Penn State Behrend Faculty Council

Thursday, Nov. 17, 2016

4:30 p.m. in Reed 112

Attendance: Michael Rutter, Terry Blakney, Charlotte de Vries, Joshua Shaw, Matt Swinarski, Aaron Mauro, Sharon Gallagher, Laurie Urraro, Luciana Aronne, Jodie Styers, Ralph Ford, Joe Previte, Blair Tuttle, Alicyn Rhoades

1. Call to order by Chair
	1. The meeting was called to order at 4:32 p.m. by Sharon Gallagher.
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Oct. 12, 2016
4. Matt Swinarski pointed out one typo in the minutes. The motion to approve the amended minutes was made by Matt Swinarski and seconded by Terry Blakney.
5. Reports of Officers and Standing Committees
6. Officers
7. Sharon Gallagher, Chair
	1. Accountability Forms-The forms are to be completed by the chair after the committee’s last meeting of semester. Send completed forms to Sharon by the end of the semester.
	2. Dr. Mary Kahl had suggested to Sharon that each committee chair could write a brief summary about what the committee is working on that could be sent in advance of Behrend Faculty Senate meetings. This would allow people to review the committees’ updates prior to the meeting and provide more time for discussion during the Senate meeting.
	3. Faculty Forum for the spring-Sharon would like to have the entire slate of forum discussions confirmed in advance so that we’re able to advertise them as a whole. Sharon requested that the Undergraduate Studies Committee do a presentation on the new general education requirements as one of the forums.
		1. Joe Previte (Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee) says the committee is waiting for news from University Park on this issue. Once the new requirements are finalized, the possibility of a forum will be revisited.
	4. The next University Senate is meeting on December 6th, 2016. Encourage faculty members to bring issues and concerns to senators to bring up during the meeting.
	5. The Nominating Committee met on November 14th, 2016. An email announcing the call for nominations will be forthcoming.
8. Laurie Urraro, Vice Chair
	1. No updates.
9. Jodie Styers, Secretary
	1. No updates.
10. Luciana Aronne, Past Chair
	1. The Office of Disabilities and Learning Differences is at/beyond capacity for students that receive extended time for exams. This might be worth investigating.
11. Blair Tuttle, Parliamentarian
	1. No Updates.
12. Committees
13. Aaron Mauro, Chair of Academic Computing
	1. The committee is working on formulating a plan for recommendations for the SEO (Search Engine Optimization) site. The site is born out of The Center for Teaching and Learning. Currently, the site is somewhat hidden and the committee would like to give it greater exposure.
	2. The committee is working with John Fontecchio from the Copy and Multimedia Center to discuss any plans, concerns, or issues the CMC might have and inquire about ways the Academic Computing Committee can assist with the CMC’s activities or help communicate with faculty.
14. Terry Blakney, Chair of Athletics
	1. The FAR Report was submitted for the 2015-16 year. Two-thirds of student athletes have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above.
	2. Upcoming NCAA convention has two pieces of legislation that may be voted in:
		1. Graduate student with remaining athletic eligibility could be permitted to transfer schools to participate in college athletics. Currently, these students can only stay at institution where they earned undergraduate degree.
		2. If this is passed, it could possibly allow camps and clinics offered by Division II and III schools to be recruiting events.
	3. These will be voted on during January meeting.
15. Matthew Swinarski, Chair of Curricular Affairs
	1. The committee is currently compiling procedures for the filing and submission of new course proposals. Most of the schools already have procedures in place.
	2. Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee-Currently, only four members of the Curricular Affairs Committee have graduate status (Matt Swinarski, Mike Lobaugh, Melanie Hetzel-Riggan, and Diane Parente). The remaining four committee members do not. This leaves the School of Science without representation on a Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee. However, the School of Science currently does not offer any graduate programs. Do we appoint members to the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee to assemble a full committee with eight members? Or do we hold a separate election for the four remaining members?
		1. After some discussion, Ralph Ford determines we will most likely need a separate Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee. He feels that four members would be sufficient. He feels that this year it would be easier to appoint members. Once we start elections in the spring, we can ask about how to handle this.
		2. Mike Rutter asks whether there is a separate committee to handle graduate proposals at University Park. No one is sure but we should investigate to find out before we make a decision.
		3. Sharon Gallagher points out that we may need to amend our constitution to include such a committee.
16. Michael Rutter, Chair of Faculty Affairs
	1. Faculty Affairs is working with the Undergraduate Studies Committee on make-up exam policies. There are inconsistent policies across the four schools. If students miss for an excused reason (such as athletics or university sponsored events), we need to be able to give a make-up exam and we need a space in which to do this. Recently, there has been push back from staff about being asked to proctor make-up exams. The committee agrees. The faculty member needs to be available to the student to answer and questions about the exam and to resolve any conflicts that occur during the testing process. Do we need a testing center? That’s expensive. Would it be possible to have a designated classroom two nights a week staffed by a faculty to proctor make up exams?
		1. Alicyn Rhoades: Doesn’t that defeat the idea of having the faculty member there to answer questions and resolve conflicts?
		2. Michael Rutter: I don’t understand why a student wouldn’t make every effort to set up a make-up exam with the faculty for those reasons, but not every student does.
		3. Joe Previte: This is a similar issue with Disability Services. When students complete exams in the Disability Services Office, the faculty member isn’t there to answer questions.
		4. Luciana Aronne: You can give them your cell phone number.
		5. Mike Rutter: Students have a right to take a make-up exam in a testing environment that is similar to the classroom environment.
	2. There is a growing number of policies we need to include on our course syllabus. Faculty Affairs would like to see a single form that contains these policies maintained by Behrend. The form would need updated each semester. Faculty could just copy the information on the form and paste it into the course syllabus to make sure we’re all in compliance. The committee will determine the best place to put the form. Mike Rutter will talk to Mary Kahl about this possibility.
	3. The Office of Disabilities and Learning Differences has changed a policy without issuing a formal announcement to alert faculty. The office will no longer return exams completed in the office directly to faculty members’ mailboxes. The forms used by the office have been updated to reflect this change. The forms now contain two options: the faculty member picks the exam up from the office, or the office scans the exam and emails it to the faculty member. It appears as if the office will shred the exam after the scan is sent.
		1. There appears to be conflicting information as to what prompted this policy change.
		2. Mike Rutter: A large number of faculty, including our part-time faculty, teach late which prohibits them from picking up the exam in person.
		3. Alicyn Rhoades: Couldn’t the office scan it and then put it in intercampus mail?
		4. Michael Rutter: If this becomes prohibitive for the faculty, they may hesitate to sign off on the forms to allow testing in a separate location.
		5. Jodie Styers: How does scanning and emailing a student’s exam protect confidentiality better than intercampus mail?
		6. Alicyn Rhoades: Could we scan and send directly to p drive? Like our copy machines?
17. Alicyn Rhoades, Chair of Research
	1. Research committee reviewed the sabbatical applications. Approximately 18 faculty applied. This year, the committee worked to formalize and quantify the procedures used to evaluate applications.
18. Joshua Shaw, Chair of Scholarship & Awards
	1. The committee hasn’t met yet this semester. They will meet more often in the spring.
	2. An email was sent out on November 16th soliciting nomination for University-wide Awards. The deadline for nominations is December 2nd.
	3. Encourage your faculty to submit student names for the awards.
	4. As of this year, Behrend students are o long eligible for the John W. Oswald Award. Josh will investigate why this changed occurred.
	5. Luciana Aronne asked if it was possible to send an informal email earlier in the semester so that faculty could plan ahead and have more time to complete the nomination process. Josh Shaw said he will look into this.
19. Charlotte de Vries, Chair of Student Life
	1. The student life committee worked with the front desk of Reed to get vans to shuttle students to get to the polls to vote on Election Day. Over 100 students took advantage of the rides. This was a big success.
		1. Terry Blakney: Some of the poll workers at the Saltsman Road polling station were irritated that some Behrend students showed up at the wrong polling station. Having to look up polling stations for these students took workers away from signing in voters. Part of this confusion could be a result of on campus students being assigned to vote at the Saltsmans location while students living at University Gates Apartments vote at a different location.
		2. Charlotte de Vries: The committee wants to look into getting a voting station on campus, possibly in Junker.
20. Joseph Previte, Chair of Undergraduate Studies
	1. Working on a joint project with Mike Rutter and the Faculty Affairs committee regarding make-up exam policies and make-up exam locations.
	2. The committee is also looking the awards for teaching and advising.
		1. The call for nominations used to be announced in January but the committee wants to move that up so that students graduating in December have the opportunity to nominate faculty. Now the announcement will go out in November. It is unclear whether or not the deadline for nominations will be moved earlier too.
		2. The committee wants to remove the word undergraduate from the teaching award. This will allow graduate faculty to be nominated too.
		3. Currently, the committee only receives four names for consideration for the teaching award; one from each school as forwarded by the Director. Is this the best strategy? Some members think the committee should be a direct line from the students. Also, some individual schools have their own teaching awards and send that name forward. This allows for the same person to win more than one teaching award.
		4. Luciana Aronne: In the past, some Directors would just forward one faculty nominee while other directors would send the name of every faculty member that was nominated. The current policy was put in place to make this more consistent.
		5. The committee also talked about requiring each nominee to submit a teaching philosophy. Should we go to the faculty as they are nominated and ask for this document? Does everyone have one?
	3. The committee is working to increase their interactions with SGA. One member of the committee will be attending each SGA meeting. SGA has asked for one faculty member from each school to attend meetings. The would like the faculty to be move visible.
	4. General Education guidelines: This initiative is currently on hold. The committee is waiting to see what happens at University Park before they start working.
	5. Assessment: The committee is charged with monitoring the assessment process throughout schools and programs at Behrend. This is also in flux. The committee is gathering information. They have asked directors to send assessment plans and looking to put together “best practices” guidelines for the assessment reports.
21. Renee Finnecy and Jennifer Mangus- Part-Time Faculty Representatives
	1. Not in attendance; no report.
22. Sudarshan Nelatury, University Faculty Senate Representative
	1. Not in attendance; no report.
23. Student/Senate Representatives
	1. Not in attendance; no report.
24. Unfinished Business
25. Ralph Ford, Chancellor - Vision of a Behrend Graduate Ad Hoc Committee
	1. Ralph Ford and Sharon Gallagher are in charge of this initiative. The charge for committee is to develop a vision of the ideal Behrend graduate. Members of the faculty and staff were consulted during meetings in the spring but if anyone else has input, they should send it to either Ralph Ford or Sharon Gallagher. They will work on assembling members for this committee next semester.
	2. The Nominating Committee met for the first time on November 14th. An email soliciting nominations for vice chair, secretary and part-time representatives will be sent shortly. The committee’s job is to submit slate of candidates for elections. The deadline to nominate is December 5th, 2016 and elections will be held by January 15th, 2017.
	3. The Voluntary Retirement Program (VRP): Behrend has submitted all of our proposals for lines we’d like to keep. All units are having a meeting with central administration (Madlyn Hanes and Nick Jones). Behrend’s meeting is scheduled for the end of November. We can’t replace any December retirees until this meeting takes place. The Library went through this meeting/procedure on November 16th and were told to expect decisions within a week or two.
	4. We have completed the annual United Way Campaign. Wed surpassed our goal ($50,000) and raised $54,000.
	5. Response to election: Ralph Ford sent out an email. He met with students about their perceptions and feedback after the election.
		1. International students are worried that new laws will be put in and they won’t be allowed to return to Behrend.
		2. Met with students of color. There are racial slurs and inappropriate comments. They discussed how to these comments.
		3. Behrend hosted former President Bill Clinton and Vice President-elect Mike Pence not because of party affiliation but to provide opportunities for students.
		4. If any member of the faculty has questions about general salary increases, he/she is encouraged to meet with the school director or come to Glenhill. In general, salary increases were based on two components, merit and equity. Merit based raises were between 1.4-2% based on GSI. Equity based raises were based on national comparison or salary compression.
			1. Blair Tuttle: Is public data available on salaries?
			2. Ralph Ford: No, we do not publish individual salaries. There are public benchmarks and aggregate salary information. Penn State publishes the data for the different colleges and locations each year through Faculty Senate.
			3. The letters containing raise information used to break down merit versus equity adjustments. We’ve moved away from that but we could go back.
				1. Mike Rutter: Could we have the ranges of the merit based raises?
				2. Ralph Ford: Yes. This is something we considered. We could send a memo.
				3. Terry Blakney: The same question was asked of Nick Jones at Faculty Senate. Each campus gets to decide whether or not to share the ranges.
				4. Sharon Gallagher: A few years ago, raises were published across campuses through University Senate.
				5. Terry Blakney: This was a concern with Joe Paterno and endorsements through Nike.
				6. Ralph Ford: 9-90’s every non-profit has to report their top 20 salaries.
26. New Business
27. Student Civility

Penn State Principles [Website for Penn State Principles](http://www.psu.edu/this-is-penn-state/penn-state-principles)

Faculty Rights Regarding Classroom Behavior [Website for Faculty Rights](http://psbehrend.psu.edu/sites/default/files/intranet/faculty-resources/faculty-council/minutes/facultyrights.pdf)

* 1. Addressing Hate Speech on Campus and Beyond. Received from Melanie Hetzel-Riggan through Eric Corty. There is some concern that the amount of hate speech will increase around the inauguration.
1. Concerns for Faculty
	1. There is worry and concern for international, tenure track faculty on SRTE’s. Does someone sort through the comments on these surveys?
		1. Mike Rutter: The Promotion and Tenure Committee does not see the open responses. We only see the scores and second form of evaluation.
		2. Alicyn Rhoades: Last time she was pregnant there were comments in her SRTE. She brought the comment to attention of the administration and asked to have it removed. The administration was unable to remove it.
		3. Matt Swinarski: It might be possible to delete individual comments based on the system being able to pull your individual results.
		4. Sharon Gallagher: We need them to evaluate the teaching not the personal stuff.
		5. Mike Rutter: We can’t correlate comments with scores, which makes deleting information difficult.
		6. Matt Swinarski: All we can see is the average. It’s a small sample size.
		7. Terry Blakney: I pushed to give the average and the median.
		8. Josh Shaw: I wonder if school directors can address this in the tenure letter?
		9. Luciana Aronne: It’s easy to hide behind a screen. Are students less likely to say these things in person?
		10. Mike Rutter: Speaking of SRTE’s, students that have late dropped the course are still getting invitations to complete SRTE’s.
		11. Sharon Gallagher: We can maybe bring this up at the next Senate meeting after break.
2. Announcements
3. January Faculty Discussion Forum, TBA
4. Faculty Council Meetings for Fall 2016:
5. Wednesday, Dec. 7 at 3:30 p.m. in Reed 112
6. Faculty Senate Meetings for Fall 2016
7. Wednesday, Nov. 30 at 4:00 p.m. in Science 101
* Request Faculty Committee Updates from Chairs by Monday, November 28th
1. University Senate Meetings
2. Fall 2016: Tuesday, December 6th, 2016
3. Spring 2017: Tuesday, January 24th, 2017; Tuesday, March 14th, 2017; and Tuesday, April 25th, 2017
4. Adjournment
	1. Jodie Styers motions to adjourn and Joe Previte seconds. The meeting is adjourned