

Faculty Senate Minutes
March 6, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 4:11 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Business Administration, Education Foundations and Nursing.

I. Minutes of previous meetings

The minutes of the February 20, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Chairperson Börger-Greco noted that issues related to Middle States accreditation will be coming up soon for which faculty assistance will be critical. She also noted that APSCUF has expressed concern that the planned mechanism for voting on the proposed Honor Code System would set a bad precedent. She indicated that Meet & Discuss determined that this vote should be taken as part of the general APSCUF election to be held in April.

When asked about the percentage of faculty who normally participate in APSCUF votes, Dr. Heintzelman indicated that a higher than usual turnout is expected in April since there is potential for a strike authorization vote. She also responded that the rationale for needing greater input from faculty on instituting an Honor Code was shared at Meet & Discuss. She indicated that APSCUF is concerned that junior faculty might be pressured by senior faculty during a vote taken at the departmental level. It was pointed out that the plans for collecting votes allow for anonymous voting or that a double-envelope system could be used to address this concern. It was further clarified that there appears to be an issue of whether Senate or APSCUF is responsible for conducting this vote. The possibility of multiple polling stations on campus was raised as a way to increase faculty participation in voting.

The question of needing a majority of eligible votes rather than a majority of votes cast was revisited. It was noted that the specification for support from the majority of faculty was based on the fact that the success of an Honor Code System is dependent on significant faculty buy-in on campus. Concern was expressed about whether the need to maintain current voting practices is important if appropriate alternatives are possible. Dr. Heintzelman was asked whether there are additional concerns from APSCUF that have not yet been shared with Senate. She indicated that there were also concerns that Senate may also take over voting on items like the General Education proposal and that the Honor Code System is not a curriculum issue.

A Mowrey/Wismer motion to table the issue of voting on the Honor Code System was approved with one abstaining vote.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

Student Senate President Andrew Moyer reported that recruiting for orientation this fall is going well. He also presented plans and sketches for the proposed SMC renovation and expansion project. Key considerations are wellness, involvement and entertainment. Phases I and II involve updating fitness spaces, and Phase III includes new entrances to the building. There is also a proposed Student Sports Education Center. Mr. Moyer indicated that a referendum will be held regarding increasing the activities fee from \$49 to \$156, beginning in 2010, to fund the project.

Several questions raised by faculty were addressed: dance studios will be moved to the basement level, Brooks Hall classrooms will be retained, lounge spaces should appeal to commuting students. Additional discussion was held regarding how to ensure that the facility is beneficial to non-traditional students. A suggestion made was offering family access to the fitness facility. Dr. Prabhu noted that the needs of non-traditional students are being considered carefully across campus. No other fees should be affected by this project, and graduate students would only be affected if they pay this fee currently. Concern was expressed about putting off the increased fee until so late in the project since the students making the decision about the increased fee will not be the ones required to pay it. Mr. Moyer indicated that the delay avoids charging students more before they have access to the improved space. A gradually increasing fee that parallels completion of various phases was suggested. A question was raised regarding the role of Student Services Inc. for the renovated SMC. Mr. Robert Slabinski responded that they would continue to manage the space as they do currently. However, he pointed out that the planned Sports Education Center encompassing Brooks Hall would be instructional. It is intended primarily for intramural use and could potentially tie in closely with the Wellness department. Concern was raised about where events will move during the renovation process. It was shared that this has not been completely addressed yet but will be considered by the architects.

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Association

None

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

Provost

Provost Prabhu distributed a timetable for the upcoming Middle States accreditation process. [see Attachment #1] He noted that subcommittees are needed to address each of the 14 standards specified by MS. He highlighted the new Institutional Assessment and Assessment of Student Learning as important overarching standards. He also pointed out the new General Education standard. Dr. Prabhu reminded faculty that Millersville does a good job of carefully considering new programs, like the FYE, for implementation.

However, he indicated that in order to be prepared for MS, we will likely need to move forward with programming under consideration with the understanding that changes can be made as needed.

Associate Provost for Academic Administration

Associate Provost Burns reminded faculty of upcoming campus visits by candidates for the position of Assistant Vice President for Institutional Planning and Assessment. He encouraged faculty to attend and ask questions. Dr. Burns also reminded faculty that it is not too late to plan for DL courses to be offered in the summer.

Follow up was requested on the issue of errors in online registration information being posted. It was noted that some chairs received old schedules to review instead of the current information. Dr. Burns replied that discussions are underway on how to make this process run smoothly and allow adequate review. He noted that some departments did not return reviewed information. The need for accuracy in the posted course information was stressed. The potential impact on graduate students was noted in particular since they take fewer courses and have significant scheduling considerations to accommodate.

Another question raised was whether the agreed upon cap of 30 students in writing courses would be firm. Dr. Prabhu noted that the cap is 30 + 10% which is really 33 and is generally checked with the department. Concern was expressed about the Registrar automatically adding extra students into these courses since it conflicts with additions being made manually by faculty. It was pointed out that faculty or departments are able to best discern when it is appropriate to add students based on their situation. There was vigorous opposition expressed to the administrative requirement of a cap of 33 rather than the 30 agreed to at Meet & Discuss.

VI. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

GERC

Senator Warmkessel distributed an updated Proposal for Revised Gen Ed Curriculum with changes from faculty feedback and discussions in Senate. [see Attachment #2] She noted that a motion would be brought to the next meeting regarding a vote on the proposal. A document was also distributed regarding methods for integrating revision into writing assignments. [see Attachment #3] This is meant to be shared with colleagues.

UCPRC

Senator White noted that there is only one remaining meeting of UCPRC where course proposals will be considered for Fall 2007. Faculty are also encouraged to bring DL course review proposals.

First Readings

(1) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
BA INTL majors. Proposal to update the International Studies program.

(2) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM
BA INTL minors. Proposal to update the International Studies program.

(3) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
COMM 311: Environmental Advocacy, 3 credits, G1. Proposal to create a course to explore how citizens and public groups influence policies and practices affecting natural and human environments.

(4) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
ENGL 483: Politics, Film and Electronic Media. Proposal to add a P designation.

(5) CHANGE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE
ELED 376: Assessment for Instructional Planning. Proposal to add a W designation.

AOAC

Senator White reported that issues of oral communication, technical competency and scientific reasoning are being worked on. She noted plans for random testing of scientific reasoning and an upcoming survey regarding technology.

APC

Senator Luek noted that at the last meeting she had expressed concern about the proposed form of determining GPA for Latin Honors. However, upon review of the proposal, she is now in favor of the proposed revisions. The proposed revisions to Latin Honors were approved without dissent.

Honors College

It was noted that regular students must complete a semester abroad in order to satisfy Perspective requirement for General Education and that this is different than the proposal presented for Honors College students. The proposal allowing Honors College students to satisfy their Honors Perspectives requirement with 3 hours of study abroad was approved with one abstaining vote.

VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

None

VIII. Proposed Courses and Programs

(1) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

GOVT 361: The Politics of Race and Ethnicity, 3 credits, G3. Proposal to create a course to examine the role of racial and ethnic minority groups in American politics was approved without dissent.

IX. Faculty Emeritus

None

X. General Education Review Committee

Senator Warmkessel noted that although there was not time for discussion now on the documents distributed, GERC will bring the proposed motion at the next meeting.

XI. Other/New Business

Senator Wismer distributed a document addressing the issue of whether courses affected by a change in one of their pre-requisite courses could be updated without submitting a new course proposal. [see Attachment #4] He requested that APC consider this issue.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller
Faculty Senate Secretary

Action Summary:

The minutes of the February 20, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

A Mowrey/Wismer motion to table the issue of voting on the Honor Code System was approved with one abstaining vote.

The proposed revisions to Latin Honors were approved without dissent.

The proposal allowing Honors College students to satisfy their Honors Perspectives requirement with 3 hours of study abroad was approved with one abstaining vote.

Attachment #1

Middle States Accreditation
Planning and Timelines

Activity	Middle States Timeline	MU Actual	MU Proposed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee and members chosen MS liaison schedules self-study preparation visit to the institution 	Fall of AY 1	Spring 1997 (SPARC, a standing committee, was designated as Steering Cmt)	October 2007 (identify Steering Cmt)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institution chooses self-study model, determines types of working groups, finalizes a draft self-study design including charge questions for working groups 	Spring of AY 1	Spring 1998 (co-chairs of self-study appointed, who appointed chapter chairs, who assembled chapter teams) Late Spring 1998 (self-study design approved by SPARC)	Spring 2008 (Cmt begins work)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MS liaison conducts self-study preparation visit; approves institution's self-study design 	Spring AY 1 – Fall AY 2		Spring 2008 – Fall 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steering Committee oversees research and reporting by working groups Working groups involve the community Working groups submit reports 	Fall – Spring AY 2	Fall 1998 – Spring 1999 (chapter teams collected data and drafted self-study chapters)	Fall 2008 – Spring 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MS selects evaluation Team Chair and institution approves selection Institution (with MS evaluation Team Chair) select dates for team visit and Chair's preliminary visit Institution sends a copy of self-study design to MS Team Chair 	Winter AY 2		Fall 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MS selects evaluation team members and institution approves selection Steering Committee develops draft self-study report from working group drafts 	Spring – Summer AY 2	Summer 1999 (co-chairs edited chapters into a self-study draft)	April 2009 (draft self-study)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campus community reviews draft self-study report MS Chair reviews draft report Institution's governing board reviews draft report Institution sends draft self-study report to MS Chair prior to Chair's visit MS Chair visits at least 4 months prior to Team visit Institution prepares final version of self-study report 	Fall AY 3	Fall 1999 (SPARC approved the self-study draft after campus community review) November 1999 (SPARC approved final self-study) December 1999 (COT endorsed final self-study)	Fall 2009 (final draft self-study) November 2009 December 2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions sends final report to MS Team at least 6 	Winter or Spring	After COT endorsement, self-study disseminated	Winter 2009

weeks prior to Team visit	AY 3	to University community and sent to MS Team	(6 weeks prior to team visit)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS Team visit • Team report • Institutional response 	Spring AY 3	March 2000 (Middle States evaluation team visit)	Spring 2010 (team visit)

Attachment #2

Proposal for Revised General Education Curriculum

Presented to Millersville University Faculty Senate

by the General Education Review Committee

January 30, 2007

Amended based on Senate feedback—March 6, 2007

Introduction

This proposal is the culmination of three and a half years of campus dialogue and would be the first significant revision of general education since 1988. The proposed revision of the General Education objectives and curriculum preserves the values of the current system while providing a progressive step forward.

The changes from the current system emphasize greater coherence, flexibility, and preparation for a changing world. Greater coherence comes in part through better alignment of objectives and the curriculum and through opportunities for enhanced connections between general education and studies in the major. The proposal allows up to six credits of electives, providing increased flexibility to both students and programs. The addition of a Cultural Diversity and Community requirement fits with the central value of diversity and community at Millersville University and will better prepare graduates for the increasing diversity of the United States and the growing importance of the international community in all facets of life. Other changes, such as revision of the W requirement, and redefinition of criteria for Wellness courses, do not change current curricular requirements but are clear improvements.

In the view of the General Education Review Committee, this proposal meets the learning needs of our students and is one that Millersville faculty can believe in and teach with passion, commitment, and intentionality¹.

¹Paraphrase of Ann Ferren, June 2002.

Purpose

Consistent with Millersville University's mission to provide a liberal arts-based education, the purpose of General Education is to provide breadth of knowledge as a balance and complement to the depth provided by the major. This is necessary for the holistic development of Millersville graduates as responsible citizens in a diverse and technologically complex, global community.

General Education Objectives

Students, working with advisors, and taking into consideration prior knowledge and experience, purposefully select courses in the General Education curriculum that meld with required courses, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, and courses in the major to achieve the following objectives:

Foundations for Life-Long Learning

1. Students will think, speak, and write clearly. This is evidenced by:
 - a) the clear presentation of ideas in formal spoken, written, and media forms.
 - b) the use of effective communication for ongoing dialogue.
 - c) the ability to find appropriate sources of information, evaluate that information, and integrate that information into a final product.
 - d) the use of statistical methods and other techniques of mathematics to analyze and solve problems.

Critical Thinking across the Liberal Arts

2. Students will demonstrate foundational knowledge of the important ideas and methods of different ways of knowing as follows:
 - a) in the humanities students will analyze and interpret existing works of literature and the arts.
 - b) in the sciences students will engage in the scientific method, laboratory study, appropriate technology, and mathematics to investigate, evaluate, and apply scientific concepts and theories.
 - c) in social sciences students will develop the necessary tools of critical thinking, inquiry, and diplomacy to participate effectively in our democracy and the increasingly complex global society.

Connections and Exploration

3. Students will connect important ideas and methods of inquiry from different disciplines as a means of becoming holistic and responsible citizens in a diverse and technologically complex, global community. Students will:
 - a) demonstrate civic and social responsibility.
 - b) grow in their engagement with peoples of diverse histories and communities, both inside and outside the United States.
 - c) build the foundation for a lifelong process of understanding, developing, and monitoring healthy lifestyle behaviors in all dimensions of wellness, including physical, social, emotional, intellectual, spiritual, and environmental wellness.
 - d) gain personal enrichment by developing new interests that can be enjoyed throughout a lifetime.

GENERAL EDUCATION STRUCTURE (Minimum 51 credits)

Foundations for Lifelong Learning

- ENGL 110: English Composition 3 credits
- COMM 100: Fundamentals of Speech 3 credits
- Approved MATH Course 3-4 credits
- ENGL 311, 312, 313, or 316: Advanced Writing 3 credits

Critical Thinking across the Liberal Arts (9 courses – min. 27 credits)

- Three courses (min. 9 credits) each in Humanities and Fine Arts (G1), Science and Mathematics (G2), Social Sciences (G3).
- *Exactly* 2 courses must be taken from one department within G1, G2, and G3.
- In Science and Mathematics, 2 of the 3 courses must come from Biology, Chemistry, Earth Sciences, and/or Physics including one which has a Laboratory (L) component.
- At least 3 courses taken throughout blocks G1, G2 and G3 must be at the 200 level or above.
- Courses in a student's primary major discipline cannot fulfill a Liberal Arts Core requirement; courses from the minor or second major can fulfill a Liberal Arts Core requirement.

Connections and Exploration

- First Year Perspectives course 0-3 credit hours
- Approved Wellness course 3 credit hours
- Perspectives course 3 credit hours
- Elective(s) [outside of primary major] 3 - 6 credit hours
- Cultural Diversity and Community course¹: 1 required; may be in General Education, the major, the minor or general electives.
- Writing courses: 4 required; may be in General Education, the major, the minor or general electives.

Additional Stipulations:

- Six courses (18 credit hours) from Required Related course work in student's major may be counted toward any of the Gen Ed requirements above.
- Courses meeting any Gen Ed requirement will be approved according to procedures to be specified in the Governance Manual.
- Junior standing required for Advanced Writing and Perspectives.

¹is intercultural and/or cross-cultural, with culture being a worldview that reflects beliefs, customs, values, politics, and experiences as shaped by race and ethnicity, gender, geography, language, sexual orientation, education, economics, age, nationality, religious affiliation, occupation, and/or physical ability among other factors.

Recommendations for Specific Changes:

1. Encourage incoming students to take a First Year Perspectives (FYP) course which will count as part of a Connections and Exploration block.

FYP is a component of General Education specifically designed for first semester freshmen and offered in a seminar format, typically linked to a foundations course (either ENGL 110 or COMM 100) as part of a living/learning community. Students will choose from several varieties of FYP courses offered each semester. A major function of these FYP courses is to introduce a process of critical inquiry applied to important social, cultural, scientific, technological, and/or aesthetic problems. Each FYP course will introduce multiple perspectives related to the understanding and resolution of these problems. A second function of these FYP courses is to support students' transition into the college experience academically, socially, and personally. Each FYP course topic will be approved according to guidelines to be specified in the Governance Manual.

Specifically, each FYP course:

- a) involves 3 credit hours at the 100 level.
- b) has a meaningful written and oral component, but may not carry a W label.
- c) requires students to consider multiple perspectives in advancing their understanding of the importance of social, cultural, scientific, technological, and/or aesthetic problems.
- d) enables quality interaction.
- e) provides intellectual richness through its assignments and assessments.
- f) promotes an understanding of the importance of the liberal arts and the General Education program at Millersville.
- g) supports the students' successful transition into college life by fostering connections between and among students, teachers, and the college community.
- h) strengthens students' information literacy.

Rationale:

- Provides coherence and intellectual richness to the General Education program.
- Data collected through student focus groups, faculty interviews, and student surveys during the recent implementation of First Year Perspectives courses (i.e., UNIV 101 and 179) all point to the success of this initiative.

2. Institute clarified guidelines for a required WELLness course.

The WELLness requirement is designed to assist students in making positive lifestyle changes that reduce their health risks, modify their consumer behavior, and enhance their personal well-being and productivity.

Criteria for the General Education WELL requirement are as follows:

- a) must be a 3 credit course.
- b) requires students to participate in a weekly physical or experiential component.
- c) must be a comprehensive approach to wellness employing a variety of cognitive, behavioral, and social learning strategies to encourage and assist students in accepting responsibility for their own wellness.
- d) engages students in critical thinking about wellness.
- e) emphasizes the development of life-long holistic learning.

3. Require students to take at least three credits of Elective courses outside of their primary major. Students who are exempt from the Perspectives requirement and/or did not take or satisfactorily complete a FYP shall take additional Elective credits to satisfy the 12 credit Connections and Exploration block.

Elective courses details:

- a) include any 100-level and higher University courses except the English Composition, Fundamentals of Speech, and Mathematics General Education Foundations courses.
- b) may not include courses in a student's primary major (BSE students may not count required professional education courses).
- c) may be credited toward a second major or minor program.

Rationale:

- Adds flexibility and choice to the curriculum.
- Promotes exploration of and experimentation with subjects of interest.

4. Change from a 4-4-4 distribution to a 3-3-3 distribution in Critical Thinking across the Liberal Arts.

In order to create the flexibility and choice embedded in Recommendations 1, 2, and 3, Critical Thinking across the Liberal Arts is reduced from 12 to 9 courses. All the previous guidelines to structure students' course selection are maintained, including the "2 in 1" department rule, the number of required related courses allowed, the definitions of the G blocks, and the number of required 200-level courses. Note that the required Mathematics course is moved to the Foundations for Lifelong Learning block.

Rationale:

- Provides the ability to add 2 courses to the "Connections and Exploration" block while retaining the current 51 credit load.
- Fulfills Characteristic 6 (i.e. "Simplicity and Flexibility") of a reformed program.
- Enables programs to meet both the demands of accreditation and State System limits on the total number of credits.
- Provides students a greater range of choice by allowing them to explore new areas of study.
- Provides an avenue for innovative programming, such as FYP courses, to count within the curriculum.

5. Institute stronger guidelines for Writing Intensive (W) courses including a “revised prose” component. Class size limits for W courses should be reset to 25.

This recommendation re-affirms the faculty’s commitment to writing-across-the-curriculum which has been eroded from its original design with increases to class size and the resulting lowering of expectations for writing and revising. The original 1988 guidelines have been updated and made slightly more flexible while maintaining the original spirit of revised prose and the centrality of the writing process to teaching and learning.

Proposed Revised Guidelines:

- 1) Students practice forms of writing typical of the field. Writing assignments are designed to develop their content knowledge and enhance their communication skills.
- 2) Students are required to submit at least 2500 words of graded analytical/persuasive writing (about 10 standard double-spaced pages). Some examples of how this requirement might be met include:
 - (A) a research paper in which the student is required to define a problem, select, organize, and synthesize information around a stated thesis.
 - (B) short analytical essays that explore a topic with reasoned evidence and informed opinion.
 - (C) position papers prepared by students that address pros and cons of controversial topics.
 - (D) microthemes that ask the student to find academic sources, organize ideas, develop a thesis and show evidence, but condense the final paper to a single page or two.
- 3) Because W courses assume that writing is a process, students will be given opportunities to develop and revise papers through more than one draft. Assignments will be structured and sequenced in ways that help students improve their writing through practice and revision. Instructors’ feedback on students’ writing will contribute to effective revision and encourage students to develop effective self-assessment.
- 4) Writing intensive courses work best when they include a combination of informal and formal writing experiences for students. In addition to the 2500 words of revised graded analytical/persuasive writing, instructors are encouraged to assign expressive, reflective and/or observational writing tasks. The purpose of these assignments is to bring out the student’s perceptions informally, and to increase writing practice.

Rationale:

- Provides clear purpose, intentional alignment and coherence to the General Education program.
- Restored rigor of writing and revision will add to students’ intellectual experience.

6. Add a Cultural Diversity and Community (D) requirement such that students will be required to take one approved D course as part of their major, minor, or General Education requirements.

To satisfy the Gen Ed Cultural Diversity and Community (D) requirement, all students must successfully complete one approved 3-credit course meeting the D criteria. This course may also count for credit in a student's major or minor program or may satisfy another Gen Ed requirement.

Cultural diversity refers to the differences among people in terms of beliefs, customs, values, politics, and experiences. In essence, culture is a worldview; it is both learned and evolved. The following factors are seen as underlying these differences: Race and ethnicity, gender, geography, language, sexual orientation, education, economics, age, nationality, religious affiliation, occupation and/or physical ability among others.

Specifically, a D course:

- a) involves 3 semester hours at the 100-level or above.
- b) is intercultural and/or cross-cultural, with culture being a worldview that reflects beliefs, customs, values, politics, and experiences as shaped by race and ethnicity, gender, geography, language, sexual orientation, education, economics, age, nationality, religious affiliation, occupation, and/or physical ability among other factors.
- c) examines historical and environmental factors that underlie cultural differences.
- d) examines the potential global, regional, or local socio-economic factors that underlie cultural differences.
- e) helps students to identify, critically analyze, and apply scholarship and experience related to cultural diversity.
- f) provides academic structure in support of students' positive engagement with peoples of diverse histories and communities.
- g) challenges students to evaluate their own personal worldview.
- h) has a meaningful written and oral component.
- i) may also count as part of any additional requirement (major, minor, or Gen Ed) of the Baccalaureate degree.

Rationale:

- Aligns general education curriculum with University mission to foster in students an appreciation for cultural diversity.
- Professional scientific literature supports the value of a structured educational approach rather than simply an experiential approach to exposing students to cultural diversity.
- Students with improved abilities to understand and engage different cultures are more likely to succeed as positive citizens in the increasingly complex local and regional multicultural environment beyond Millersville University.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities in 2000 reported that 62% of all colleges and universities either already had some form of a diversity course requirement or were in the process of developing one.

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: General Education Review Committee

DATE: March 6, 2007

SUBJECT: Motion to Endorse Proposal for a Revised General Education Curriculum

The General Education Review Committee moves that Faculty Senate endorse the proposal for a revised General Education Curriculum and that Faculty Senate approve the scheduling of a vote by the faculty on the proposal prior to the end of the Spring 2007 semester. The specific revisions proposed are outlined below:

Revised General Education Proposal

The proposed revision organizes the general education curriculum and objectives into 3 categories: Foundations for Life Long Learning, Critical Thinking across the Liberal Arts, and Connections and Exploration. The proposed revision includes 6 specific areas of curricular change:

- 1) Offer First Year Perspective courses that meet defined criteria and count in the Connections and Exploration block.
- 2) Institute clarified guidelines for a required 3 credit WELLness course.
- 3) Require students to take at least 3 credits of elective courses. Students who do not take a First Year Perspectives course will be required to take at least 6 credits of elective courses. Electives include any 100-level and higher University courses except courses in a student's primary major (BSE students may not count required professional education courses).
- 4) Change the distribution in the G blocks (Critical Thinking across the Liberal Arts) from 4-4-4 to 3-3-3, not including a mathematics course that will count in the Foundations block.
- 5) Institute stronger guidelines for Writing-Intensive (W) courses. Based on the 1988 guidelines, these will include a requirement for at least 10 pages of revised prose.
- 6) Add a Cultural Diversity and Community (D) course requirement. Any course that meets defined criteria may count as a D course. A D course must be intercultural and/or cross-cultural, with culture being a worldview that reflects beliefs, customs, values, politics, and experiences as shaped by race and ethnicity, gender, geography, language, sexual orientation, education, economics, age, nationality, religious affiliation, occupation, and/or physical ability. The D course can be a course that also fulfills requirements of the major, the minor, or satisfies another general education requirement.

Methods for integrating revision into writing assignments

(Presented to GERC, 2/27/07, by Caleb Corkery)

Revision and editing are two different processes. Editing, or proofreading, is searching your writing for errors, both grammatical and typographical. Revision is more substantive, addressing multiple issues concerning the effect of the piece. Additionally, revision should be taught in all the stages of a text's development. If provided opportunities by the instructor, the student author can play an important role in both revising and editing a piece before submitting it for a grade.

Pedagogies for revision

Guided peer review: student uses questions provided by instructor to critique peer's paper

Peer writing groups: students give, seek, and react to oral feedback among themselves

Oral presentations: student explains ideas to class for writing project

Example critiques: instructor critiques sample outline or plan or draft for entire class

Revision checklist: students use a checklist to guide their revision process

Role Play: student author or peer assumes the audience's stance while hearing aloud a draft

Pedagogies for editing/proofreading

Modeling: instructor presents editing strategies to entire class

Editing checklist: students use a checklist to guide their editing process

Guided peer editing: once trained on specific issues, students look for those problems in peers' papers

Attachment #4

TO: Faculty Senate
From: Robert K. Wismer, Chemistry
Date: 6 March 2007
Re: Changes in Prerequisite Courses

Our department recently was informed by the Registrar's Office that we had to change the prerequisites for a course. The department teaching two of these prerequisite courses had altered (and changed the number of) those courses. That department had simply changed the number of a third course. All of these changes occurred between the 2000-2002 and the 2002-2004 catalogs.

We were not told that we could retain one prerequisite course because its number had not changed, although its content had slightly altered. Yet we had to initiate a course proposal revision for another prerequisite course, even though the only change was the course number.

Sending through course proposal revisions for such matters seems a needless use of resources, and further taxes UCPRC and Senate. I would suggest that Academic Policies visit the issue.

One solution might be that the proposal that rennumbers, replaces, or discontinues a course contain a recommendation of a suitable substitute. Once the proposal passes, the Registrar informs (by e-mail) all departments that use the original course as a prerequisite. The e-mail would state the change being made, give the suggested substitute from the proposal, and give at least a link to the course description of the substitute. If the department receiving the e-mail agrees with the suggestion, it informs the Registrar and nothing further is needed. If it does not agree, it initiates a course modification.