

Penn State Harrisburg
Joint Faculty Senate and Academic Council Agenda
Thursday, October 18, 2012
Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room C300 11:50-1:20 p.m.

- A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING
Approval of Senate Minutes September 20, 2012 Appendix "A"

- B. APPROVAL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Approval of the Minutes October 9, 2012 Appendix "B"

- C. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

- D. REPORT OF THE SENATE PRESIDENT
 - a. Faculty Forum: Update on Core Council Recommendations – Oct 30
 - b. Senate Self-Study Committee

- E. COMMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR

- F. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIV. COUNCIL REP

- G. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. Faculty Mentorship Program – Academic Council
 - b. Administration Role – For the Good of the College
 - c. Faculty Workload Policy Appendix "C"
 - d. College Faculty Senate Action Items
 - e. College Faculty Senate Constitution

- H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- I. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

- J. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

- K. FORENSIC BUSINESS

- L. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS
 - Enrollment Management and Outreach Committee 9/26/12 Appendix "D"
 - Faculty Affairs Committee 9/27/12 Appendix "E"
 - Human Resources and Business Services 9/25/12 Appendix "F"
 - International and Intercultural Affairs 9/11/12 Appendix "G"
 - Student Affairs 9/13/12 Appendix "H"

- M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE COLLEGE

NOTE: The next meeting of the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate is Thursday, November 15, 2012 – 11:50-1:20pm in the Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room.

CAPITAL COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
September 20, 2012

Attendees:

Capital College Senators: S. Agili, P. Burrowes, R. Gray, R. Luquis, G. McGuigan, G. Morcol, C. Rios, C. Sabina and M. Strickland

Administrators Present: M. Kulkarni

Invited guests: Joe Cecere and Rahsaan Carlton

Raffy Luquis, Faculty Senate President opened the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

A. Minutes Approval for Faculty Senate Meeting

Luquis requested a motion to approve the minutes from the August 30, 2012 meeting. One change was noted, J. Wilburne was not in attendance. A motion was made by Burrowes/Morcol to approve the minutes with changes and they were unanimously approved.

B. Minutes Approval for Academic Affairs Meeting

Luquis requested a motion to approve the minutes from the September 4, 2012 meeting of the Academic Affairs. A motion was made by Rios/Gray to approve the minutes and they were unanimously approved.

C. Communications to the Senate

1. Dr. Larry Backer and Dr. Pamela Hufnagel from the University Faculty Senate visited our campus on Wednesday, September 19, 2012. As part of the meeting, Dr. Backer discussed three points: a) re-missioning, b) workload policies, and c) evaluation & assessment. There was an extensive discussion about re-missioning and possible restructuring of the University, including the commonwealth campuses. Kulkarni noted that with the change in leadership coming within the next few years, the University has the opportunity to look at its policies and mission; however, he has not heard of any plans for changes in the structure at this point. During the meeting, one of our faculty members asked about issues regarding scheduling and prerequisites, which the computer system cannot check for it. Backer responded that this is an ongoing issue.
2. Backer informed Luquis of a report to Examine General Education, and asked for feedback before the University Senate discusses it. Luquis will be forwarding it to the senators. Strickland questioned who would be getting this report and how would the recommendations be implemented.
3. Luquis noted that he received a report from the Committee on Faculty Benefits regarding the Dependent Eligibility Verification initiative, which will be communicated to faculty during this year's benefit open enrollment period. As part of

this initiative, faculty and staff will be asked to provide proof their dependents to receive benefits.

D. Report of the Senate President

1. Luquis asked to move to unfinished business. (Please see that section below.)
2. Luquis was asked to answer questions regarding our Faculty Workload Policy for the University Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee. Each campus has its own workload policy. Our current policy states that tenure and tenure track faculty have a 3+3 course load, while FT1's have a 4+4 course load. Luquis mentioned that he would share a copy of the committee's report when he gets it. A discussion ensued regarding equity on workload policy. It was decided that this issues would be explored at a future meeting.
3. During the next Faculty Senate meeting, the Academic Council will be joining us as well. As part of the meeting, the Academic Council would like to discuss a mentorship program for tenured track faculty as well as faculty members looking to become full professors. Everyone is asked to bring ideas to the meeting.
4. Luquis made the Senate aware of the Chancellor's Speakers Fund, which can be used to bring speakers on to campus. Members are asked to take this information back to their schools and can contact G. McGuigan with any ideas they may have, as he serves on the committee.
5. Members are asked to spread the word to their faculty regarding the pre-tenure symposium that is to be held on October 26, 2012. "Equity and Inclusion: Successfully Navigating the Promotion and Tenure Process," sponsored by the President's equity commissions and hosted by the University Libraries, will be held from 9 a.m. to 3:15 p.m. on Friday, Oct. 26, in the Paterno Library on the University Park campus. Plenary sessions and breakout discussion groups will address issues important to early tenure-line faculty from underrepresented groups, including women. Carol McQuiggan's office will be providing transportation. For those who cannot attend in person, the symposium will be available by MediaSite Live or Adobe Connect. More information will be available online at <http://equity.psu.edu/pec/pt>.

E. Comments by the Chancellor

Kulkarni had to leave the meeting early; therefore, there were no comments from the Chancellor.

F. Comments From the University Council Representative

The University Faculty Senate did not meet since the last meeting of the College Faculty Senate.

G. New Business

None

H. Unfinished Business

1. College Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics

- Gray was asked to chair a special ad-hoc committee on athletics. Since we are now an NCAA Division III school, it was recommended that we have a faculty senate committee and we add the committee to our constitution. Gray prepared the wording for the new committee and presented it to the senate.
- Cecere stated that the purpose of the committee is to provide better interaction and communication between athletics and academics.\
- Morcol questioned why this committee was necessary. Gray stated the committee would provide checks and balances within the athletic program and strengthen the relationship with students and faculty. Cecere added that student athletes are students first and foremost; however, they bring positive attention to our college. A committee of faculty members will help with issues that arise between students and faculty.
- A motion was made and Burrowes/Strickland to accept the recommendation to create Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics, which would require an amendment to the constitution. Morcol questioned the need to have a required number of meetings per semester for the committee. After further discussion, it was suggested that the number of required meetings be taken out of the original document, everyone agreed. The amended motion was once again examined. A vote was taken to accept the motion, with the proposed changes. Eight members approved and one member abstained.
- The creation of the committee, which required an amendment to the constitution, will be sent for vote by the entire faculty.

2. Discussion on role of senate committees

- As part of the previous discussion, Morcol believes that we have too many committees that faculty are asked to serve on, when they could be working on their research or dedicating time to other pursuits. Strickland believes that these points should be looked into, but at another time and asked that action points be added to the agenda.
- Burrowes suggested that a review of the faculty senate committees be placed on the agenda of a future meeting.

A motion to adjourn was made by Gray/Agili at 1:35pm.

The next meeting will be a joint meeting with the Academic Council on Thursday, October 18, 2012 in the Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room beginning at 11:50am.

/slp

**MINUTES
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Tuesday, October 9, 2012
12:00 – 1:00 P.M.**

Members present: Qiang Bu, Y. Frank Chen, Rick Ciocci, Gregory Crawford, Scott Lewis, Linda Null, Odd Stalebrink, and David Witwer

Invited guests: Katina Moten

L. Null opened the meeting at 12:00pm.

1. **Minutes Approval from September 4, 2012 meeting** – The minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed, a motion to accept was made by Crawford/Ciocci, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **Approval of Courses/Programs Proposals:**

B.S. Civil Engineering and M. Eng. Environmental Engineering Integrated Undergraduate-Graduate (IUG) Degree Program – Dr. Jerry Shoup, Dr. Joe Cecere, Dr. Y. Frank Chen and Dr. Tom Eberlein

We are currently in the process of phasing out our B.S. in Environmental Engineering and wanted to provide students with another option in Environmental Engineering.

Several issues were brought up:

- The wording on page 3 regarding the reduced course load was confusing (maximum of 10 credits with 50% at the 500-level). The wording should be changed to (10 credits, where 7 credits are at the 500 level).
- Concerns were raised about the 500-level core course in the same paragraph. The core courses are listed on page 12. It would read better if it said “500-level core elective.”
- On page 1, the wording under “List of New Courses” is confusing. One of the two electives that we are adding is not new. C E 592 exists; however, ENVE 591 is currently in the CSCS system waiting to move to the next level. Since the course was waiting to be moved to level three in the system, the committee reviewed the course. Minor changes were made to the proposal and a motion to approve the course was made by Witwer/Crawford and was unanimously approved.
- On page 3, information needs to be added that students must take the GRE to be considered for a graduate assistantship.
- It was noted that the bulletin copies for the undergraduate CE and M.Eng. need to be updated as well to include the new IUG program. In addition, the changes being made to the M. Eng. need to be specifically addressed.
- It was requested that Dr. Sedig Agili provide consultation on the new program as well.
- The schedule on page 5 does not match the junior and senior area in the appendix. Changes need to be made in the placement of GHA credits.

- In the admission requirement section for international applicants, it needs to be clarified that TOEFL scores are not required for students applying from English speaking countries.
- It was noted that under the approved electives section (page 10) M E 370 is not offered at the Harrisburg Campus; however, it is available at University Park, so the committee agreed to leave it in the proposal. It was suggested M E 470 Analysis and Design in Vibration Engineering be added as well.
- It was recommended that the C E faculty members be listed on the Graduate Bulletin for the Environmental Engineering program, since the programs will now be overlapping.
- It was recommended that a cover sheet be created listing all of the changes that are being made to make it easier to reference changes.
- A motion to approve the IUG, with noted changes, was made by Witwer/Crawford and was unanimously approved.

3. Miscellaneous

- a. Training will be offered on the CSCS system on Tuesday, November 6, 2012. Please encourage your faculty, especially program coordinators, to attend. Staff members who work with curriculum are also encouraged to attend.
- b. We have decided to keep the next meeting for the same time following the CSCS training.
- d. Null discussed the “review and evaluate academic planning including enrollment projections and academic admissions standards” charge with the faculty senate president and it was determined that the Enrollment Management and Outreach committee would be better able to handle said charge.

4. Meeting dates for the Fall 2012 semester

Tuesday, November 6, 2012 12:00-1:20pm W140

Tuesday, December 4, 2012 12:00-1:20pm W207

Adjournment at 1:00pm

Faculty Workload Policy

All full-time faculty (excluding library faculty) in the Capital College are expected to teach and advise students, to engage in research and/or creative endeavors and scholarly activities, to provide service to the University, the public, and the profession, and to be involved in outreach activities appropriate to their rank and position. Faculty workload is defined by a combination of teaching, scholarship, and service and the evaluation of faculty performance will be based on these areas. The College and Schools may have varying expectations and requirements for individual faculty members depending on the nature of their assignments.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: The standard teaching responsibilities for tenured and tenure-track faculty engaged in significant scholarly research and/or creative endeavors and service activities is nine (9) credit hours per semester or eighteen (18) credit hours per academic year. Since most courses are three credit hour offerings, faculty generally teach three courses each semester during the academic year. In this context, a course is defined as a credit-bearing offering that satisfies the University standards for minimum enrollmentⁱ and that meets as a regularly scheduled class during the fall or spring semester. Suitable adjustments may be made for courses that include extended contact hours such as laboratories. Assignment of teaching responsibilities is under the purview of the School Director. Course releases are generally for a limited time only. Tenured faculty who lack a record of significant scholarly productivity or service will be assigned twelve (12) credit hours of teaching per semester. All full-time faculty who are neither tenured nor on tenure-track status are expected to teach twelve (12) credit hours per semester. In general, newly hired tenure-track faculty members will receive the equivalent of one three-credit course release during each of their first two academic years at the Capital College. All full-time faculty are expected to advise students as determined by the School Director and program coordinators.

The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments: All full-time faculty are expected to engage in scholarly and professional development activities. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the requirements for such activity are determined by the promotion and tenure guidelines developed by the faculty of each School of the Capital College and by University policies such as HR-21 and HR-23. Specific directions and suggestions may be made by the School Director.

Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession: All full-time faculty are expected to provide appropriate service to the University, the public, and their profession. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the requirements for such service are determined by the promotion and tenure guidelines developed by the faculty of each School of the Capital College and by University policies such as HR-21 and HR-23. Specific directions and suggestions may be made by the School Director.

ⁱ While a minimally enrolled course will count as a course for workload purposes, enrollment limits should be determined by School Directors, based upon academic rationale.

(Note: The *Teaching Load Policy*, first adopted on 6th April 2000 and subsequently revised on 15th October 2008, was further revised and labeled as *Faculty Workload Policy*. It was reviewed by the College Faculty Senate on 21st September 2010 and approved by the Academic Council on 22nd September 2010.)

APPENDIX “D”

To: The members of the enrollment management and outreach committee (EMOC)
From: Triparna Vasavada, Chair EMOC
Subject: Charges and Agenda for the meeting
Date: September 26, 2012
Time: 1:00pm- 2:00pm in E 200 Olmsted
Attendees: Ma'moun Abu-Ayyad, Gina Brelsford, Jesse Middaugh, Chiara Sabina, Triparna Vasavada, Craig Welsh

We discussed the following in the meeting.

1. We discussed the total number of focus groups that needs to be conducted, and concluded to go for two groups with graduate students and two groups with undergraduate student.

Following are the faculty members who have volunteered so far.

Undergraduate group 1: Jesse as facilitator, Gina as recorder

Undergraduate group 2 : [Jesse as Facilitator, _____ as recorder \(need volunteer\)](#)

Graduate group1: Bill as facilitator, Heidi as recorder

Graduate group2: Craig as facilitator, Triparna as recorder

2. Members discussed about the questions for focus groups. See the attachment to this meeting for the first draft of the questions. Please provide your feedback. Group decided that we should be ready with questions when we send out the recruitment announcement.
3. Next the group discussed about the plan for conducting the focus group. Following are the specifics.
 - a. Group agreed that best time frame for focus groups to be conducted is between October 21st and November12th.
 - b. Specific day and time within this timeframe should be decided by the team of faculty members who will be conducting the focus group. Each team should send the suitable time to Triparna by October 4th. She will, then, contact Stephanie for room reservations.
 - c. Once the time and location is decided, Triparna will inform it to Craig.
 - d. Craig has gracious volunteered to develop student recruitment announcement. He will include the information and will share it with the committee members on October 8th.
 - e. Meanwhile, Triparna will contact Stephanie to see if she can post this announcement on graduate and undergraduate list-serves. We will also, distribute the announcement on the other avenues as discussed in the previous meetings.
4. Two items were included in the application form: Number of semesters a student has been at the university and the start date of their education at the university.

Focus Group Questions

Start with general explanation of the project based on the description provided in the recruitment announcement.

No.	Questions	Charges that it addresses
1	<p>What is your experience with campus life and facilities?</p> <p>Note all the items that come up and make sure that following items are covered if they do not emerge in the discussion naturally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Classroom facilities b. Research opportunity c. Dorm and living availability d. Quality of cafeteria e. Food quality and meal choices f. Food pricing g. Student transportation services h. Parking facilities 	#2
2.	<p>How does our campus compare to other campuses? (Strength and weakness)</p>	#1
3.	<p>How do you like the new schedule and why?</p>	#3
4.	<p>Do you have any problems with registering for courses?</p> <p>When registering for classes, what are your thoughts on the selection of required courses being offered? Are students able to register for the classes that they need?</p> <p>What do you think about classes offered on week-ends?</p> <p>Do you know about the hybrid courses? What are your thoughts about it?</p>	#5
5	<p>What do you think about courses offered in summer?</p>	#6
6	<p>Is there anything that you would like to share about the campus life and campus facilities?</p>	

**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes
September 27, 2012
Olmsted Building, W-207, 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.**

In attendance: S. Poyrazli P. Ahrens, J. Beckett-Camarata, S. Chang, C. McCormick, I. Shvartsman, P. Swan.

Excused: G. Morcol, C. McQuiggan

Absent: C. Rios

1. The committee members were introduced and the charges we received were discussed.
2. Dr. Poyrazli shared a copy of the report this committee produced for the charges it had received in the previous academic year. The current committee will refer to this document as we are working on addressing Charge #2 for this academic year.
3. Regarding Charge #1, “examine issues related to summer compensation for faculty members,” the senate president Dr. Luquis presented some background information. The Academic Council is discussing the possibility of changing the summer teaching contracts to include service requirements, and if this is a possibility, the ways this can be achieved. In the meeting, the committee reviewed relevant Penn State Harrisburg Academic Guidelines and Policies, specifically F-2 Summer Compensation for Teaching Faculty and F-3 Compensation for Faculty Performing Non-Teaching Duties During Summer Sessions. The committee agreed that the current policies should be followed and that changing the summer teaching contracts would lead to the violation of these policies. The committee also agreed that, based on F-3, the faculty who are on “non-teaching assignments [should] receive a separate contract for those services.”

Another topic that was discussed was related to summer compensation the faculty receives in relation to teaching. The faculty gets compensation at a set rate (e.g., a certain dollar amount per credit per student). While some courses enroll well and full-time faculty receive the full 11% of compensation, many other courses have low enrollment and full-time faculty who teach them end up being paid less than adjunct faculty teaching the same course. In addition, the compensation rate for the summer has been the same for over a decade (\$102/\$125 per student per credit for undergraduate/graduate courses) even though the tuition rate has increased substantially. The committee would like the mentioned compensation rate to be revised and, in addition, a minimum level of compensation (a lower limit, a floor) for teaching a summer course, above the one for the adjunct faculty, be established while at the same time respecting the 11% upper-limit rule.

The committee believes that bringing such changes will result in more full-time faculty interested in summer teaching.

4. Regarding Charge #2, it was decided that the chair of the committee, Dr. Senel Poyrazli, would contact Dr. Marian Walters to set up a meeting with the entire committee. The purpose of this meeting will be to review the recommendations last year's Faculty Affairs Committee provided in relation to grant proposal writing/submission and obtaining a US patent and engage in a discussion with Dr. Walters about how her office may be able to address some of these recommendations. At the conclusion of this meeting, the committee will recommend specific actions to be taken by the Faculty Senate.

**Human Resources and Business Services Committee of the Faculty Senate
Penn State Harrisburg
Minutes
September 25, 2012
12:00-1:00pm
Olmsted - C113**

Present: NIHAL BAYRAKTAR, MICHAEL STEFANY, RICHARD ROBERT YOUNG,
RAYMOND F GIBNEY JR, JOHN KIM, ERIC P DELOZIER, DOROTHY
JEAN GUY, JOSEPH STEIBEL, SEDIG SALEM AGILI

Absent: JENNIFER ANN ALBERT, MARGARET CECILIA LOHMAN, DAHLIA
PARKER

Minutes prepared by Nihal Bayraktar

1. The meeting started at 12:00. The members introduced themselves.
2. Discussion of the Faculty Senate Charge I: "Review polices for the enhancement of a work climate that supports individual differences and promotes and effort fairness and equity. As part of this process, establish collaboration or liaison with the Climate Assessment subcommittee of the DEEC."
3. Different online climate assessment documents are shared with the members.
 - a. Diversity Plan 2004-2009 Final Report (PDF)
<https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/HarrisburgDiversityPlan2004-2009FinalReport.pdf>
 - b. Diversity Plan, 2010-2015 (PDF)
<https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/HarrisburgDiversityPlan2010-2015.pdf>
 - c. 2009 Climate Assessment <https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/DEEC-2009-v2.0.pdf>
 - d. Link to the diversity page <http://hbg.psu.edu/diversity/>
4. Also the list of members of the Climate Assessment subcommittee of the DEED: Steve Peterson, Auden Thomas, Scott Lewis.
5. The issues raised about the charge are:
 - a. The charge is very broad. We need more specific information on which policies to review? Human resources policies (such as benefit policies) or whole university

policies? Are we supposed to modify or enhance policies and make them more inclusive?

- b. One interpretation of the charge was reviewing the climate assessment reports in light of current university policies and work on how to improve them. It will be asked to Dr. Raffy Luquis, the Senate President, for clarification.
 - c. The question was whether there will be any recent climate assessment survey study. The latest one is from 2009. It will be asked to the Climate Assessment subcommittee of the DEED.
6. Discussion of the Faculty Senate Charge II: “Review policies regarding the viewing of promotion and tenure materials by the faculty member that is up for promotion and tenure. There seems to be a misunderstanding about the policy as to when and how the faculty member has access to his or her file during this process.”
7. The issues discussed and raised about the charge are:
- a. The committee members think that it would be very helpful if we know why such request occurred. Was there a specific incidence?
 - b. Some members indicate that they had viewed their dossiers without any problem.
 - c. The issue has been discussed with Mrs. Guy. She cleared that the dossier materials can be seen any time after submitting a form at the Human Resources. The exception is that during the review process candidates cannot see the dossier materials after they submit it. But when the review process is over, the candidates have full access to dossier materials except outside reviewer letters, which can never been seen by candidates. By signing a statement after submitting the dossier, candidates waive their rights. The university Administrative Guidelines HR-23 clear the issue.
 - d. An email message needs to send to Dr. Luquis for clarification.

AFTER THE MEETING ...

- A follow-up email message asking for clarification of the charges has been sent to the Faculty Senate President, Dr. Raffy Luquis.
- A follow-up message has been sent to the members of the Climate Assessment Sub-Committee to ask whether any new Climate Assessment Report will be published.
- Dr. Bayraktar’s follow-up meeting with Mrs. Guy:
It has been clearly specified in the frequently ask questions about the promotion and tenure (link: http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/pdfs/p_and_t_faq.pdf)

In this link, the question 4 reads: “Can there be material included in the dossier, besides letters from external reviewers, that is not made available to the candidate for review when he or she signs the signature statement?”

ANSWER: Only the material identified in the Administrative Guidelines on page 8, III.C.2.k. (external letters of assessment), is listed as confidential and excluded from the candidate’s review or inspection. Before the dossier goes to the committee, the candidate signs a statement that he or she has reviewed all materials in the dossier, with the exception of that section. If material is added to the dossier afterwards, excluding the committee and administrative letters, the candidate should be so informed and be able to review it. (Page 8, III.C.2.k., m.; page 12, III.F.; page 51, Appendix F.)

Dr. Bayraktar’s interpretation of Mrs. Guy’s comments: The candidate cannot see the outside reviewers’ letters under any condition. They can see all other dossier materials including internal evaluation letters any time after filing a form at the Human Resources Office except during the review process. After the candidate submits the dossier (February 15) and signs the statement, s/he is not allowed to see their dossiers until the review process is complete. For the second and fourth year reviews, candidates can see their dossiers after the college P&T committee sends out the evaluation letters to candidates. For the sixth year review, candidates can see their dossiers after the university P&T committee sends out the evaluation letters to candidates, which happens around mid-May.

- Response of Dr. Raffy Luquis
 - Charge 1 - this was suggested by members of the HR & BS committee last year. Thus, you may want to ask members of the committee who were there last year to determine the intend of this charge. Unfortunately, Dr. Lohman, who was the chair of the committee last year, is on medical leave this semester; hence, I can't ask her what the committee meant by this. Still, my understanding is for the committee to review the documents we have regarding diversity/equity (you already found them) and determine if the policies (both HR and in general, if we have them - I am not sure about this) are sufficient and then make recommendations accordingly. Mike Behney, Director of Institute of State and Regional, in collaboration with members of the climate assessment subcommittee of DEEC, just completed the 2011-12 climate assessment survey. Thus, it will be a good idea to contact him, invite him to your next meeting, and discuss this charge.
 - Charge 2 - you are correct, there are specific guidelines on how/when does a faculty member has access to his/her materials/file in the HR office. It seems to me that you have obtain the answer to this charge. But the question remains, why is there a misunderstanding by faculty members? The Senate was asked to look into this, as some faculty members have received different information on how/when to get access to their file. However, I do not have a concrete case/incidence to tell you about. Again, the committee members may want to inquire informally to other faculty members about this issue to determine how to move forward. If this is an issue (i.e., faculty member does not know how to get

access to their file or what information they can get, etc.) then we need to address it. If this was just one or two incidence, then there is no need for further actions.

- Second message:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Raffy R. Luquis" <orl100@psu.edu>

To: "NIHAL BAYRAKTAR" <nxb23@psu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 11:36:23 PM

Subject: Re: Request for clarification of charges - Human resources and business services committee

Nihal,

What you are referring, it is the same document I have. Thus, I will defer to the committee to decide which policies to review. As for charge #2, given the clarity of the policy, if you do not find any other issues, then you can consider that completed and report it as such.

Raffy

- I sent an invitation email message to Mr. Mike Behney on September 25. His reply:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "MICHAEL BEHNEY" <xvc@psu.edu>

To: "NIHAL BAYRAKTAR" <nxb23@psu.edu>

Cc: "FELICIA LYNNE BROWN-HAYWOOD" <flb1@psu.edu>, "Raffy Luquis" <rluquis@psu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2012 5:58:24 AM

Subject: Re: Request about climate assessment reports

Nihal,

The draft report has been completed but not reviewed by the Diversity and Educational Equity Sub-Committee on Climate Assessment . Once reviewed by the sub-committee it will go to the full Diversity and Educational Equity Committee for review and recommendation to the Chancellor. Only after it has been released by the Chancellor can we begin making public presentations on the findings. It is possible that the Chancellor will release by your November 6 meeting but there is no guarantee.

So you may want to wait until the report is released before scheduling the presentation. I've copied Felicia Brown-Haywood, Co-Chair of the DEEC on this email - so she can add any additional information as appropriate.

Thanks,

Mike Behney

- To clarify Charge 1: From last year's HR&BS Committee Senate Final Report: "... In terms of a charge for the committee next year, one idea put forth by committee members

is to review policies for the enhancement of a work climate that supports individual differences and promotes fairness and equity.”

- **Correction by Mrs. Guy:**
- **Let me correct the statement below:**

"My interpretation of Mrs. Guy's comments: The candidate cannot see the outside reviewers' letters under any condition. They can see all other dossier materials including internal evaluation letters any time after filing a form at the Human Resources Office except during the review process. After the candidate submits the dossier (February 15) and signs the statement, s/he is not allowed to see their dossiers until the review process is complete. For the second and fourth year reviews, candidates can see their dossiers after the college P&T committee sends out the evaluation letters to candidates (not an accurate statement). For the sixth year review, candidates can see their dossiers after the university P&T committee sends out the evaluation letters to candidates, which happens around mid-May."

- **Candidates for Sixth-Year Review and Promotion to Full Professor**
May review dossier after the process is finalized - which means the College has received notification from the President's Office for each candidate on the status of their review. This typically occurs in mid-May.
- Each candidate receives a letter from the President informing him/her of the outcome of their review.
- All candidates may submit additional information to their dossier up to February 15th of each review year.
- All sixth-year and promotion to full dossiers must be submitted to OHR-UP by March 1st of each review year.
- After March 1st, the Chancellor informs each sixth-year and promotion to full candidate that he is forwarding their dossier to the University Committee.
- The external review letters are forever confidential and are not made available to the candidates at any time.
- The committee evaluations are accessible to the candidates after the review process has been finalized.
- In order to access one's dossier, the candidate must complete and sign the *Access to Personnel File Form* found in HR-60 and make an appointment with OHR to review the dossier. *Remember, even after requesting official access to the dossier, the external review letters are not a part of the dossier that the candidate reviews.*
- Dossiers for candidates up for 6th Year review and Promotion to Full are handled differently than dossiers for provisional candidates. (1) These candidate dossiers go to the University Committee for review and on to the President for final decision on promotion and/or tenure. (2) There are external review letters that serve as the basis for a confidential assessment of the candidate's overall readiness for promotion and/or tenure. The external review letter assesses the candidate's research in his/her discipline and evaluates how the candidate compares to them.

Candidates for Provisional Review

- Provisional (second- and fourth-year candidates) may submit additional information to their dossier up to **February 15th** of each review year. Provisional candidates may also have third- and/or fifth-year reviews, as determined by the Chancellor.
- See the highlighted sentence above as it is not accurate. The College Committee does not send a letter to the candidate regarding the evaluation. The Chancellor sends a letter to each provisional candidate informing him/her of the outcome of the review.
- The dossiers of provisional candidates are not forwarded to the University Committee or the President, so **March 1st** is not applicable.
- The Chancellor is the final signatory on dossiers of provisional candidates.
- Provisional candidates may not have access to their dossiers until after they receive a letter from the Chancellor indicating the outcome of the review.
- In order to access one's provisional dossier, the candidate must complete and sign the *Access to Personnel File Form* found in HR-60 and make an appointment with OHR to review the dossier.

The question was asked if a candidate may see a copy of the dossier with the college-level evaluative comments before it is forwarded to the University Committee. The answer is no. After the process begins, it must proceed until the final review is made, whether by the Chancellor for provisional candidates or the President for sixth-year and promotion to full candidates.

After the process is complete, all candidates may access their dossiers by completing and signing the *Access to Personnel File Form* found in HR-60 and make an appointment with OHR to review the dossier. The dossier is not available to the candidate after the review process begins except as noted in the *Frequently Asked Questions About Promotion and Tenure 2012-2013* (question #4).

Signature Page of the Dossier - All Candidates

Below is an example of the signature page statement:

"I have reviewed the contents of my dossier, with the exception of confidential materials, as defined in the HR-23 Guidelines."

Candidate Signature

Date

May I recommend the following for reference in follow-up discussions.

- HR-23 Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations

- The Administrative Guidelines to HR-23 Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations
- Frequently Asked Questions About Promotion and Tenure 2012-2013
- <http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/promotion.htm> - link to Promotion and Tenure Process on the website of the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs

- I do hope this is helpful and clarifies what I was able to locate relative to the specific question regarding access to the dossier on or about **March 2nd**.

**Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate
International and Intercultural Affairs Committee
Minutes: Sept. 11, 2012**

Members present:

Lewis Asimeng-Boahene
Amit Banerjee
Gregory Crawford, Chair
Richard Scheib
Robin Redmon Wright

Member excused:

Michael Becker

Members not accounted for:

Michael Barton
Sai Kakuturu
Student representative

Others present:

Marie-Louise Abram
Donna Howard
Martha Strickland, Senate Liaison

1. Introductions: All individuals present introduced themselves.
2. Review charges: The charges for the committee as received from the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate are as follows:
 - a. Explore ways to help new international students make the transition to life at Penn State Harrisburg, including college infrastructure, academic learning center, housing availability, and collaboration with human service organizations.
 - b. Update faculty international engagement database created in 2006-07. Work with Marketing/Web staff to keep database available in the college webpage.
3. Report on international students (Donna Howard)
Currently the College has 233 international students enrolled, of whom 162 are undergraduates, 59 are master's students, and 6 are doctoral students. The countries with the largest representation are China, India, and South Korea. Business is the most popular major, with computer science and various engineering programs being very popular. The international students received a two day orientation program. On the first evening, a dinner was hosted by the International Affairs Association and coordinated by Clem Gilpin. There was a reception for the international students on Sept. 4. An

International Coffee Hour featuring Spain and Hispanic culture was held on Sept. 10. On Sept. 25, there will be a lunch with a focus on China. International students have received emails about these events, flyers have been posted on bulletin boards, and the events have been listed in This Week and on the event monitors. Donna encourages members of the Committee and all faculty to attend these events.

The Committee is appreciative of Donna's efforts in having the flags placed in the vestibule. Members of the Committee also suggested a special event such as an International Student Day which could be celebrated during International Education Week. Donna suggested applying for SAF funding to support such an initiative. She also suggested that the Committee consider having an international student. The Committee accepted the suggestion.

For the next meeting, the Chair will contact Leyla Spahich from DUS Advising to get her perspective on advising international students since advising is critical for retention of students.

The Committee also expresses its concern over the staff available to assist international students. Only two staff members (Donna Howard and Maida Muslic-Kovar) working part-time must cope with a greatly increasing number of international students.

4. Report on international travel/study abroad (Marie Louise Abram)

Marie-Louise presented on the current international programs. Four study trips are scheduled for the spring: Peru, London, Rome, and China. She expects each to attract sufficient enrollment to be offered. She also discussed the SAF funding that Michael Barton has secured that will partially pay for students to attend a conference in Portugal over the Thanksgiving break. This is the fourth time that Michael has successfully requested such funding. Lewis Asimeng-Boahene and Denise Meister are in the planning stages for a trip to Ghana with students. Penn State as a whole, with strong support from Harrisburg, is working on collaborating with the University of Pune (India). An agreement between the Technical University of Darmstadt and Penn State Harrisburg has been signed.

The Chair will meet with Donna and Marie-Louise to formulate specific recommendations that will then be sent to the Committee prior to being forwarded to the Senate.

5. Office of Global Programs website (<http://www.psu.edu/ur/global.html>)
The Chair pointed out that the Office of Global Programs maintains a database of faculty expertise and interest in international research. This database also includes faculty language ability and contacts abroad. In lieu of re-creating, the Penn State Harrisburg international engagement database, the Committee will examine and discuss the use of the OGP database.

6. Discussion, concerns, next steps

The Chair (who also serves on the University Senate's Global Programs Committee) will ask if the campus with which a faculty member is affiliated can be added to the OGP database. The link to the database is: <http://global.psu.edu/GIS/Portal.cfm>.

Martha Strickland reported that the Worldwide Narratives project is continuing this year. The basic question asked of respondents is how does diversity affect you on campus.

Prepared by Gregory Crawford, Chair.

APPENDIX “H”

Student Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes 9/13/12, 12:30pm, Olmsted 200E

Present: Paul Thompson, Denise Meister, Kim Schreck, Glenn McGuigan, Karin Sprow Forté

Not Present: Ugar Yucelt, Shobha Potlakayala, Raven Harrison, Felicia Brown-Haywood, Joseph Cecere

Excused Absence: Amy Sauertieg

Present Committee Members introduced themselves to each other. Chair explained that several members did not notify her of their anticipated absence. **Denise Meister** suggested that perhaps the Chair needed to mark the box on the ANGEL message to forward the message to the Members’ internet address, which could account for the lack of responses. Chair agreed and indicated that she would use Zimbra to communicate in the future. Despite the absences, the committee decided to move forward with the first meeting agenda.

The charges were read and briefly explained by the Chair, particularly that they were based on the committee’s suggestions from the previous year. The committee decided to discuss each one individually.

Charge #1: Explore a better process for Student Activities Fees (SAF) to allot funds for hotel rooms, paying special attention to the city where the students are staying.

Denise Meister explained this charge in detail. The issue is that students are only granted \$100 per night for hotel, and the funds may not be combined with other students’ funds. Dr. Meister cited a previous discussion with **Felicia Brown-Haywood**, during which Dr. Brown-Haywood indicated that SAF funds were meant to support student travel, not fully pay for it. Dr. Meister suggested that the committee invite Dr. Brown-Haywood, Janelle Heiserman (SAF Coordinator), the student government president, and possibly Don Holtzman, to speak to the committee regarding this policy and rationale.

Kim Schreck confirmed that it is impossible to find a hotel in a conference city for only \$100.

Dr. Meister mentioned a reason for this policy as resulting from an unfortunate incident in the past regarding hotel rooms and combining of funds by students.

Glenn McGuigan notified the committee that **Joe Cecere** proposed to create a NCAA Committee and this looked like it would be approved by the Faculty Senate.

Charge #2: Explore ways to provide classroom textbooks in the library for those students who want to borrow them during the semester.

Glenn McGuigan informed the committee that the library purchased one copy of each SET textbook, and they are available in the library for 2-hour checkout. He indicated that although he understood the committee's concern for the cost of books to the students, if the library purchased every textbook, they would have no money for anything else. He suggested that if the faculty member has a copy, he or she could put it on reserve in the library for 2-hour or 1-day checkout. He will prepare a statement of the situation for the committee.

Kim Schreck brought up the problem of the bookstore, and students who still have no books. She indicated that the bookstore refuses to purchase some books if there are new editions coming out soon. She asked the library could copy the faculty member's book, but there are copyright issues—only 10% of the book may be used on ANGEL. **Dr. Meister** suggested that we have Joe Steibel and Don Holtzman visit with the committee regarding these issues.

Karin Sprow Forté mentioned that it is sometimes an issue of financial aid that delays the ordering of books for some students—those who cannot purchase books outside of the bookstore and have late-arriving aid.

Dr. Schreck asked the librarian if a roomful of psychology textbooks could be donated to the library. **Glenn McGuigan** responded that they could potentially be donated, if the faculty members agreed that students may use older editions. He again mentioned the problem of having them in the library, particularly related to waiting lists, recalling, and delays. He suggested that Dr. Schreck speak to Bernadette about the BSED books.

Paul Thompson asked about the timeline for completion of the charges. Dr. Meister and Dr. Sprow Forté indicated the benefits of completing work on the charges by early spring to allow for full consideration of scholarship awards.

Charge #3: Explore ways to engage graduate students, especially to those part-time students who attend in the evening.

Dr. Meister, Dr. Schreck, and Glenn McGuigan suggested inviting the President of the Grad School Organization, the leadership of the Grad Student Club in Psychology, and someone from the Doctoral Student Organization, respectively. Dr. Meister suggested contacting Melinda Logan for a list of clubs and presidents. Dr. Schreck asked about a list of activities that used to take place on campus in the evenings, including ice cream, food, coffee, and meet-and-greets, both before and during breaks of evening classes. **Dr. Thompson** mentioned the Chancellor's soup and ice cream gatherings in the afternoons as a possibility later in the day. Dr. Meister suggested that we also ask Felicia, Don, and Marian Walters to speak with the committee. Dr. Schreck also brought up the fact that graduate students need to know how to request travel funds. Dr. Meister agreed and pointed out that clubs can receive funds from SAF, but not a class. Glenn McGuigan told us about the Honors program that provides \$500 per student for travel. Dr. Schreck would like a guide for graduate students.

Dr. Meister suggested that we broaden the first charge to include all travel funding, not just hotel reimbursement. Dr. Thompson also reminded the committee about distinguished speakers who could come late in the day, perhaps at 5:00pm, using the Homeland Security speaker who visited

campus the previous year. Glenn McGuigan recalled the controversy regarding SAF and a previous president who used travel money for purposes that were not approved. He indicated that transparency in the process was needed. Dr. Meister followed up with additional details of the controversy. Dr. Schreck would like to see more publicity in how to apply. Dr. Meister wants to know how SAF establishes rates for registration, airfare, travel, per diem, etc.

Action Items:

The Chair will do the following:

- Establish reliable communication with all committee members;
 - Contact the individuals from whom the committee wishes to hear regarding the charges;
 - Schedule times when the visitors can join us; and
 - Schedule meetings through the rest of the semester with all committee members.
-