

Faculty Senate Minutes
June 20, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Academic Student Development, Business Administration, Music, Nursing, Philosophy, and Special Education.

I. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the May 2, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Dr. Börger-Greco thanked senators for participation in a successful commencement held May 13. She also thanked Dr. Carol Phillips for her years of valuable service in Senate and wished her well in her upcoming retirement.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

None

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Association

None

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips

Executive Assistant to the President Phillips commented that a very successful summer program is underway.

Provost Prabhu

Provost Prabhu thanked Dr. Phillips for her hard work and strong leadership on campus. Dr. Prabhu also noted that summer enrollments are excellent.

VI. Faculty Emerita

None

VII. Task Force on Future Directions for Major Campus Lectures and Events

Dr. Carol Phillips distributed an updated version of the report from the Task Force on Future Directions for Major Campus Lectures and Events [see Attachment #1]. She noted that Senate provided positive feedback at the last meeting and work is already underway on upcoming co-curricular activities relating to the Citizenship theme. She highlighted the revisions to membership based on recommendations given at the last Senate meeting. Faculty representation on the University Theme Committee will be elected by Faculty Senate rather than appointed by the Provost. School Deans and the Chairs of the Women's Commission and Commission on Cultural Diversity were also added. A Saunders/West motion to endorse the Task Force recommendation of the purpose, objectives and membership of the University Theme committee and to remove the University Theme Committee section from the Faculty Senate Bylaws was approved without dissent.

VIII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

Academic Policies

Senator West returned two proposals to Senate for consideration. The first proposal addressed removal of students from courses for which pre-requisites were not met [see Attachment #2]. The proposal had been modified to specify that the professor should notify both the Registrar and the student by the end of the drop period. The proposed policy regarding removal of students not meeting course pre-requisites was approved without dissent.

The second proposal was to modify the policy on taking less-advanced courses to allow students to repeat courses in order to improve their overall GPA as needed for graduation or competency requirements [see Attachment #3]. Dr. Robert Smith expressed concern from Mathematics that this policy places the focus on grades rather than learning. He expressed fear that it will also create an environment where upper-level students fill seats in already-crowded lower courses, keeping early-career students from getting into classes they need. He further reiterated that this policy circumvents good advising of students to repeat courses for the purpose of mastering content. Senator DeCaria also expressed that Earth Sciences was not able to support this proposal.

A question raised was why the proposed change is needed. Senator West commented that it addresses the needs of only a few students. A further reminder was made that the policy does specify that each request would have to be approved by the appropriate department chair. It was noted that advising has already helped improve early awareness among BSE students regarding GPA requirements. The question of defining less-advanced courses was raised again. It was noted that these can be defined within a department and enforced in the Banner registration system. The proposed policy allowing students to repeat a less-advanced course in order to raise GPA to meet graduation or competency requirements was defeated. One supporter commented that their vote was cast based on the fact that the policy does allow departmental chairs to deny student requests.

UCPRC/GCPRC

First Readings

(1) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

BIOL 360: Histology, 4 credits. Proposal to create course to study cellular architecture and cell and tissue function in mammalian systems.

(2) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

WSSD 390: Athletic Training Techniques with Surface Anatomy, 3 credits. Proposal to create course to introduce fundamental principles and basic techniques used by Certified Athletic Trainers.

(3) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 140: Bio-Related Technologies, 3 credits. Proposal to create course to introduce technologies used in the study of living organisms.

A question was raised about the content of lab work for Bio-Related Technology. The response was that lab experiences and activities would be integrated with lecture content.

(4) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 291: Foundations of Technology Education. Proposal to revise course objectives to meet accreditation expectations.

(5) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 391: Curriculum and Instruction in Technology Education. Proposal to revise course objectives to meet accreditation expectations.

(6) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 435: Manufacturing Enterprise, 3 credits. Proposal to create course to explore the processes required to take a product from concept to market.

(7) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 491: Seminar in Technology Education. Proposal to revise course objectives to meet accreditation expectations.

(8) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 496: Innovations and Design Methodologies, 2 credits. Proposal to create course to learn methodologies appropriate for teaching advanced innovation and design activities.

Senator Anna requested a waiver of the two-meeting rule for approval of these courses (3-8 above) to support changes to the Technology Education major that will bring it into compliance with the 126-credit mandate by fall 2006. An Anna/Bookmiller motion to

waive the two-meeting rule for the six EDTE course proposals was approved without dissent.

(9) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

EDTE, Major in Technology Education. Proposal to change major to reduce credits to 126.

Senator Anna requested a waiver of the two-meeting rule for approval of this curriculum change (9) to bring the Technology Education major into compliance with the 126-credit mandate by fall 2006. An Anna/Bookmiller motion to waive the two-meeting rule for approval of the EDTE major in Technology Education was approved without dissent.

(10) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

THEA 312: The History and Principles of Stage Design, 3 credits. Proposal to give course G1 designation.

Dr. Tony Elliot requested a waiver of the two-meeting rule for this course (10 above) so that this designation would be in place for fall 2006. An Elliot/Gilani motion to waive the two-meeting rule for approval of THEA 312 as a G1 course was approved without dissent.

(11) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE CURRICULUM

FORL, BSE French/German/Spanish and Post-Baccalaureate certification in French/German/Spanish. Joint proposal to require a minimum grade of a B- or better in the French/German/Spanish linguistics course.

Senator Moine commented that this requirement has been in the handbook and enforced by the Foreign Language department for several years. However, official documentation for the requirement apparently had not been approved previously. He requested a waiver of the two-meeting rule to make the change (11 above) officially effective in fall 2006. A Moine/Ward motion to waive the two-meeting rule for the FORL grade requirement in linguistics proposal was approved without dissent.

(12) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

SOAN Major in Sociology. Proposal to change course options for required related courses.

(13) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

SOAN, Major in Sociology, Criminology option. Proposal to change course options for required related courses.

Dr. Carrie Lee Smith requested a waiver of the two-meeting rule for approval of these changes (12 & 13 above). A Smith/Kevorkian motion to waive the two-meeting rule for the SOAN changes in course options was approved without dissent. It was noted that for the Major in Sociology students cannot get credit for both MATH 130 and MATH 235. The decision was made to modify the proposal to note that students are required to take

either MATH 130 or MATH 235 rather than including MATH 235 as an option for required related courses. The need for waiving the two-meeting rule was questioned in light of the necessary changes. While the changes will not be included in the catalog, they may be implemented via Banner for the fall semester. Revised documentation would need to be submitted to Deans' Council immediately in order to have the change considered for fall 2006.

(14) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

PHYS 331: Fundamentals of Optics, 2 credits. Proposal to create lab-based course in physical optics.

Senator Gilani requested a waiver of the two-meeting rule for this course (14 above) to meet budget deadlines for purchasing necessary equipment. A Gilani/Luek motion to waive the two-meeting rule for PHYS 331 was approved without dissent.

Concerns were raised about the number of course and curriculum proposals requesting a two-meeting waiver at this meeting. It was pointed out that this creates a burden on UCPRC to review a large number of proposals during the last weeks of the semester. Dr. Prabhu also commented that forwarding so many proposals to Deans' Council at this point makes it difficult for them to give a quality review of the proposals. He encouraged faculty not to let this be a pattern. Senator White noted that UCPRC intends to adhere to a tighter deadline schedule in the future and asked that senators relay this to departments. Dr. Phillips further noted that it is difficult to adequately communicate to students the implications of late changes since they cannot be included in the catalog. It was recommended that Senate revisit the issue of establishing a timeline for course approvals.

IX. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

None

X. Proposed Courses and Programs

Proposals with 2-Meeting Rule Waived (*numbers match First Readings)

(3*) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 140: Bio-Related Technologies, 3 credits. Proposal to create course to introduce technologies used in the study of living organisms was approved without dissent.

(4*) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 291: Foundations of Technology Education. Proposal to revise course objectives to meet accreditation expectations was approved without dissent.

(5*) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 391: Curriculum and Instruction in Technology Education. Proposal to revise course objectives to meet accreditation expectations was approved without dissent.

(6*) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 435: Manufacturing Enterprise, 3 credits. Proposal to create course to explore the processes required to take a product from concept to market was approved without dissent.

(7*) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 491: Seminar in Technology Education. Proposal to revise course objectives to meet accreditation expectations was approved without dissent.

(8*) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

EDTE 496: Innovations and Design Methodologies, 2 credits. Proposal to create course to learn methodologies appropriate for teaching advanced innovation and design activities was approved without dissent.

(9*) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

EDTE, Major in Technology Education. Proposal to change major to reduce credits to 126 was approved with one dissenting vote.

(10*) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

THEA 312: The History and Principles of Stage Design, 3 credits. Proposal to give course G1 designation was approved without dissent.

(11*) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE CURRICULUM

FORL, BSE French/German/Spanish and Post-Baccalaureate certification in French/German/Spanish. Joint proposal to require a minimum grade of a B- or better in the French/German/Spanish linguistics course was approved without dissent.

(12*) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

SOAN Major in Sociology. Proposal to change course options for required related courses amended to reflect requirement for either MATH 130 or MATH 235 was approved without dissent.

(13*) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

SOAN, Major in Sociology, Criminology option. Proposal to change course options for required related courses was approved without dissent.

(14*) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

PHYS 331: Fundamentals of Optics, 2 credits. Proposal to create lab-based course in physical optics was approved without dissent.

Second Readings

(1) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ITEC 241: Drafting Communications. Proposal to update curriculum to meet recommendations for accreditation was approved without dissent.

(2) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ITEC 245: Descriptive Geometry, 3 credits. Proposal to create course dedicated to the fundamentals of graphical mathematics and projection theory was approved without dissent.

(3) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ITEC 342(242): Computer-Aided Engineering Drawing. Proposal to redesign course to concentrate on computer-aided engineering drafting and solids modeling was approved without dissent.

(4) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ITEC 345: Statics, 3 credits. Proposal to create course covering elementary, analytical and practical approaches to the principles and physical concepts of statics was approved without dissent.

(5) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ITEC 445: Design for Manufacture and Assembly, 3 credits. Proposal to create course that deals with methodologies and tools to define product development phases was approved without dissent.

(6) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC, BS CADD Technology option. Proposal to include 2 specialization areas, 3 new courses and 2 modified courses was approved without dissent.

(7) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC, AT CADD Technology option. Proposal to include 3 new courses and 2 modified courses was approved without dissent.

(8) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC, BS Mechanical option. Proposal to renumber course and add student selection of ITEC 448/445 was approved without dissent.

A DeCaria/Wismer motion to approve all the remaining ITEC proposals collectively was approved without dissent.

(9) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC, AT Mechanical option. Proposal to renumber course and add elective of ITEC 445 was approved without dissent.

(10) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC, BS Manufacturing option. Proposal to add ITEC 445 as technical elective was approved without dissent.

(11) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC, BS General Tech option. Proposal to add ITEC 342, 345 as technical options electives and ITEC 445 as acceptable R&D elective course was approved without dissent.

(12) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC, AT Manufacturing option. Proposal to add ITEC 445 as technical elective was approved without dissent.

(13) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC minor, CADD Technology option. Proposal to include 2 new courses (ITEC 345, 445) as electives and modify 2 existing courses was approved without dissent.

(14) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ITEC minor, Mechanical Technology option. Proposal to add ITEC 445 as elective was approved without dissent.

(15) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ESCI, Meteorology minor. Proposal to be more aligned with BS in Meteorology and provide flexibility was approved without dissent.

(16) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ESCI 443: Climate Dynamics, 3 credits. Proposal to create course that gives a comprehensive treatment of the components of the climate system. Required course for Meteorology majors was approved without dissent.

(17) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

ESCI, BS Oceanography. Proposal to rename to BS Ocean Sciences and Coastal Studies and revise options.

A question was raised regarding whether this proposal contained a hidden pre-requisite of ESCI 221 needed to take ESCI 362. It was also noted that students cannot opt to take PHYS 131/132 if PHYS 232 is required to ESCI 364. Senator DeCaria will return these proposals to Senate in the fall with these issues addressed. It was also pointed out that this name change cannot be used until the Chancellor's Office is notified.

(18) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ESCI 467: Engineering Applications in the Coastal Zone, 3 credits. Proposal to create course covering application of coastal processes and engineering practices. Required course for BS Ocean Sciences and Coastal Studies majors was approved without dissent.

The currency of resources for ESCI 467 was questioned. Senator White responded that UCPRC addressed this and the older texts listed will also be supplemented with current journal articles. It was suggested that some of these articles be added to the proposal.

(19) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

PHYS BSE. Proposal to waive Perspectives requirement in General Education to meet 126-credit limitation was approved with several dissents.

The concern was raised that General Education requirements are different for some students due to numerous exemptions of Perspective courses. Recent Gen Ed discussions highlighted strong support of P courses and support of uniform Gen Ed requirements for all students. There was recognition of the inconsistency between these general views and the need to find ways to trim curriculums to meet the 126-credit limitation for BSE students. It was noted that the recommendation for waiving P course requirements for students in the sciences is based on the idea that these students already take courses across several disciplines.

(20) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

CSCI 426: Adaptive Technologies, 4 credits. Proposal to create course covering adaptive technologies for the disabled was approved without dissent.

(21) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

SPED 312: Serving Individuals with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings, 3 credits. Proposal to create course covering special education for ELED majors was approved without dissent.

(22) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE/GRADUATE CURRICULUM

FORL, BSE French/German/Spanish and Post-Baccalaureate certification in French/German/Spanish. Joint proposal to require passing oral proficiency interview with at least an Advanced Low Level was approved without dissent.

A request was made to specify that students must achieve at least an Advanced Low Level score on the oral proficiency interview. A question raised was whether students receive any financial aid for the cost of taking this exam. It was noted that there is currently some help available although the cost of the exam is no different than the cost of textbooks for courses.

XI. Other/New Business

None

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller
Faculty Senate Secretary

Action Summary:

A Saunders/West motion to endorse the Task Force recommendation of the purpose, objectives and membership of the University Theme committee and to remove the University Theme Committee section from the Faculty Senate Bylaws was approved without dissent.

The proposed policy regarding removal of students not meeting course pre-requisites was approved without dissent.

The proposed policy allowing students to repeat a less-advanced course in order to raise GPA to meet graduation or competency requirements was defeated.

An Anna/Bookmiller motion to waive the two-meeting rule for the six EDTE course proposals was approved without dissent.

An Anna/Bookmiller motion to waive the two-meeting rule for approval of the EDTE major in Technology Education was approved without dissent.

An Elliot/Gilani motion to waive the two-meeting rule for approval of THEA 312 as a G1 course was approved without dissent.

A Moine/Ward motion to waive the two-meeting rule for the FORL grade requirement in linguistics proposal was approved without dissent.

A Smith/Kevorkian motion to waive the two-meeting rule for the SOAN changes in course options was approved without dissent.

A Gilani/Luek motion to waive the two-meeting rule for PHYS 331 was approved without dissent.

A DeCaria/Wismer motion to approve all the remaining ITEC proposals collectively was approved without dissent.

Attachment #1

Report to Faculty Senate Task Force on Future Directions for Major Campus Lectures and Events

In Spring 2005, President McNairy shared her thoughts with Faculty Senate regarding what future directions might be indicated for our major campus lectures and events. She asked the group if they felt the Academic Theme was continuing to fulfill its purpose and received an interesting array of responses. She commissioned a presidential task force to explore this matter, which commenced meeting in July 2005 and has continued its work throughout the fall semester. It was anticipated that the task force would develop recommendations to be shared with the Faculty Senate for review and input in January 2006. In the course of its work, the Task Force determined that it was important to wait for the final report of the institutional identity initiative, which will delay the report to Faculty Senate until early April.

The charge of the task force is:

To investigate new models for revitalizing our major lecture series to increase faculty and student participation, answering the following questions:

- ❖ How has our academic theme fulfilled its purpose?
- ❖ How do we enrich our social and cultural programming so that our students and faculty will participate?
- ❖ How do we foster a cross-disciplinary approach to programming?
- ❖ Are there ways, without stifling lecture purposes, to facilitate a more coherent approach to programming and subsequent marketing of major events ("Tradition and Innovation" has served us well in this fashion.)?
- ❖ Are there ways to integrate further the academic purposes of a new model (e.g., freshman reading program around the theme)?
- ❖ How do we utilize our resources, both human and material, effectively to promote what is best for MU?

In investigating responses to the questions identified in the charge, the task force first reviewed the history of the academic theme at the University. The theme commenced in 1990 with the inaugural Arthur Miller Festival, and it has continued with the conclusion of the 150th anniversary celebration in Spring 2006. In its review of past themes, the task force determined that some themes were more successful than others in providing an integrating, coherent perspective to programming that fostered interdisciplinary conversations and exploration.

1990-91	The Arthur Miller Festival
1991-92	Encounter of Two Worlds [Columbian Quincentenary]
1992-93	Encounter of Two Worlds [Columbian Quincentenary]
1993-94	Earth: The Next Generation
1994-95	Technology and Human Evolution
1995-96	In Search of Justice: Balancing Rights and Responsibilities in a Pluralistic Society
1996-97	Preparing for Life in the 21 st Century

1997-98	Culture and Communication in the Electronic Village
1998-99	MU, a Community of Learners
1999-2000	Achievements throughout the 20 th Century
2000-01	Building a Community of Partnerships: The Role of Arts in Society
2001-02	World of Cultures in Our Own Back Yard
2002-03	Crossing Boundaries: Decolonializing the Curriculum
2003-04	Unity, Excellence and Strength through Diversity
2004-05	150 th Anniversary: Tradition and Innovation
2005-06	150 th Anniversary: Tradition and Innovation

A brief review of the major lectureships on campus, including their mission/charge and basic funding information also was undertaken. This yielded the following information, noted below. Generally, these lectures have not considered the current theme selected by the Academic Theme Committee in selection of lecture speakers and/or focus of the lecture itself.

Brossman Science Lectureship: The mission of the Brossman Science Lectureship and Competition is to stimulate interest in science among middle/high school students and the general public. The Lectureship advances the commitment of the University to the community and public higher education. The lecture series advances the image and awareness of the University by bringing on campus a nationally known speaker to address about 600 middle school students, 80 high school students and teachers, several hundred members of the general public, and several hundred members of the University community. In addition to the two lectures presented by the speaker there is a science knowledge competition for high school students and a series of demonstrations and displays presented for the high school students and teachers by the Millersville faculty. Funding Source: Mr. & Mrs. William F. Brossman Charitable Foundation. Total budget is approximately \$10,000.

Christie Lecture: An annual lecture by an up and coming economist (sometimes a business/economics journalist) with name recognition. Speaking fees are a real issue. Most economists of any distinction are commanding \$15K and up. The lecture is funded by corporate sponsorship obtained by the Advancement Office. Past speakers have included Nobel Prize winners.

Kenderdine Lecture: Endowed annual lecture on a current issue in international political affairs. Usual cost is \$6,000-8,000 per speaker but can vary given the speaker if additional funds available.

Lockey Lecture: Endowed lecture in the field of education. Currently do an all-call to the education faculty for nominations in the spring for the following year. Amount that can usually be spent is \$2,500, although supplemental funds have been received to support special speakers (Jonathan Kozol was about \$10,000).

Carter Woodson and Hazel Jackson Lectures: Woodson lecture is sponsored and has a budget of approximately \$8,000. The Commission on Cultural Diversity pays for the Hazel Jackson Lecture (\$5,000). Black Culture Celebration has a \$10,000 budget.

Millersville University International Holocaust Conference: Founded in 1980, the conference brings world-class scholars to the University as part of the ongoing struggle to understand this horrific event in human history. During the last several conferences, a close working relationship has formed with various departments of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. Beginning with the 25th conference in 2005, the

focus of the conference emphasizes various genocides in world history. The conference has a \$10,000 budget.

University funds of about \$35,000 provide additional support for the lectures. This allocation has not changed in recent years and has not kept pace with costs today.

Recommendations of the Task Force:

Purpose of University Theme:

The primary purpose of the academic theme is to provide a co-curricular experience in the Liberal Arts, designed to build intellectual community, engaging students and faculty in discussions of broad questions of importance across a two academic year span. The theme will be informed by the goals and purposes of general education, serving to make the University's liberal arts curriculum more explicit. The selected thematic question must also foster interdisciplinary and inclusive conversations.

As a secondary purpose, the university theme will serve as a bridge to the regional community.

An important consideration is that it will support and address the University identity.

Planning and Organization

The academic theme (or question) will cycle for two years to facilitate intentional planning for course development (topics or seminar courses) and related events, and available monies may be allocated differently. Where possible, major lectures will "take turns" at getting a larger portion of available funds so that special, big name speakers may be brought in one time per cycle. Also, while we want to maintain a rich array of offerings, LESS is BETTER, and we must look for natural synergies across existing or newly planned programs in both Academic and Student Affairs to see where they might be combined. This reduces competition among many offerings and should facilitate attendance and active participation.

The theme committee will be reconfigured to be a combined Joint Faculty-Student Theme Committee, so that we will foster programming across the major lectures, an array of other programs, courses, co-curricular and extracurricular activities. It will permeate the entire campus experience as best as is possible, without force-fitting (some years, some major events may not lend themselves well to tying into the theme but should be held). Faculty involvement is central to the success of the theme and the Theme Committee will be restructured to include faculty leaders for all major lectures, the director of the Center for Academic Excellence, as well as staff, student and community members. The Committee's work will be expanded to include major responsibility for planning theme implementation throughout the year. The Committee needs a new mission, objectives, tasks and broader membership.

Integration of the theme across campus:

- All invited speakers will be asked to respond to several theme-related questions (2 or 3), determined by the Committee, even if it isn't a major focus of their address. These could be combined into a book of interviews or a video presentation, providing additional learning opportunities for students.
 - The Exchange/Snapper could keep emphasis on the theme evident throughout the year.
 - Faculty will be asked to share their expertise on the issue. Faculty will be invited and encouraged to provide talks, inviting other colleagues into classes to share insights, etc. On-campus expertise will be stimulated and acknowledged. We might consider maintaining a history of profiles of faculty through student interviews, etc.
 - Special connections will be sought. For example, this year the American Democracy Project, Constitution Day, the Robin Wright address (Kenderdine lecture), the Katrina symposium, the Rwanda lecture, service-learning, civic engagement, Japanese American Internment Symposium, extracurricular community service, all tie into citizenship. This unofficially has emerged as a "theme" addressing, from very different perspectives, what it means to be a citizen.

The task force recommends continuing the citizenship theme for at least another year. This will foster the conversations on general education. We further recommend that **citizenship needs to be viewed broadly as, "from family, to neighborhood, to community, to the world."**

The first new approach to the academic theme should begin in Fall 2007 with the change in student orientation from summer to immediately prior to the fall semester. It will be coordinated with a reading program for all new students, which will be expanded to include upperclassmen (and graduate students where appropriate) as well so that dialogue on the reading may occur across all student groups.

Theme Days and Events

Early in the fall semester and late in the spring semester, theme days should be held. These days will serve as a focused beginning (a "kick-off") and ending (a closing) to the academic year. An evening and following all day venue appear to be the best way to schedule these theme days. A major lecture/event will be held on the opening evening and the following mid-day. Numerous other activities will occur throughout this day as well so that faculty, students and staff will be afforded many different approaches to discussing the theme question.

In addition to theme day activities, there will be multiple conversations, opportunities to engage in significant dialogue and discussion on issues related to the theme throughout the entire academic year. The campus will be alive with events, and integration of these co-curricular events into course syllabi and included as course requirements with expectations of participation should be fostered to the fullest extent possible. The

inherent benefit to all on campus will be explicated and all students and faculty will be strongly encouraged to participate in the programs that are provided.

Suggested Questions for Theme Consideration

Who am I? Who are we?

How do we define sustainability?

What does it mean to be human?

What defines a liberal arts education?

What does it mean to be a citizen (American/global)? Do we have a civic responsibility?

What does it mean to be an educated person?

How do we discover truth?

What does it mean to be thoughtful?

Can there be peace? What is peace?

How can I (each individual) make a difference?

What (is) about privacy in the 21st century?

University Theme Committee

Purpose: The primary purpose of the University Theme Committee is to provide leadership and direction for the selection of the university theme and the implementation of theme programs and activities throughout each academic year.

Objectives:

1. On a biennial basis, (beginning in Spring 2006 for a Fall 2007 implementation), select the question that will guide University programming and cultural affairs events for the subsequent two years.
2. In collaboration with lectureship chairs/committees, provide recommendations for the selection and implementation of speakers, performers, and specific special events, including the venue and the budget decisions.
3. Provide direction and coordination for all other co-curricular and extracurricular-related programming, including such items as selection of books for academic reading programs, determination of questions to be posed to each speaker, and synchronization with related performing arts events.
4. Submit an annual report to the President by June 1 of the work of the committee; this should include an annual review as well as a biennial evaluation of the success of each selected theme.

Membership:

- Faculty chairs/representatives of all lectureships (Brossman, Christie, Kenderdine, Lockey, Carter-Woodson, Jackson, and Holocaust Conference)
- Four additional faculty, one representing each school plus the library, elected by the Faculty Senate
- School Deans
- Director, Center for Academic Excellence
- Representative from Cultural Affairs Committee
- Coordinator, General Education
- Representative from University Advancement
- Chairperson, Women's Commission
- Chairperson, Commission on Cultural Diversity
- Provost or designee
- Vice President of Student Affairs or designee
- Three students, two appointed by Student Senate and one selected by the Vice President of Student Affairs
- Representative from the Alumni Association
- Two members representing the community

Task Force Committee Members

Dr. Kirsten Bookmiller, Kenderdine Lecture
Dr. Robert Buchanan, Chairperson, Academic Theme Committee
Mr. Tony Elliot, Chairperson, Cultural Affairs Committee
Dr. Michael Gumper, Christie Lecture
 Mr. Dwight Horsey, Advisor to the Cultural Affairs Committee
Dr. Linda McDowell, Lockey Lecture
Dr. Carol Phillips, Task Force Chairperson
Ms. Carol Reichler, Director, Special Events
Dr. Lyman Rickard, Brossman Lecture
Dr. Rita Smith Wade-El, Commission on Cultural Diversity
Dr. Diane Umble, Representative, Deans' Council
Dr. Marjorie Warmkessel, Director, Center for Academic Excellence
Dr. Tracey Weis, Women's Studies
Dr. Sepi Yalda, Women's Commission

Memorandum

To: Faculty Senate

CC: Department Chairs

From: Lillie S. West, Chair of Academic Policies

Re: Course Prerequisite Proposal

Senate – June 20, 2006

Academic Policies Committee recommends the following addition and changes to both the undergraduate catalog and Governance Manual. As requested the committee has considered your requests.

1. Add language that courses taken at Millersville University must be retaken at Millersville:

This language is clearly stated in the Undergraduate Catalog under the heading Repeat Policy. The committee recommends that the categories under the heading, Grading Policies, be changed. As shown on the attached sheet, the Repeat Policy would be moved to follow Z-Grade (Z). This will place the language, “Courses failed at Millersville must be repeated at Millersville in order to earn course credit and credit toward graduation. Students may not transfer credit for any course taken at another institution that is the equivalent of a course previously taken at Millersville: this policy applies whether the course was passed or failed at Millersville University,” on the same page as the Course Prerequisite policy.

2. Add language for timeframe for removing students from a class:

“The professor will notify the Registrar and student by the end of the drop period” has been added to the policy.

3. Implementation procedures.

The committee recommends that each department determine the procedure that will work best.

Rationale:

Each department has different needs.

Some departments have existing procedures.

No one procedure seemed to work for every department.

CURRENT

GRADES AND POLICIES

- Schedule Adjustment: Drop/Add
- Withdrew (W)
- Repeat Policy
- Incomplete Policy
- Pass/Fail Courses (P, F)
- Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory
- Audit (AU)
- Proficiency in Progress (X)
- Z-Grade (Z)

GRADE CHANGES

TAKING A LESS ADVANCED COURSE

Students do not receive credit for a less advanced course if they have already demonstrated competency by passing a more advanced course. For example, MATH 100 and 101 may not be taken for credit after MATH 161, and FREN 201 may not be taken for credit after FREN 202. Students who wish to review less advanced material may do so on an audit basis.

REVISED

GRADES AND POLICIES

- Schedule Adjustment: Drop/Add
- Withdrew (W)
- Incomplete Policy
- Pass/Fail Courses (P, F)
- Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory
- Audit (AU)
- Proficiency in Progress (X)
- Z-Grade (Z)
- Repeat Policy

GRADE CHANGES

COURSE PREREQUISITES

Courses may have a series of prerequisites (satisfactory completion of a prior course, minimum GPA or earned credits, placement test scores, etc.). Students who do not meet the stated prerequisite(s) may be removed from a course at the discretion of the professor. The professor will notify the Registrar and student by the end of the drop period.

TAKING A LESS ADVANCED COURSE

Students do not receive credit for a less advanced course if they have already demonstrated competency by passing a more advanced course. For example, MATH 100 and 101 may not be taken for credit after MATH 161, and FREN 201 may not be taken for credit after FREN 202. Students who wish to review less advanced material may do so on an audit basis.