

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

Friday, October 11, 2019

1:00 PM to 2:00 PM – Reed 114

Faculty Council and Senate Website: <http://behrend.psu.edu/for-faculty-staff/committees/faculty-senate-and-council>

- I. Call to Order – Melanie Hetzel-Riggin, Faculty Council & Senate Chair
- II. Approval of the minutes from the Faculty Council Meeting on 09/12/19
Emily Cassanno and Matt Levy, unanimously.
- III. Welcome and Comments from the Chair
- IV. Report from the Chancellor, Ralph Ford
 - a. University Strategic Budget Task Force. Behrend has completed it and it has been accepted. The report was shared by Ralph via email.
<https://news.psu.edu/story/592475/2019/10/09/administration/task-force-recommends-broad-change-penn-state's-current>
This will not be immediate change. There is going to be new business software, which will allow for consistent budgeting process across the system. There will be a university wide townhall October 15, the faculty are encouraged to review the document sent by Ralph.
 - b. Vision of Behrend Graduate. Surveys to parents have gone out. The results are very positive. This was the last piece of the puzzle. The final report will be coming very soon.
 - c. Open Lab. The statement is in good shape; the next step is implementation.
 - d. Strategic Planning - Pam is handling academic side and Ken Miller -- everything else. The strategic planning meeting is coming and Pam will be approaching each school asking each school to think about that school's own strategic plan.
There will be more information from Pam in November. Strategic Plan is due to UP by July 1. Once Pam and Ken figure out their strategy on tackling the plan it will be communicated to the faculty in order to foster transparency. Faculty Senate will be helpful in having an important part of the conversation, the topics can be discussed either at the next faculty Senate meeting or more likely later in November and December in the form of faculty townhalls.
- V. Report from the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Pam Silver
 - a. University has revised AD77 conflict of commitment – this has to do with consulting and teach at other universities. UP is asking each campus to revise what is allowable on our campuses. By Nov. 30. Have to do mostly with teaching commitment. Pam will set up meeting with Melanie and school directors to discuss how to involve faculty in the process. Next administrative meeting is next Tuesday; more info is forthcoming.
 - b. “Count me in”. Pam is going to put together a report and update on what has been done and how we did. Report coming within several weeks.
 - c. Data Analytics Major – the prospectus has been presented and went through. We are waiting for the memo; program architecture has been figured out; we are in the process of identifying courses. It has a good backing from the UP and other campuses.
- VI. Report from the Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, Ivor Knight
- VII. Report from University Senator, Lisa Mangel

- a. The committee is working on Academic Integrity policy. There are concerns about centralized authority.
- b. Interdomain courses. Math is not a course that is interdomain, because it is a foundation course and not a knowledge course. One of the campuses is attempting to change that.
- c. Forensic business report was given at the senate meeting.
- d. Questions asked at the last Senate meeting. Lisa is working on drafting a very specific question for the Senate specifically about the 80-20 syllabus policy 42.10 Course Uniformity. "Must include 80% current course proposal.
 - i. The questions about interdomain courses and work load has to be answered at the college level and not at the University level. As more collaborative projects become prevalent this will be challenging. These decisions at Behrend are done at the school level to accommodate the different situations when you have interdomain and interdisciplinary co-teaching.
Melanie suggests that there should be a document in the works that might address, at the very least, the process of decision making.
Pam suggests that there should be a task force including faculty and administrators to start thinking about this. However, these decisions might not be completed in one academic year. For now, with some many changes. The process for distribution and allocation will involve two faculty members and school directors, as the first step and done in case by case basis.
One other important question to consider whether the interdomain courses are same as co-taught courses. Not all inerdomain courses are co-taught courses. This distinction is necessary.

VIII. Reports from Committee Chairs

- a. Academic Computer, Chuck Yeung
 - i. The committee met before the last meeting to discuss strategies for competing resources and saving some money. There are tentative ideas, including, moving more computers to the library to increase the usage of the library.
The important question to consider is how this might interfere with the library space used for teaching? More conversation will be had with Humanities and Social Sciences.
 - ii. Ralph is asking about use of remote lab resources and use of low cost machinery. While it is not perfect it might be used for some purposes. However, students do not seem to be too receptive. Melanie suggests that there are possibilities, however, reliability is a question.
 - iii. VLC classroom with 20 computers which are up for update. Could it be scrapped? Ralf suggested that committee reach out to Amy Bridger and Ken Miller.
 - iv. Lisa pointed out that here is a need for designated computer lab for exams, where students can take exams in a computer lab that is proctored over a period of designated time. The testing center does not live up to those expectations. A conversation for the future.
- b. Athletics, Blair Tuttle
- c. Undergraduate Curricular Affairs, Lisa Elliott
 - i. Curriculum has been approved. 21 have been reviewed since the beginning of September, 2 more are currently pending review.
- d. Faculty Affairs, Matt Swinarski

- i. The Faculty Affairs committee is making progress on the Workload charge. Currently we are defining a Peer Group, a Competitive Group and an Aspirant Group for comparison. For example, the Peer Group might include some other PSU colleges and select BIG 10/ State University related colleges similar in size or mission. We have also asked administration if they have a list of institutions they use for comparison - Pam is looking into it.
 - ii. Pam – we don't. Ralph -- more conversation is necessary and he will work with the committee with some ideas. More information that already has been collected will be sent to the committee.
- e. Graduate Affairs, Ken Louie
 - i. The committee is discussing the formal set of procedures for new graduate programs and courses. First meeting was in September. Committee is gathering information from other campuses before they make their own policies. Ken reached out Vicki Hewitt, Harrisburg and Great Valley and received useful information. The committee is meeting next week, the procedures are well established at the university level and the committee will work on procedure for Behrend.
- f. Research Committee, Jay Amicangelo
 - i. The committee has had two meetings so far. Frist change – sabbatical applications. Committee discussed the criteria and are reviewing the applications. Next meeting is going to be on October 24 to finalize proposals to be sent to Ivor Knight.
- g. Scholarship and Awards, Omar Ashour
 - i. Review.
- h. Student Life, Matt Levy
 - i. The committee met on Oct. 10. Retention charges might be more suited for administration and “Count Me In”.
 - ii. The committee proposes to create a Student life resources hand book – easy and centralized hub for both faculty and students on extracurricular students’ activities.
 - 1. Melanie suggests to speak to Student Life. Matt – apparently, there is no such resource yet. The committee will be working on this project.
- i. Undergraduate Studies, Joseph Previte
 - i. The committee has formed subcommittees to start work on several of the charges before the committee.
 - ii. There will be a meeting in late October to assess progress of these subcommittees.
 - iii. One subcommittee met with SGA members to discuss the students' desire to have a standardized (possibly web-based) grievance process (for Behrend College- standard across all schools) to be able to report problems with faculty via an online (anonymous) form submission. The form submission would either go to the respective Associate School Director or Department Chair or both of these parties.
 - iv. During this meeting, SGA members also voiced concerns about students not knowing or having access to current grades and suggested that all faculty make grade information available on CANVAS.
- j. Institutional Equity and Diversity, Boon Ong
 - i. Over the email “We read the charges that for this committee and brainstorm on some of the ways to locate the graduates of International students, students of color and underrepresented students. Andy should be at the meetings to move further.”

IX. Old Business

X. New Business

- a. Next faculty senate meeting. More students need academic help. More information about the resources available. Presentation from Disability Office and perhaps Personal Council Center.
- b. Matt Levy – re-evaluate the “red” in the “red folder,” as “red” indicates crisis.

XI. Announcements

XII. Adjournment

- a. Chuck Yeung and Jay Amicangelo, unanimously.