courses that are offered outside the student’s major toward Gen Ed.

9. John McLarnon, facilitator of the Gen Ed working group consisting of both MU faculty and professionals from outside MU, suggests that writing is one of the most important elements of a Gen Ed program. All proposals envisioned maintaining the current freshman composition course (some of the proposals envision including this course within learning communities or making other changes in approach to the course). Most proposals kept the current W requirements. The Task Force proposed a review of all current W courses to assure that all courses with a W label are truly writing intensive. What should we do with the W system?

- We should not change the current W system.
- We should keep W courses and look into ways to increase the effectiveness of the current approach even further.
- We should reduce the number of W courses and instead purposefully integrate writing into a variety of Gen Ed / major courses without using the W designation.

10. Most proposals maintain advanced writing. The Task Force suggested that a capstone course could be substituted for advanced writing and Lynn Marquez suggested that discipline specific sections of Advanced Writing would be better able to concentrate on writing in context. Steve Centola suggested strengthening the current writing emphasis by not only maintaining advanced writing but also by allowing a writing intensive capstone to be substituted for the Perspectives course. In what way should advanced writing be represented in Gen Ed?

- The present requirements for Advanced Writing should be maintained.
- As much as possible, Advanced Writing should be offered in sections designed specifically for majors in certain fields.
- Allow programs to embed advanced writing skills in other advanced Gen Ed / capstone courses

11. The 4th principle guiding the reform process states that, “Reform of Gen Ed will be balanced by the curricular needs of major programs of study, especially as they are impacted by State mandates and/or disciplinary accreditation.” Some proposals allowed for some flexibility in Gen Ed requirements for different degrees. For example, Scott Schaffer’s proposal envisions all students taking 2 minors, but he also envisioned an exception for education majors. The current pressures of the 120 credit mandate will likely be increased by proposals being set forth by various accrediting bodies. Should Gen Ed reform allow for flexibility between degrees, schools or even majors?

- There should be a single set of requirements for all programs

Or if you think there should be flexibility, please check all that apply:

- The system should allow for some differences in Gen Ed requirements among degree programs
- The system should allow for some differences in Gen Ed requirements among schools
- The system should allow for some differences in Gen Ed requirements among majors

12. Scott Schaffer also proposed a one year equivalent of foreign language, but some have suggested that this requirement might be adopted for BA degree students only. John McLarnon cited the importance of language in our increasingly global world, but raised doubts about the level of proficiency that could be achieved through a requirement. Should there be a foreign language requirement?

- Yes, for all students.
- This should be an option that is decided separately for each school
- Foreign language should count toward distributional credits, but should not be a Gen Ed requirement.

13. Some have suggested the need to reduce required credits from 51 to 48. One way this might be done is by taking a course that is currently required and embedding the skills from that course in major courses / other Gen Ed courses and by allowing the course to count toward Gen Ed electives. Speech and Wellness were two areas that were proposed for this change. Do you support making either of these reductions?

- Wellness should become an elective course
- Speech should become an elective course

- Both of these courses should become electives
- Both courses should be required for all students

14. Barb Stengel proposed that: “Twelve credits.. can be taken Pass/No Credit – after 15 credits earned with a 2.0 or better -- with a C- required to earn a passing grade and credit. (Student will have until the 11th week of the semester to elect P/NC; instructors will not know of any student’s choice.)” She writes that “[this] will allow students to try other majors, to test interest in a field, to take challenging instructors, and to experiment academically with minimal risk.” How many Gen Ed credits should a student be allowed to designate “pass / no credit” under these rules?

- None
- 2 courses
- 3 courses
- 4 courses

[context for 15, 16, & 17]

Barb Stengel proposed gradually moving toward a series of “shell” inquiry courses as a replacement for and expansion upon current foundational courses. Possibilities might include Scientific Inquiry, Social Science Inquiry, Historical Consciousness, Aesthetic Experience, Critical Analysis and Written Representation, and Applied Math Reasoning. The Task Force proposed that a set of core courses be identified (either from existing courses or newly developed ones) in each of the disciplinary blocks to provide an Introduction to Critical Thinking in the Disciplines. The four core areas were: (1) Math with statistics or calculus component; (2) Laboratory science; (3) U.S. Civics-related Social Science; (4) Literature (from the Humanities).

15. Both proposals have a pointed emphasis on critical thinking and inquiry at the foundational level. Barb cites several examples that suggest that these courses could deal with questions that are interdisciplinary. Is there a need for an increased emphasis on critical thinking, methods of inquiry, and interdisciplinary questions in foundational Gen Ed courses?

- Yes
- No

16. Barb Stengel also proposes a change in the way such courses would be approved. She writes that, “We do this (i.e. make use of shell syllabi with different content rather than approval of specific courses on a course by course basis) in order to minimize the amount of oversight and scrutiny required. We assume that the appropriate faculty will be able to approve a course shell that can accommodate topical reconfigurations selected according to the instructors’ area of expertise and interest. This makes it possible for faculty to teach topics of special interest on an irregular basis without undergoing the rigors of seeking approval for a completely new course.” The Task Force made a similar proposal for Freshman Seminars. Should we work on innovative approaches to make the current course approval process less cumbersome?

- Yes
- No

17. A separate question that arises from Barb’s proposal is that some of these shell courses might be taught by a broader range of qualified faculty than is currently the case. For example, she writes that some sections of the Scientific Inquiry course could be taught by “faculty with doctorates in exercise physiology, NURS faculty if appropriate, ITEC faculty if appropriate” and that Applied Math Reasoning could be taught by Math faculty and by research methods faculty.” Should this be considered?

- Yes
- No

Department _____

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Do you support the idea of increasing the number of thematically organized courses and learning communities? | Yes | No | | |
| 2 | What role should distributional requirements play in a revised system? | Distributional requirements should not be changed. | There should be minor reductions in distributional requirements to provide more flexibility | We should consider alternative approaches to the G Block system | |
| 3 | Would you support increasing the role of demand scheduling? | Yes | No | | |
| 4 | Do you support a “developmental” approach? | Yes | No | | |
| 5 | Should we require literature and civics courses as part of distributional requirements? | Civics Yes | Literature Yes | Yes to both | Both should be optional |
| 6 | Should diversity be intentionally designed into requirements of the Gen Ed system? | Yes | No | | |
| 7 | If a diversity requirement is included, how should that requirement be focused? | On U.S. diversity only. | On Global diversity only. | Both U.S. and global diversity should be required. | Students should have an option |
| 8 | In what way should credit for freshman seminars count in Gen Ed? | A variety of Freshman Seminars formats should count toward Gen Ed credit | Only count 3 credit courses that are offered outside the student’s major toward Gen Ed. | | |
| 9 | What should we do with the W system? | We should not change the current W system. | We should keep W courses and look into ways to increase the effectiveness of the current approach even further. | We should reduce the number of W courses and instead integrate writing into a variety of Gen Ed / major courses | |
| 10 | In what way should advanced writing be represented in Gen Ed? | The present requirements for Advanced Writing should be maintained. | As much as possible, Advanced Writing should be offered in sections designed specifically for majors in certain fields. | Allow programs to embed advanced writing skills in other advanced Gen Ed / capstone courses | |
| 11 | Should Gen Ed reform allow for flexibility between degrees, schools or even majors? | There should be a single set of requirements for all programs | The system should allow for some differences in Gen Ed requirements among degree programs | The system should allow for some differences in Gen Ed requirements among schools | The system should allow for some differences in Gen Ed requirements among majors |
| 12 | Should there be a foreign language requirement? | Yes, for all students. | This should be an option that is decided separately for each school | Foreign Language should not be a Gen Ed requirement. | |
| 13 | Do you support making either of these reductions? | Wellness should become an elective course | Speech should become an elective course | Both of these courses should become electives | Both courses should be required for all students |
| 14 | How many Gen Ed credits should a student | None | 2 courses | 3 courses | 4 courses |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|-----|----|--|--|
| | be allowed to designate “pass / no credit” under these rules? | | | | |
| 15 | Should we work on innovative approaches to make the current course approval process less cumbersome? | Yes | No | | |
| 16 | Need to increase emphasis on critical thinking in foundational courses? | Yes | No | | |
| 17 | Should a broader range of qualified faculty be considered? | Yes | No | | |