

Faculty Senate Minutes
July 18, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. All departments were in attendance.

I. Minutes of the 4-19-05 Meeting

The minutes of the April 19, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as distributed.

II. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

No Report.

III. Report of the Student Senate President

No Report.

IV. Report of the Graduate Student Organization

No Report.

V. Report of the Administrative Officers

Provost Prabhu

Provost Prabhu reminded faculty members that the deadline for submission of materials for promotion is November 1, 2005; he emphasized that November 1 is a firm deadline. He announced that there will be a workshop in mid-September that will deal with the process. If there is sufficient demand, a second workshop will be scheduled.

He also announced that 40% of the faculty participated in the academic advisement survey. The survey results will be distributed electronically in the near future. Hard copies of the survey results will also be available.

Vice President for Student Affairs Thomas

Vice President for Student Affairs Thomas reported on new construction of the dorms built by Student Services on Shenk's Lane. They will be ready for the Fall semester and will be fully occupied.

The ACE Task Force Report originally scheduled for this meeting was postponed until the Fall semester at Dr. Ron Umble's request.

VI. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

First Readings

New Undergraduate course: GEOG 248 – Geography of Africa, 3 credits, a G3 General Education course.

New Undergraduate course: HIST 381 – History of West Africa to 1800, 3 credits, a G3 General Education and Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (W) course.

A number of proposals were introduced that requested waiver of the one-meeting rule so that they could be acted on at the current meeting. Many of these proposals dealt with bringing Bachelor of Secondary Education majors into compliance with PASSHE regulations. A McLarnon/Bookmiller motion proposing waiver of the one-meeting rule for these proposals passed without dissent. These included changes in the BSE in Biology, the BSE in Earth Sciences, the BSE in History, the Technology Education major, the BSE in Art Education, the Biology minor and the BSE Social Studies (Citizenship) Major; a new Earth Sciences course (ESCI 281), and a new option (the Biology/Pre-Athletic Training Option and Dual Degree Program with West Chester University). Details of these proposals are included below under the Second Readings heading.

Second Readings

The Revised Distance Learning Policy brought to Senate by the Academic Policies Committee was passed by the Senate without dissent.

(1) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Requirements for the BSE in Biology – dropping required credits from 129 to 126 credits.

Proposal to count the Professional Education block courses (EDFN 211, EDFN 241, EDSE 321, EDFN 330, and EDSE 435) as satisfying the Perspectives (P) Requirement for BSE Biology majors. This is being done to satisfy the PASSHE mandate to decrease the BSE Biology major from 129 to 126 credits. Rather than allow the 5 Professional Education block courses to count as fulfilling the P requirement, Dr. Wismer suggested [see Attachment #1] that a better way to accomplish this goal is to waive the Perspectives (P) requirement for Biology BSE majors because this particular curriculum is extremely multidisciplinary in nature (with Required Related courses in Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics and Earth Sciences in addition to the Professional Education block courses). The Wismer/Luek motion to amend the BSE Biology proposal passed as did the amended proposal with one dissenting vote (Dr. Bookmiller).

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(2) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Requirements for the BSE in Earth Sciences – dropping required credits from 129 to 126 credits.

Proposal to decrease the requirement for 6.0 Biology credits to 3.0 Biology credits (BIOL 241 – Principles of Ecology) by dropping the requirement for BIOL 100 (3 credits). BIOL 241 requires demonstrated competency in Biology as a prerequisite. Such competency may be demonstrated by one of the following:

1. Course grade of "A" or "B" in AP Biology
2. Score of 3 or better in the national AP exam
3. Successful score on the CLEP exam
4. Passing grade in General Biology (BIOL 100)
5. Successful score on a General Biology challenge or placement examination

The change will reduce the total semester hours needed for the BSE in Earth Sciences from 129 to 126 s.h. The proposal passed without dissent.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(3) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Requirements for the BSE in History – BSE-History majors who successfully complete HIST 406 (with a B or better) will be permitted to substitute HIST 406 (Senior Seminar) for the G4 Upper Level/Advanced Writing (AW) requirement. This will help the BSE in History comply with the 120-credit limit imposed by the Board of Governors.

Some amendments were passed and the amended proposal subsequently passed. The Wismer/McLarnon motion to amend the proposal follows:

On the second page of the proposal, Psychology was removed from the second line under Rationale and on the third line from the bottom, "waived" was replaced with "satisfied".

There was also a McLarnon/Luek motion passed to remove the proposed AW label from the course, since the intention is for the course to satisfy the requirement for an AW course rather than for the course to actually become an AW course.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(4) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Requirements for the Technology Education major – a reduction in the number of advanced technical elective credits from 3 to 2; thereby reducing the overall program credits to 126. This reduction in credits is mandated by PASSHE. The proposal was approved without dissent.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(5) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Requirements for the BSE in Art Education – Eliminate ART 310 (Art Criticism and Aesthetics) and allow ART 312 (Survey of Art History) to count as a Perspectives (P) course for Art BSE majors. These changes drop the total credits required for graduation with the BSE in Art degree from 132 to 126 credits; the major field requirements would drop from 60 to 57 credits. This reduction in degree credits is mandated by PASSHE.

An objection to this proposal was raised. ART 312 is not a Perspectives (P) course. The Chair has been directed to ask the Art Department if they intend to propose Art 312 as a Perspectives course, so that anyone at the University could take it. If that were done, the proposal could be handled as the MUSI 363 course is presently handled. Each year the Senate is asked to renew the proposal to double count the course toward the major and as a Perspectives (P) course.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(6) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Renewal of the policy allowing the Music Department to double-count MUSI 363 (Music History and Literature II) as both a required Music major course and as a Perspectives (P) course for the 2005 – 2006 academic year. This proposal will allow the Music Department to remain in compliance with the 120-credit policy mandated by PASSHE. This renewal was approved without dissent.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(7) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Revision of the Biology Minor

Addition of BIOL 100 (General Biology) to the Required Biology course block and provision of options in the Required Biology course block (a choice of two of the following four courses (BIOL 263 [Cell Biology], BIOL 211 [Concepts of Zoology], BIOL 221 [Concepts of Botany] and BIOL 365 [Genetics])). Previously all four of these courses were required and General Biology was not. Furthermore, the number of Biology elective credits is being raised from 5 credits at the 300 – 400 level (with one 200 – level course used upon advisor's approval) to 9 – 10 credits of Biology courses at the 300 – 400 level (with one 200 – level course used upon advisor's approval). This provides more flexibility for Biology minors. The proposed changes passed without dissent.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(8) NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

ESCI 281 – GIS Applications for the Earth Sciences, 3 credits. Course prerequisites – ESCI 221 or ESCI 241 or ESCI 261. Students cannot take both ESCI 281 and GEOG 295 for credit. The proposal passed without dissent.

Desired effective date – Fall 2006

(9) CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Revision of requirements for the BSE Social Studies (Citizenship) Major-- The History, Geography, Government and Economics courses taken in the concentration must be at the 200-level or above. This closes a loophole that allowed students to take certain 100-level courses within the major. This revision passed without dissent.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

(10)CHANGE IN COURSES/CURRICULA

Biology/Pre-Athletic Training Option and Dual Degree program with West Chester University.

Students will earn a Bachelor of Science in Biology/Pre-Athletic Training from Millersville University and a Bachelor of Science Degree in Athletic Training from West Chester University. The program provides general education, biology and pre-athletic training requirements through Millersville University and the Athletic Training credits via Distance Learning and one summer of courses through West Chester University. The proposal was approved without dissent.

Desired effective date – Fall 2005

The Faculty-Student Athletic Committee asked for Senate endorsement of a proposal [see Attachment #2] suggesting procedures for the avoidance of scheduling conflicts between the athletic and academic schedules of student-athletes. The proposal, if adopted, would allow *in-season* student athletes to register one day earlier than all other similarly situated students with respect to credits (those within the same credit-hour groupings) and only if the student-athlete opts to take advantage of the opportunity. Juniors and seniors would thus not be excluded from courses that have been filled by first- or second-year student athletes. The Senate voted without dissent to endorse this policy.

VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

No Report.

VIII. Faculty Emeritus

No proposals.

IX. Other/New Business

None

X. Old Business

Further discussion of the General Education Task Force Recommendations was postponed until the Fall 2005 semester due to the length of time spent on the earlier part of the agenda.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joel B. Piperberg
Acting Chairperson and Acting Secretary of the Senate

Attachment #1

To: Faculty Senators
From: Robert Wismer, Chemistry Department
Date: 16 June 2005
Re: Biology BSE proposal – Original Version

I have read with care the proposal of the Biology Department to resolve its dilemma regarding the 126-credit mandate of the SSHE Board of Governors. (Briefly, for BSEd BIOL majors the proposal advocates allowing the Professional Education block to satisfy the Perspectives requirement of GenEd.) In fact, I have been involved peripherally in the Biology discussions. Furthermore, I have been extensively involved in similar discussions within the Chemistry Department. Accordingly, I support the goals of the Biology Department proposal. I believe that the overall result of the proposal for the students involved is minimal damage to their academic program.

In contrast, I believe that the methods of the proposal insult both the General Education curriculum and University Governance, specifically the course approval process. I have an alternative, which achieves the same goals as the proposal and avoids both insults.

The insult to General Education springs from the criteria for a Perspectives course. Criterion E is that a Perspectives course "May not have a narrow technical, professional, or career orientation." Of course the Professional Education block has exactly a "professional...orientation."

The insult to the course approval process has at least two aspects. The first is that none of the courses in the professional block are approved for Perspectives course or GenEd status, nor is such status sought. The second is that the Biology Department proposal is indirectly proscribing the content of courses within another department, by specifying that those courses fulfill the Perspectives requirement.

I propose instead that the Biology Department be granted a waiver of the Perspectives Requirement by Faculty Senate. The waiver would be based on a similar rationale to the BIOL proposal, acknowledging that the Professional Education block fulfills most, but not all of the criteria of a Perspectives course. The waiver would specifically state that it is being granted to comply with the credit limitations imposed by the Board of Governors. It would be implicit in the waiver that, if the content of any of the courses in the Professional Education block were to change (as recently was the case with the content of EDFN 241), the waiver would have to be reconsidered.

The waiver I propose has the advantage of avoiding both insults. In addition, it continues to make the Biology Department responsible for the content of courses taken by its majors. Finally, it avoids tampering with the present GenEd curriculum, and makes it evident that there is yet another problem that any revision of GenEd needs to solve.

The waiver of the Perspectives requirement lowers the total GenEd credits for a BSEd biology student from 51 to 48. The SSHE mandate is for 40% of a student's total credits, which we have taken to mean 40% of 120 credits, or 48 credits. One can easily conclude that the Biology proposal also lowers the total GenEd credits to 48, as none of the courses in the professional Education block have received GenEd approval.

Senators should be aware that both Chemistry and Physics face similar dilemmas in their BSEd curricula to that of Biology.

To: Faculty Senators
From: Robert Wismer, Chemistry Department
Date: 16 June 2005
Re: Biology BSE proposal – Amended Version (Amendment in Bold)

I have read with care the proposal of the Biology Department to resolve its dilemma regarding the 126-credit mandate of the SSHE Board of Governors. (Briefly, for BSEd BIOL majors the proposal advocates allowing the Professional Education block to satisfy the Perspectives requirement of GenEd.) In fact, I have been involved peripherally in the Biology discussions. Furthermore, I have been extensively involved in similar discussions within the Chemistry Department. Accordingly, I support the goals of the Biology Department proposal. I believe that the overall result of the proposal for the students involved is minimal damage to their academic program.

In contrast, I believe that the methods of the proposal insult both the General Education curriculum and University Governance, specifically the course approval process. I have an alternative, which achieves the same goals as the proposal and avoids both insults.

The insult to General Education springs from the criteria for a Perspectives course. Criterion E is that a Perspectives course "May not have a narrow technical, professional, or career orientation." Of course the Professional Education block has exactly a "professional...orientation."

The insult to the course approval process has at least two aspects. The first is that none of the courses in the professional block are approved for Perspectives course or GenEd status, nor is such status sought. The second is that the Biology Department proposal is indirectly proscribing the content of courses within another department, by specifying that those courses fulfill the Perspectives requirement.

~~I propose instead that the Biology Department be granted a waiver of the Perspectives Requirement by Faculty Senate. The waiver would be based on a similar rationale to the BIOL proposal, acknowledging that the Professional Education block fulfills most, but not all of the criteria of a Perspectives course. The waiver would specifically state that it is being granted to comply with the credit limitations imposed by the Board of Governors. It would be implicit in the waiver that, if the content of any of the courses in the Professional Education block were to change (as recently was the case with the content of EDFN 241), the waiver would have to be reconsidered.~~

I propose instead that the Biology Department be granted a waiver of the Perspectives Requirement by Faculty Senate. The waiver would be based on a similar rationale to the BIOL proposal, but instead alleging that the already broad requirements of the Biology BSEd curriculum, as mandated in part by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, [specifically the course in Ecology,] meet the criteria for a perspectives course. The waiver would specifically state that it is being granted to comply with the credit limitations imposed by the Board of Governors. It would be implicit in the waiver that, if the content of any of the courses in the Biology BSEd were to change substantially, the waiver would have to be reconsidered."

The waiver I propose has the advantage of avoiding both insults. In addition, it continues to make the Biology Department responsible for the content of courses taken by its majors. Finally,

it avoids tampering with the present GenEd curriculum, and makes it evident that there is yet another problem that any revision of GenEd needs to solve.

The waiver of the Perspectives requirement lowers the total GenEd credits for a BSEd biology student from 51 to 48. The SSHE mandate is for 40% of a student's total credits, which we have taken to mean 40% of 120 credits, or 48 credits. One can easily conclude that the Biology proposal also lowers the total GenEd credits to 48, as none of the courses in the professional Education block have received GenEd approval.

Senators should be aware that both Chemistry and Physics face similar dilemmas in their BSEd curricula to that of Biology.

Attachment #2

MEMO

To: Robert Thomas, Vice-President for Student Affairs

From: Richard A. Glenn, Faculty Athletic Representative

Date: December 7, 2004

RE: Conflict Avoidance Scheduling for Student-Athletes

1. Statement of Interest

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) requires that each member institution appoint or elect a member of the faculty to provide a faculty perspective in athletics administration by serving in an advisory and oversight capacity. This practice helps ensure institutional control of athletic programs, a fundamental operating principle of the NCAA. The two major responsibilities of the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) are protecting the academic interests of the student-athlete, broadly defined; and helping maintain compliance with NCAA regulations. At Millersville University, the FAR is appointed by the President, and works closely with the Vice-President for Student Affairs and the Athletic Directors.

2. Statement of Problem

Over the past three years, the lion's share of my time as FAR has been spent attempting to resolve conflicts that arise between professors and student-athletes over a single issue—missed classes. Professors are often frustrated because student-athletes “miss too much class time.” Student-athletes are often frustrated because professors expect them to be in class (sometimes punishing them when they are not) at the same times that coaches expect them to be practicing or competing.

Millersville University has a class attendance policy: “[F]aculty will excuse absences for . . . participation in a University-sponsored activity” (Undergraduate Catalog, Millersville University, p. 51). Several years ago, in response to complaints from numerous faculty, the athletic departments, in consultation with the FAR and senior-level administrators, adopted a policy that excused student-athletes from classes only for participation in a scheduled intercollegiate athletic contest. Student-athletes would *not* be excused from classes for practices, visits to the athletic trainers, study halls, team meetings, etc. In addition, this policy required student-athletes to notify faculty in writing at the earliest possible date of all scheduled athletic contests during the semester. While the policy has clearly reduced the number of conflicts over missed classes, many faculty and student-athletes remain frustrated.

Faculty remain frustrated because students are still excused from “far too many” classes. For example:

- (1) During the 2003 fall semester, a field hockey player enrolled in a 1:00 class on TR missed that class four times for athletic contests. The field hockey player thus missed just shy of 15 percent of the classes during the semester.

- (2) During the 2004 spring semester, a baseball player enrolled in an 11:00 class on MWF missed that class eleven times for athletic contests. The baseball player thus missed 26 percent of the classes during the semester.
- (3) Student-athletes enrolled in courses offered late in the afternoon and at night regularly miss an even greater percentage of classes during a semester for athletic contests.

Student-athletes, many of whom want to perform at high levels both in the classroom and in competition, are frustrated because the university places separate and often conflicting demands upon their time. The faculty wants them in class; the coaches want them in contests. Obviously, it is difficult for a student-athlete expect to succeed academically when missing a significant number of classes for athletic competition (or travel to such competition).

3. Proposal

It is clear to me that faculty, coaches, and student-athletes are dissatisfied with our current practices. I think, however, that the university can provide some resolution to the problem—to the satisfaction of faculty, coaches, and student-athletes—by adopting a policy that permits student-athletes to participate in conflict-avoidance class scheduling.

Conflict avoidance scheduling may take many forms. At some universities, for example, student-athletes are provided preferential scheduling; that is, student-athletes, because of the demands placed upon them by the university, are always permitted to register for classes before all other students. At other universities, only in-season student-athletes are permitted to register for classes before all other students. This particular advantage allows student-athletes to have the first opportunity to enroll in classes, presumably to choose those classes that are offered during hours in which athletic contests are not held. It thus cuts down on missed classes (which pleases faculty and student-athletes).

Some university constituents, however, may object to preferential scheduling on “favoritism” grounds. After all, one is hard pressed to explain to a junior or senior why some first-year student should have the opportunity to choose classes first simply because he or she happens to play a sport. A compromise method—which would cut down on missed classes and may be more palatable to other university constituents—might provide *in-season* student-athletes with a less pronounced advantage. For example, Millersville University students now register for classes by number of credits earned, in descending order. Those who have earned ninety or more credits may register on the first day, beginning at 6:00 a.m.; those who have earned sixty or more credits may register on the second day, beginning at 6:00 a.m.; and so forth. Under a compromise conflict avoidance scheduling method, student-athletes might be permitted to register one-day earlier than all other similarly situated students. So, if all students who have earned sixty credit hours are permitted to register beginning at 6:00 a.m., *in season* student-athletes who have earned sixty credit hours might be permitted to register one day earlier. Thus, student-athletes are provided a limited advantage, over only those students who are similarly situated with respect to credits (and then only if the student-athlete opts to take advantage of the opportunity). Juniors and seniors would not be excluded from courses that have been filled by first- or second-year student athletes.

4. Justification of Conflict Avoidance Scheduling

This compromise method, while not eliminating root and branch the conflicts between faculty and student-athletes over missed classes, will most assuredly reduce missed classes (which will please both faculty and student-athletes).

The athletic departments and the FAR believe strongly that student-athletes missing a significant numbers of classes in any course because of conflicts with scheduled intercollegiate athletic contests is both detrimental to the academic success of their athletes and an imposition on their professors. Nevertheless, two factors have conjoined in recent years to increase the potential number of such conflicts. First, since 1999, the number of classes starting at or after 4:00 p.m. has increased 25 percent in the fall semester, and 19 percent in the spring semester. Second, the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference (PSAC) has increased the number of mandated contests against other PSAC schools, many of which are located in western Pennsylvania. Thus, with increasing frequency, student-athletes are faced with the dilemma of having to register for classes they need to proceed in the major or graduate but which conflict with their teams' scheduled contests.

The athletic departments did not set out to increase the number of conflicts over missed classes. But the athletic departments control neither the number of late afternoon and evening classes nor conference-mandated scheduling. A policy that allows student-athletes the opportunity to reduce the number of instances in which their classes conflict with their athletic contests would help them academically *and* lower the number of instances in which faculty are requested to accommodate these students-athletes who miss classes.

Conflict avoidance scheduling is not unprecedented. Eight other PSAC schools have some form of conflict avoidance scheduling.

5. Other Measures Adopted to Strengthen Academic Performance of Student-Athletes

In recent years, Millersville University has adopted numerous measures to strengthen the academic performance of student-athletes. First, the university has implemented academic performance standards for student-athletes in each semester. The NCAA and our sister schools in the PSAC only require that student-athletes be academically eligible at the beginning of the academic year. Student-athletes must have a cumulative GPA of at least 1.6 at the end of their freshmen year, 1.8 at the end of their sophomore year; and 2.0 at the end of their junior year. Their semester's GPAs (fall and spring) have no impact on their eligibility in the eyes of the NCAA or the conference. Millersville University, however, implemented in 1997 the requirement that all student-athletes earn a 2.0 every semester. Those student-athletes earning between a 1.6 and 1.99 in any single semester, regardless of their cumulative GPA, must meet the requirements of an individualized program designed by the director of athletics and FAR to remain eligible. Those student-athletes who do not raise their academic performance are suspended from practice and competition for the following semester. And all student-athletes who earn below a 1.6 in any semester are suspended from their teams for the following semester.

Second, the university has added an Assistant Director of Men's Athletics. This post, added in 1997, is filled by a faculty member who focuses primarily on providing academic assistance to male athletes. The Assistant Director initiated an orientation program for student-athletes that runs during the fall semester and addresses issues such as time management, study skills, etc.

Third, the university has strengthened its procedures for monitoring class attendance of student-athletes. At the beginning of the 2001-2002 academic year, both athletic departments implemented more stringent procedures for monitoring student-athlete class attendance and communicating with faculty about this matter.

Fourth, the university initiated a Faculty Liaison program. During the 1999-2000 academic year, each academic department identified a faculty member to serve as a resource for student-athletes,

coaches, and athletic administrators on academic matters involving the respective departments. The FAR oversees this program.

Fifth, the university has regularly and publicly acknowledged its Scholar-Athletes. Since 1997, the athletic departments have hosted an annual banquet to recognize student-athletes who have been named Scholar-Athletes by the PSAC. A Scholar-Athlete is one who has maintained a 3.25 or higher GPA during the previous academic year.

These measures provide evidence of the athletic department's commitment to the academic success of student-athletes.

6. Evidence of Success in Student-Athlete Academic Performance

Since 1995, the year in which the PSAC began recognizing Scholar-Athletes, the number of Millersville University athletes earning that recognition has risen from forty-nine to 110, an increase of 124 percent. The university has more than doubled its number of Scholar-Athletes in the last nine years.

Additionally, a review of the most recent five- and six-year graduation rates of Millersville University student-athletes indicated that 66.7 percent of all student-athletes graduated in five years; and 72.2 percent completed their degrees in six years. These rates exceed the rates for all Millersville University students, who graduated at a rate of 62.1 percent after five years and 65.4 percent after six years.

7. Miscellaneous

This proposal would not affect in any way the current policy of excusing student-athletes from classes only for athletic contests.

I am not wedded to the particular method of conflict avoidance scheduling proposed above, but to the principle that faculty, coaches, and student-athletes will benefit from measures that reduce the number of instances in which these detrimental "class absence" conflicts occur.

I hope you and other decision-makers will consider this proposal. I look forward to talking you and others about its merits.