**Faculty Affairs Committee End of Year Report**

2015/2016 Committee Members:

Bob Edwards (ENG), Rick Hedderick (BUS)\*, [Eva Kuttenberg](mailto:euk1@psu.edu?subject=Faculty%20Affairs%20Committee%20Chair), Chair (HSS), Michael Naber (SCI), Courtney Nagle (SCI), Carol Putman (BUS), Ashley Sullivan (HSS), Rob Weissbach (ENG);

\*initially David Causgrove (BUS) who stepped down in October because of other service obligations in the School of Business

2015/2016 the committed worked on three of four charges in the order they were assigned:

**CHARGE # 1**

**Best practices for faculty involvement in improving student retention at Behrend**

**Framework:** Fall 2015, 35% of the incoming freshman class listed University Park as their first campus choice. Retention is important to the college as a whole, and many key areas do not involve faculty directly. However, faculty typically know students better than other campus staff, so it’s important to serve the role of recognizing retention challenges and opportunities and referring students to the right place for help. Specific data related to why students leave Behrend is not readily available, so we were unable to target specific actions by faculty that could measurably impact any current retention issue. After discussions with Faith Graham, Jane Brady, Mary Ellen Madigan, ACPC, and several faculty members across all four schools, below is a joint list of faculty actions through the roles we serve that can help alleviate any potential retention issues and logically should have a positive impact on retention in general.

Classroom:

* Observe students for red flags in terms of attendance, grades, participation
* Proactively meet with these students to try to resolve challenges
* Submit online referral form to retention coordinator for any academic concern (financial, grades, attendance, etc.)
* Complete Early Progress Reports (EPR’s)
* Encourage study groups
* Refer students to the Learning Resource Center for tutoring

Campus:

* Encourage student involvement in clubs and organizations by discussing or inviting representatives to talk briefly in appropriate classes
* Connect with international students to help integrate into campus community as needed
* Identify juniors/seniors to speak at freshman seminars as student success stories (internships, research, etc.)
* Seek opportunities to involve students in Undergraduate Research early in their education

Advising:

* Be accessible beyond office hours to meet as needed
* Perform academic reviews to connect with advisees
* Target advisors for international students with language barriers by assigning to appropriate faculty who share the language and can mentor
* Refer students desiring to transfer to UP to ACPC for evaluation

We recommend the following college-level actions to improve future efforts with retention:

* Develop a plan to collect and analyze data as an ongoing effort for the reasons students leave in order to focus efforts for greatest impact. Is there a way to require an exit survey?
* Establish Recruitment and Retention Committees in all four schools.
* Incorporate a measure of faculty involvement in retention on performance evaluations via the list above (key areas might be completing requested EPR’s, involvement in Undergraduate Research, and advising)

**CHARGE # 2**

**The number of promotions of faculty to full professor is much lower than at University Park. An ad-hoc committee was established and began work in January. Eva Kuttenberg set up the first meeting in January when John Roth (Engineering) was elected chair.**

The following data was collected by the faculty affairs committee fall 2015:

Associate Professor Counts provided by Carol Putman via Rhonda Steg

08-09        09-10    10-11    11/12    12/13 13/14 14/15 15/16  
BSCH        11         11         13        13         15        15        11        13  
ENG         13         13         15        15         16        18        17        17  
HSS         15         16         17        17         17        16        14        15  
SCI         16         16         16        18         17        15        16        21  
         55         56         61        63         65        64        58        66

School of Engineering: 16 Associate Professors (by Rob Weissbach)

1998 – 1

2002 – 1

2004 – 2

2005 – 1

2006 – 1

2007 – 2

2008 – 3

2009 – 1

2010 – 2

2013 – 1

2014 – 1

School of the Humanities and Social Sciences: 15 Associate Professors (by Eva Kuttenberg)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| promotion to associate professor | number of faculty at that rank |
| 1994 | 1 |
| 1995 | 1 |
| 1998 | 1 |
| 1999 | 1 |
| 2000 | 1 |
| 2001 | 1 |
| 2003 | 1 |
| 2009 | 1 |
| 2010 | 3 |
| 2012 | 1 |
| 2013 | 1 |
| 2015 | 2 |

School of Science Promotion History (by Courtney Nagle)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Associate Professor | Full Professor |
| 1992 | 1 |  |
| 1993 | 0 |  |
| 1994 | 0 |  |
| 1995 | 0 |  |
| 1996 | 0 |  |
| 1997 | 0 |  |
| 1998 | 1 |  |
| 1999 | 2 |  |
| 2000 | 3 |  |
| 2001 | 1 |  |
| 2002 | 0 |  |
| 2003 | 1 |  |
| 2004 | 2 |  |
| 2005 | 1 | 1 |
| 2006 | 2 |  |
| 2007 | 2 | 1 |
| 2008 | 1 |  |
| 2009 | 0 | 1 |
| 2010 | 0 |  |
| 2011 | 2 |  |
| 2012 | 0 |  |
| 2013 | 0 | 2 |
| 2014 | 2 |  |
| 2015 | 4 |  |

**Actions taken:** By secret ballot, a simple yes/no vote with 7 committee members present, we had 5 votes in favor of establishing a sub-committee to address the charge of promotion from associate to full professor. Eva Kuttenberg wrote the motion. Rob Weissbach presented it at the October faculty council meeting.

**Rationale for motion:** The 2015/2016 faculty affairs committee has only 2 of 8 members at the rank of associate professor. Preliminary data suggests a total of 66 associate professors at Behrend. A closer look at three schools indicates that in Engineering, more than 10 associate professors hold that rank since 2008; in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 7 associate professors hold that rank since 2003; and in the School of Science, 16 associate professors hold that rank since 2008.

In October, a motion to appoint, from a list of volunteers, a task force composed of tenure-track and tenured professors (two from each School) to pursue the following goals was approved.

1. Review individual School policies on promotion from associate to full professor. Gather data, compare, and analyze significant similarities and differences.

2. Develop a document of best practices for promotion to full professor within our Behrend realities, e.g., a campus with high research expectations without the research environment of a research I campus (e.g., 3-3 teaching load, no graduate students)

3. Develop a document of best practices to evaluate research in addition to external letters by experts in the candidate’s field.

4. Benchmark data against similar institutions.

In November, Rob Weissbach (together with Eva Kuttenberg) recruited members for the committee to begin its work January 2016. All data was then passed on the ad-hoc committee to investigate promotions to full professor. Its final report and membership can be found at the intranet website.

**CHARGE # 3**

**Develop recommendations for engaged scholarship at Penn State Behrend and to reward faculty appropriately and for creating Engaged Scholarship opportunities**

**OVERVIEW OF ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP AT PENN STATE BEHREND**

**Definition**: Engaged scholarship is defined as out-of-classroom academic experiences that complement classroom learning.

**Background:**

The source for categories of engaged scholarship is an e-mail sent out on October 20, 2015 by Associate Dean Dawn Blasko titled

“Call for Student Lightning Presentations at the 2015 Engaged Scholarship Expo at University Park.”

The e-mail mentions ***The Council of Engaged Scholarship***formed in October 2012 to advance Penn State’s mission by creating a student-centered environment that fosters engaged teaching, research, and service.

Additional sources:

Carol Putman looked at **Behrend’s Strategic Plan**, specifically Transformative Strategy 2 (pages 11-17) where engaged scholarship is strongly supported. Some actions listed, however, seem to be more relevant to specific schools.

Student engaged scholarship is already highly encouraged and strongly evident at Penn State Behrend.  Knowledge Park is identified as a unique transformative partner for this strategy and the open-laboratory model.  Strategy 2B Action Item 4 plans for “an improved system for flexible assignment of faculty…to match the college’s strategic needs with the capabilities and interests of its faculty members.”

Strategy 2F is “Maintain and grow support for undergraduate research, a signature program of the college.”  Many actions are focused on out-of-class experience so are not tied to any specific major.

**Addressing charge:**

1st step: Assess what is actually done at Behrend according to schools, programs and faculty ranks.

2nd step: Make recommendations on how to reward faculty for these efforts.

Spring 2016, we have evaluated a total of 22 programs from three schools\* (Business, Humanities and Social Sciences, Science) and noticed quite a few similarities:

\*program charts can be shared upon request.

By far the most common form of engaged scholarship at Behrend is undergraduate research. Supervising student research is listed under teaching. If student research materializes in a publication it is then certainly also listed under research.

Internships are done in most majors, however, compensation for internships varies greatly. Only one program in one school offers a course release for an appointed internship-coordinator at the rank of lecturer.

**The faculty affairs committee recommends:**

Efforts of engaged scholarship (undergraduate research, community based learning, service learning, internships, capstone experiences, study abroad, study away, and embedded course travel) should be fully recognized in all forms of evaluation currently done at Penn State Behrend including annual review, extended review, and promotion and tenure reviews, and for all faculty members at all ranks.

Below we offer some very hands-on ideas on how to reward faculty for their efforts and how to increase engaged scholarship:

1) Annual Review Evaluations: AFAR points (Everything listed as engaged scholarship other than “capstone experience” is and should be recognized.  To increase effort in engaged scholarship, these points should be weighted much more significantly in the area of research.)

2) Monetary compensation: Faculty advisors of internships that are scheduled for summer are paid.  This pay should be equitable across faculty and through the year if it’s above normal teaching load. Or consider offering course releases for all internship coordinators responsible for 6+ internships per semester.

3)  Develop an award for engaged scholarship at the school level to recognize, if not promote, faculty involvement in this area.

4) Develop a campus-wide award.

5) Monthly/Bi-monthly - “Spotlight on Engaged Scholarship”- in the Behrend Bulletin focusing on a faculty member that has contributed to this area in ways that go above and beyond that of their colleagues.

6) Categories of and Access to Engaged Scholarship Opportunities: Given the categories of Engaged Scholarship the committee identified, perhaps this is an issue that should be tackled at the program or even School level rather than at the faculty-level.  Other than the area of Undergraduate Research, it is difficult for a faculty member to just choose to become involved in one of these areas of Engaged Scholarship.  Rather, they tend to be broader program features that may or may not exist and which faculty may or may not have an opportunity to become involved with.

Thus, we recommend that Program Coordinators assess (1) what areas of Engaged Scholarship the program currently promotes, (2) how to engage a variety of faculty in these areas, and (3) whether additional opportunities might make sense to add to a given program.

7) Schools and/or programs should better define where these categories fit into faculty (at various ranks) annual reviews.  For instance, while it is clear that community based or service learning would fit into Teaching once it is established, could someone in a Lecturer’s position receive Scholarly Activity credit for developing a new component in an established course that infuses community based or service learning?  If so, communicating these opportunities clearly might encourage additional faculty to become involved in Engaged Scholarship.

8) Study-Away: Faculty accompanying large groups of students (25+ students) on three or four-day trips should automatically get an excellent on annual review.

9) Embedded Course Travel: All courses that offer study-abroad trips for a week or longer should be team-taught. Both faculty members should receive full credit for teaching the course, and their teaching assignments should be adjusted accordingly.

10) Study Abroad: Faculty involvement in study abroad mentoring should be recognized. Students should also be encouraged to compete for fully funded national grant and/or internship opportunities, many of which are state-of-the art engaged scholarship opportunities. Behrend has been very successful in helping students secure a three-month DAAD-RISE summer grant for Germany, a nine months USTA fellowship for a graduating senior to Austria, and most recently a two-months Cultural Vistas Fellowship for Berlin, Germany. Surely, there are many more the committee is not aware of.

11) Faculty is reminded to refer all students interested in studying abroad through Penn State Global Programs to the Ruth Pflueger, Director of the Learning Resource Center. Perhaps her office can prepare a list of students who studied abroad, disseminate it widely so that returnees from study abroad programs can be contacted as potential guest speakers in classes.

**Charge # 4** **Develop best practices for appointing, evaluating and rewarding program chairs.**

Below please find what we discussed and recommended 2014/2015:

All four schools are encouraged to up-date their policies for and roles of program chairs. Committee members from several schools urged for more transparency in the process of **electing (rather than appointing) program chairs** and of their roles which seem to have significantly evolved over the past decade. Currently there does not seem to be much if any faculty consultation within programs.

There should be input from all faculty members in a designated program to elect a program chair for an initial period of three years. In the third year there should be a performance review with input from all faculty members in a program and from the School Director; there should be term limits for program chairs.

The 2015/2016 committee was unable to address charge #4 and will pass it on to the 2016/2017 committee.

Respectfully submitted

Eva Kuttenberg, Chair, Faculty Affairs, 2015-2016