**Undergraduate Studies Committee Final Report 2014-2015**

**Penn State Behrend**

**Members: Beth Potter (Chair, SOS), Mike Naber (SOS), Kathleen Noce (SOB), Randy Brown (SOB), Janet Neigh (HSS), Guadalupe Alvear-Madrid (HSS), George Dudas (ENG), Ruth Pflueger (ex-officio)**

**Fall & Spring Undergraduate Studies Committee Charges**

1. Last year recommendations were made by our committee after reviewing the CQI Team on Instructional Facilities report (Appendix #1), one area should be chosen and further researched so that implementation can happen in the next few years.
2. Support the General Education Task Force.
3. Review and recommend faculty teaching and advising award recipients (spring only).

**Summary:**

**Charge #1**

Choose one area from the CQI report to focus on and make suggestions on how to improve and begin implementation.

The committee chose to focus on technology in the classroom and in our second meeting we invited several guests for a technology discussion: Mario Loreti (Senior Instructional Services Specialist), John Fontecchio (Manager of Copy and Multimedia center), Larry Kosin (IT Manager), Todd Say (IT Support Services Specialist), Amy Bridger (Director of Advanced Technology Projects), and George Walters (Academic Computing Committee Chair). By the end of the meeting, it was evident that the college has a lot of technology to help in our classrooms and it is just not known by our faculty. The committee suggests that School Directors should reserve time within school meetings each year to focus on the technology available to faculty. One approach would be to have an IT/computer specialist present. Another possibility would be a presentation by a faculty member who is an avid user of technology in the classroom and can teach others about how they use technology to enhance the educational experience. There should also be a discussion on this topic within the new faculty orientation program.

**Charge #2**

Support the General Education Task Force.

In the fall semester a representative of the Gen Ed Task Force visited Behrend to get feedback on three proposed models to reform general education requirements (agenda and email included in Appendix #2). On April 28th the faculty Senate approved a new general education curriculum. A two page summary of the changes can be found at: <http://gened.psu.edu/curriculum/>. The biggest change is the introduction of an explicit integration component requiring 6 credits of Integrative Studies within Breadth Across Knowledge Domains. Two ways of accomplishing this requirement are Inter-­‐domain courses and Linked courses. There are still several areas within the newly proposed curriculum that need refinement and it is important for us to understand these changes before implementation begins.

**Charge #3**

Review and recommend faculty teaching and advising award recipients (spring only).

Many of the members of the committee found it hard to evaluate the candidates with the portfolios presented. The biggest concern for the teaching award was having a large amount of ‘extra’ information in that the portfolios included many years and then having very little information for the mentoring award. There was also question about the nomination procedure specifically how the final candidates are determined at the school level. In addition, the committee is proposing a new Research Mentor Award. Below are the recommendations made by the committee for the teaching, mentoring, and research mentor awards.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Nomination Procedure | Nominations should be submitted online and managed by an unbiased administrator in the chancellor’s office. The nominator should fill out a box on the nomination form as to what category they are defined as: student, administrator, or faculty. **Names of the nominators and nominees should not be provided to committee members or other personnel.**  To be considered a candidate the faculty member must receive two independent nominations, one of which must be from a student. If a school has more than 3 candidates, the School Awards Committee or ad hoc committee will select the three best candidates which will be forwarded to the Undergraduate Studies committee. The school committee should be comprised of faculty members and not School Directors.  Faculty should be notified of their candidacy for the award and will be provided 1-2 weeks to write a personal reflection describing his/her advising/teaching/mentoring philosophy. Candidates should also review their portfolios before submission to the Undergraduate Studies Committee. |
| Advising Award Candidate Portfolios should include: | Copies of nomination letters with names of the nominator and nominee removed  Number of advisees for the current and previous school years  Candidate’s personal reflection on advising philosophy  Responses from an ANGEL survey that was sent to all students on the adviser’s roster. Survey will inform students that their adviser is a candidate for the award and ask that they provide comments regarding their experience. |
| Teaching Award Candidate Portfolios should include: | Copies of nomination letters with names of the nominator and nominee removed  Teaching dossier including SRTE score for the current and previous school years  Candidate’s personal refection on teaching philosophy |
| Research Mentor Award Candidate Portfolios should include: | Copies of nomination letters with names of the nominator and nominee removed  Teaching and Research dossier with an emphasis on the following: Number of undergraduate students, List of supervised undergraduate projects/grants, List of publications highlighting student authors, List of supervised undergraduate presentation at local, national, or international meetings  Candidate’s personal refection on mentoring philosophy |

**Award Winners: TBA**

Guy W. Wilson Award for Excellence in Academic Advising – Richard Englund

Council of Fellows Excellence in Teaching – Mary Connerty

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Potter

**Appendix #1** - **Recommendations made by the CQI Team on Instructional Facilities and the suggested implementation plan put forth by the Undergraduate Studies Committee (2013-2014)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concerns Raised** | **Suggested Implementation Plan** |
| **Computer Lab Demand**   * demand for computer labs for assigned courses is very high * engineering labs are generally not public * number of seats do not correspond to course, thus wasting computer space * Behrend needs a large testing computer lab (suggested 60+ seating) | * redistribute **ALL** computer space * realign classroom space with course numbers in either direction (i.e. make course bigger or computer room smaller) * create a large secure computer testing center * enlist computer center to track “class” usage, scheduled vs. actual use |
| **Classroom Congestion**   * too many desks in classrooms * concerns about students with disabilities, space for chairs, fire hazards, etc. * need for a larger classroom to accommodate common lecture courses on the west end of campus | * facilities will need to support philosophy (big school with small classes) * purchase of new desks to maximize space efficiently while allowing room for students to navigate and move around room for group work * time table for replacements should be created * strong recommendation that faculty and staff have input on Fasenmeyer renovation |
| **Classroom Technology**   * faculty are concerned that classrooms are not properly equipped * elementary school classrooms currently have more technology than most of our classrooms | * remove overhead projectors (after faculty consult) * mandate screens not block chalkboards * for all large (>40) classrooms be outfitted with smart board (or appropriate alternative) * pilot program is suggested * new technology should be put in one specific classroom with willing faculty courses assigned who are willing to experiment with technology before we purchase new equipment for every classroom * this approach must involved media, computer & Center for Teaching Initiatives staff along with willing faculty (teamwork approach) * recommended to being with OBS 101 and OBS 114 |
| **Classroom Time Management**   * some time slots could be better used (i.e. 8 am and 3:25 PM periods underutilized) * MW only classes create problems * all class/labs offerings should be more evenly spread across the week | * new scheduling software (schedule whiz) should help classroom time management * while faculty should have some ability to make special requests, those requests should not limit student choice or more efficient use of classroom space * recommended that **single section** courses be placed at 8 am and 3:25 pm time slots * eliminate MW courses before 5 pm * move labs to MWF schedule, move lecture classes to T/R schedule equally across schools * recommended that multiple section courses be posted with a lower enrollment limit to force more even enrollment of each section   Example: 8 am (40 seats) vs. 10 am (30 seats) When 10:00 a.m. fills it forces students to consider alternative scheduling options. Courses would then need to be monitored closely. Enrollment limits could then be adjusted as sections fill.   * Note: there may be faculty resistance to moving lectures to T/R (not all our committee members agreed with this philosophy) |
| **ENGL 005**   * non-college credit course, uses resources but is critical for retention * similar concerns with MATH 004 and other remedial courses | * consulted with Mary Connerty and Craig Warren on the “English Language Study Center” * center should be closely monitored to justify cost; costs could easily be made up with retention and student success * if successful, international and non-English speaking national students should see increase retention and graduation rates |

Appendix #2

General Education Task Force Agenda

Dr. Chris Long, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

# AGENDA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9:30 am | Greetings, Reed Lobby |
| 10:10-11:00 am | **Meeting with University Senators – Reed 113**  Paul Barney, Dawn Blasko, Juan Fernandez-Jimenez, Amir Khalilollahi, Bill Lasher, Lisa Mangel, Sudarshan Nelatury, Rod Troester |
| 11:15 – 11:45 am | **Glenhill Farmhouse, Bob Light’s office (Budget)**  Tracy Claybaugh, Financial Officer  Robert Light, Sr. Associate Dean |
| 12:00 – 1:00 pm | **Chancellors lunch with faculty/town hall meeting – Metzgar Living Room**  Any faculty who make reservations |
| 1:15 – 2:00 pm | **Faculty Town Hall Meeting – Reed 114** |
| 2:15 – 3:00 pm | **Meeting with Administrators, Glenhill Farmhouse**  Don Birx, Chancellor  Dawn Blasko, Interim ADAA  Darren Williams, Faculty Council chair |
| 3:00 pm | Departure |

Below is the email that was sent to all faculty members:

Dear Colleagues,

I just wanted to take a moment to remind you that a member of the General Education Task Force, Dr. Chris Long, will be traveling to our campus on Wednesday October 15th. Chris will briefly present three prototypes for reforming the General Education Requirement and initiate an open discussion about the opportunities and implications of each prototype. The Gen Ed Task Force stresses that these prototypes are not finalized proposals and they want to hear our feedback. Please visit the Gen Ed Task Force webpage to read their Progress report in which the three prototypes are defined (http://gened.psu.edu/progress-report-september-2014/). Changes to general education will have an impact on all of us so I hope that you will take the time to look over the prototypes and attend one of the following:

* + 12:00 – Chancellors lunch with faculty/town hall meeting – Metzgar Living Room (faculty must make a reservation by Monday, October 13 at 9:00 a.m.)
  + 1:15 – Faculty Town Hall Meeting – Reed 114

If you cannot make one of the above meetings, you can provide feedback directly on the Gen Ed Task Force webpage (<http://gened.psu.edu/>).