Penn State Behrend Faculty Council

Wednesday, Oct. 12, 2016

3:30 p.m. in Reed 112

Attendance: Sharon Gallagher, Laurie Urraro, Jodie Styers, Luciana Aronne, Mary Kahl, Blair Tuttle, Matt Swinarski, Alicyn Rhoades, Charlotte de Vries, Michael Rutter, Terry Blakney, Brian Boscaljon

1. Call to order by Chair
   1. Sharon Gallagher called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Sept 22, 2016 minutes Sharon Gallagher mentions the need to double check the spelling of Charlotte’s name in the September 22, 2016 minutes.
4. A motion to approve the amended minutes is made by Michael Rutter and Mary Kahl with Charlotte de Vries seconding the motion.
5. Reports of Officers and Standing Committees
6. Officers
7. Sharon Gallagher, Chair
   1. Blair Tuttle (Physics, School of Science) is new parliamentarian.
   2. The chairs of each committee should email their spring schedule to Margie
   3. Faculty Interest Survey: met with Jodi Herman and Qi Dunsworth from the Center for Teaching Initiatives regarding system to use for survey.
   4. Are the members of the Ad Hoc committees posted?
   5. Plans for October faculty discussion forum (Tuesday, October 25th time still to be determined) are nearly finalized. Dr. Dawn Blasko, Dr. Vicki Kazmerski, and Ruth Pflueger are going to present on embedded travel for courses.
   6. Update on University senators meeting: Sharon Gallagher and Laurie Urraro took notes which will be shared with faculty.
      1. Faculty were unhappy with many different systems coming online at the same time (Canvas, Starfish, LionPath).
      2. Science was unhappy with coordinated schedule due to its impact on the scheduling of labs.
      3. Faculty are unhappy with lack of pre-requisite checks through LionPath.
   7. Sharon has received positive reactions for sharing charges of committees with all faculty. Is this something we can consider doing every year? We will need to change the constitution to include this change?
      1. Sharon asks Terry Blakney if we could do something similar with University Senate charges? Mary Kahl is concerned about the length of such a document. Matt Swinarski wants to know if we can filter this down to the things that are directly applicable to Behrend.
      2. Matt Swinarski also brings up we have no charge for the Benefits Committee.
   8. Monday October 24th is the next Faculty Senate Meeting
      1. Bill Lasher has offered to present what is going on with his committee.
      2. Information will be sent out to “generate a lot of excitement” among the faculty.
8. Laurie Urraro, Vice Chair
   1. No updates to report.
9. Jodie Styers, Secretary
   1. No updates to report.
10. Luciana Aronne, Past Chair
    1. Faculty are not understanding how raises were decided on and distributed among different faculty members. Specifically, how can two faculty members that received very different annual evaluation results receive the same raise percentage. Also someone with a lower evaluation getting a higher percent for their raise than someone who had a better evaluation. Overall, how do annual evaluations factor into the decision of raises?
    2. It would be nice to have some transparency from Glenhill on this issue.
       1. Michael Rutter: Attended a meeting where this was discussed. The director is willing to share how these raises are decided. Mike encourages any faculty member with questions to talk to his/her school director directly and ask.
       2. Luciana wants to know which other components figure into raises beyond annual evaluation.
       3. Matt Swinarski suggests there could be individual and team metrics (for example your program is growing).
    3. Mary Kahl indicates that several factors, such as one’s annual evaluation, and issues of equity, are factored into the determination of raises.
11. Blair Tuttle, Parliamentarian
    1. No updates to report.
12. Mary Kahl, Senior Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
    1. Mentoring program: Over 200 applicants for the new AIM Mentor position. The deadline for applications closed on September 30th. The committee selected 10 applicants. The goal is to hire this person before the end of the current fall semester. A cohort of students have agreed to participate in this program. The cohort will be expanded in the spring to also include students that struggled in their first semester. The goal is to help all students involved in the program perform better in second semester.
    2. Bob Light (not in attendance) asked Mary to speak about the Voluntary Retirement Program. The program has been popular at Behrend; approximately 20 people (faculty and staff) across all units and divisions that have opted in.
       1. Replacement of lines: Madlyn Haynes (Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and Executive Chancellor) said it’s possible that we will not get these lines back in the near or far term. There will be very few replacements in first year. In situations where the individual is vital, he/she can come back for one year. This process is easier to facilitate for individuals participating in TIAA-CREF than those in PSERS. Replacement hires will need to be justified using a 7+ page documentation form. These will be funneled through David Christiansen and Madlyn Haynes. The university will also be looking at efficiencies, for example, replacing two staff members with one.
       2. We’re in a better place than other campuses due to growing enrollment and need.
          1. Mike Rutter: Fall 2017 schedules are due at the end of the month. Should we schedule based on need? And we’ll fill in faculty based on need?
          2. Mary Kahl: Yes. Schedule what you need to do to deliver your major. Department heads should work with directors to make good arguments to get replacements.
    3. Raises are decided on a number of factors. The annual evaluation is not the only factor. The raises can be used to achieve parity where between individuals in the same department or unit have been paid differentially but have the same rank and level of accomplishments. This wouldn’t be in your annual evaluation. There is also the issue of gender bias which may result in adjustments through raises. There is also service to the university and salary inflation. Glenhill considers input of directors as well. Not a direct correlation of productivity within a year.
       1. Luciana Aronne: Then what motivates the faculty?
       2. Mary Kahl: This is probably due to intrinsic versus extrinsic reward.
       3. Sharon Gallagher: We could talk about this a lot but we should move forward.
    4. Dr. Barbara Masi the Associate Vice Provost for Learning Outcomes Assessment Office of Planning and Assessment at UP will come to campus on Friday, November 4, 2016 at 4:00 in Reed 114. They want all department chairs and directors in the room. This will be open to other faculty. To learn how to do learning outcome assessment.
13. Committees
14. Aaron Mauro, Chair of Academic Computing
    1. Aaron (not in attendance) emailed the following update to the Chair prior to the meeting: "I have our minutes available on the Yammer site. We've also been working to trouble shoot some issues with Qi's CTLI site. We've invited Qi to our next meeting to discuss things. We'll also be in conversation with CMC in the coming weeks to identify ways to communicate with faculty about their activities."
15. Terry Blakney, Chair of Athletics
    1. At University Park students are allowed to compete on athletic team while earning less than a 2.0 as a sophomore. Behrend is in the AMCC which requires our athletes to have a 2.0 sophomore year.
    2. Faculty athletic reports are in the process of updating team information.
16. Matthew Swinarski, Chair of Curricular Affairs
    1. The committee wants to add a charge. Instead of starting with something as complex as introducing a new program (P1) they would rather look at the course proposals and try to get a similar flow across different schools; how it’s being done, how it’s being generated. They are looking to develop time tables, check lists, etc. Matt Swinarski will write up the charge.
    2. There is a need to have a separate curriculum affairs committee for all graduate proposals. Not all members on committee have graduate faculty.
       1. Mary Kahl: Does anyone have graduate faculty status?
       2. Matt Swinarski: Me, Diane
       3. Mary Kahl: The easiest route to address this, when you have graduate course proposals, is to invite someone with this status to sit on the committee on an ad hoc basis
       4. Matt Swinarski: We’ll need a list of people on campus that have this status to know who to contact.
       5. Mary Kahl: This would be easier than a sub-committee.
    3. Matt Swinarski will come up with an ad hoc committee to serve in this capacity. Any member of the current committee with graduate faculty status will look at graduate proposals and we’ll select ad hoc members from the list as needed.
17. Michael Rutter, Chair of Faculty Affairs
    1. The Faculty Affairs Committee and the Undergraduate Studies Committee are working on a joint task.
    2. One of the charges from last semester was an ad hoc committee looking at faculty moving from the rank of associate to full professor. The committee hopes to have the report done by the end of the semester.
18. Alicyn Rhoades, Chair of Research
    1. Sabbatical applications are in (roughly 20). The committee is meeting Friday (10/14) to review them.
       1. Sharon Gallagher: Are those in drop box?
       2. Alicyn: Just a PSU Box.
19. Joshua Shaw, Chair of Scholarship & Awards
    1. (Not in attendance) No updates to report.
20. Charlotte de Vries, Chair of Student Life
    1. One concern for charge 3: this might be difficult due to changes in LionPath. The committee may need to push this charge off for a year.
       1. Talk to Jane Brady.
    2. Sharon Gallagher: Many students signed up to vote during a recent initiative on campus; where do they go to vote?
    3. Charlotte de Vries: Talking about getting a van and looking into it for this year.
    4. Could this committee take over Constitution Day so they can prepare in the spring and plan ahead?
21. Joseph Previte, Chair of Undergraduate Studies
    1. Joe Previte was not in attendance. Committee member Brian Boscaljon attended to provide the updates.
    2. The review of the general education requirements is on hold (as per University Park)
    3. No make-up exams in conference rooms because staff doesn’t feel comfortable with this. Could we have a joint location? They are going to meet with the school directors to come up with a space/time to resolve this issue.
       1. Mary Kahl: It’s illegal to have a student be the only sole person in charge of proctoring an exam.
       2. Luciana Aronne brings up that one faculty member has a final exam scheduled in 3 rooms at the same time.
       3. Mike Rutter: Minimal policy exists on this issue. Does this include make up exams?
       4. Mary Kahl: Good questions.
22. Representatives
23. Renee Finnecy and Jennifer Mangus, Part-Time Faculty Representatives
24. Sudarshan Nelatury, University Faculty Senate Representative
    1. Newsletter:  <http://senate.psu.edu/senators/newsletters/#101816>
25. Student/Senate Representatives
    1. It is still not clear who these individuals are.
26. Unfinished Business
27. Ralph Ford, Chancellor - Vision of a Behrend Graduate Ad Hoc Committee
28. New Business
29. Laurie Urraro, Vice Chair – Discussion of Title IX statement in course syllabi
    1. At the end of September, Laurie Urraro, Sharon Gallagher, and Luciana Aronne attended a meeting on Title IX. A representative from University Park came to talk about Title IX which dictates that no individual can be discriminated against sex, gender, or activities the threaten gender or sex.
    2. Should we be included a blurb on syllabus about Title IX? We could be a pilot university. University Park would create a blurb we would put on our syllabi starting in the fall. It must be the blurb itself and not a link.
       1. Eventually this will be required. Should we just get ahead of it?
       2. It is required to have a disability services statement on syllabus.
       3. A statement about mental health services will be required in the future as well.
       4. Kelly Shrout is our point of contact.
30. Announcements
31. October Faculty Discussion Forum, TBA
32. Faculty Council Meetings for Fall 2016:
33. Thursday, Nov. 17, at 4:30 p.m. in Reed 112
34. Wednesday, Dec. 7 at 3:30 p.m. in Reed 112
35. Faculty Senate Meetings for Fall 2016
36. Monday, Oct. 24 at 3:00 p.m. in Burke 180

* Bill Lasher will update faculty on his University Senate Committee and ask for faculty input

1. Wednesday, Nov. 30 at 4:00 p.m. in Science 101
2. University Senate Meetings
3. Fall 2016: Tuesday, Oct. 18, 2016 and Tuesday, Dec. 6, 2016
4. Spring 2017: Tuesday, Jan. 24, 2017; Tuesday, Mar. 14, 2017; and Tuesday, Apr. 25, 2017
5. Adjournment
   1. Motion to adjourn made by Matt Swinarski and seconded by Terry Blakney.
   2. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.