

**Penn State Harrisburg
Faculty Senate Agenda**
Thursday, August 30, 2018
Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room
C300 Olmsted 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

- A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING
Approval of Senate Minutes May 15, 2018 Appendix “A”
- B. APPROVAL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
None
- C. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE
- D. REPORT OF THE SENATE PRESIDENT
- E. COMMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR
- F. COMMENTS FROM THE SENIOR ASSOCIATE DEAN OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
- G. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIV. COUNCIL REP
- H. COMMENTS FROM THE STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL
- I. COMMENTS FROM THE SGA REPRESENTATIVE
- J. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. Selecting liaisons to Senate committees
 - b. Renaming the Faculty Center (Jennifer Keagy)
 - c. Senator’s proposals for Senate projects
 - d. Proposed Forums
- K. UNFINISHED BUSINESS Appendix “B”
 - a. Explain and Distribute Plan for Revision of Senate
 - b. Teaching Evaluation and Development ad hoc committee
 - c. Room Review and Suggestions ad hoc committee (Pete Swan)
- L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
- M. FORENSIC BUSINESS
- N. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS
- O. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE COLLEGE

NOTE: The next meeting of the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate is Tuesday, September 25, 2018 – 11:30-1:00pm in the Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room.

**CAPITAL COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
END-OF-YEAR MEETING
MAY 15, 2018**

Attendees:

Capital College Senators: B. Adams, J. Gibbs, R. Lee, Y. Kim, G. Mazis, P. Swan, D. Williamson, D. Witwer

Committee Chairs: R. Ciocci, R. Joseph, W. Kline, B. Maicke, S. Marikunte, H. Abbey-Moyer, L. Null, R. Weiler-Timmins, S. Wolpert

Administrators/Academic Council: H. Angelique, O. Ansary, J. Beck, R. Bachnak, P. Idowu, P. Julnes, M. Kulkarni, S. Schappe

Invited Guest: J. Keagy

I. Welcome and Introductions

Glen Mazis, Senate President, opened the meeting at 12:15 p.m. Introductions were made around the table.

II. Remarks from the Senate President

- Mazis commented that the college is in a good position as we welcome Dr. Mason as our new chancellor in August. He would like the faculty senate to serve as a resource for the new Chancellor and for faculty governance to continue under the new administration.
- Mazis thanked Kulkarni for his leadership over the past several years. Our campus has seen tremendous growth in student enrollment, campus infrastructure, and diversity. We are a welcoming and diverse community thanks to Dr. Kulkarni setting that tone. Mazis presented Kulkarni with a poem.
- A certificate of appreciation honoring P. Swan's presidency was presented. Mazis commented about what an energetic, thorough and proactive job Swan had done as President and also presented Swan with a poem.
- Mazis sought nominations for Senate Secretary. D. Williamson agreed to assume the position.
- The election of parliamentarian was tabled until the fall semester.

III. Committee Chair Reports

Academic Affairs Committee –Chair Linda Null – Co-Chair Rick Ciocci

The report was available for review.

- The committee reviewed 48 courses and 10 programs during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Swan had requested the schools provide a point of contact for all curriculum issues in the school and each has done that. That person will be responsible to undergo training on the CRCS system and to assist faculty in their schools when creating or changing curriculum.

- The academic affairs website is now up and running on the faculty senate webpage. It has many resources for the different types of proposals. <https://harrisburg.psu.edu/faculty-senate/academic-affairs-committee>
- Currently there is no plan from the University for streamlined program changes resulting from the new general education requirements.

Athletics Committee – Chair Rebecca Weiler-Timmins

The report was available for review.

- The committee met twice during the 2017-2018 academic year, and worked with three charges (additional meeting attempts were cancelled due to weather).
- A panel entitled “A Day in the Life of a College Coach: Mentor, Educator, and Leader” was held on September 28, 2017. The panel included 6 coaches and 6 student-athletes. The questions included detail about the role of a head coach and student-athlete at the DIII level specifically at Penn State Harrisburg. Thirty-seven people attended. It was suggested that we have a follow up panel next year to continue the conversation.
- The Student Athlete Progress Report was created by the Athletics Department and the Athletics Committee in 2015. This document was generated in an effort to enhance the current academic Progress Report for the student-athletes. The coaches found success with the implementation of the progress report as it provided increased ability to monitor the student-athletes throughout the entire semester. The committee and athletics department will continue to receive feedback from both faculty and athletes to better the form and the process.
- The committee continues to provide an ongoing initiative to disseminate information via school meeting updates from committee (Senate Policy for game absences 42-27, student-athlete absence form, student athlete progress reports). They met with Humanities, Public Affairs, and Behavioral Sciences and Education during the 17-18 academic year. Additional meetings will be scheduled for the fall.
- The timing of the Capital Athletic Conference has changed for spring 2018 to allow conference playoff competitions to be held on days when institutions were conducting final exams. The committee met with Dr. Ansary in spring of 2017 to discuss the potential issues regarding the new policy. The following steps were taken:
 - An email was sent to the faculty in January providing information about the new policy.
 - Once exam schedules were posted during the semester, the student-athletes were instructed to discuss any potential conflict with faculty.
 - Becky and Rahsaan met with most schools to provide further context and information.
 - The biggest challenge was the Capstone Project for the Engineers. The Capstone project presentation date has always been the Friday of finals week. The CAC play-off schedule presents potential for conflict on Thursday and Friday of finals. We are working with Engineering to allow for the student-athletes to work through this challenging situation.

- Student-Athlete vs. Faculty Competition (Dr. Ansary): Dr. Ansary had suggested that the committee discuss ways to have the faculty and student-athletes interact outside of the classroom. The committee discussed potential opportunities in the fall (outdoor softball/soccer game) and spring (indoor volleyball or basketball game) during DIII week. It was also suggested that we provide opportunities for faculty that might be “athletically challenged” by creating a trivia contest that runs simultaneously with each game. The committee would like to carry this initiative over to the next academic year.
- The committee continues to monitor the Faculty Athletic Liaison Program. This is a continued effort to create a well-rounded, integrated collegiate experience for the Student-Athletes. It is designed to support student-athletes by increasing communication and strengthening connections among student-athletes, coaches and faculty. The committee developed a process for the FALs to collect and review the Student Athlete Progress Reports.

Enrollment Management and Outreach Subcommittee – Chair Seth Wolpert

The report was available to review.

- The first charge requested recommendations regarding enrollment services, outreach, marketing, continuing education, and distance learning. They reviewed feedback from students about Penn State Harrisburg as a means to gauge public perceptions about the college. Positive comments included small classes, taught by full-time faculty, engaged faculty who were available, and a safe campus (one of the safest in the country). Negative comments included lack of social activities on campus and off campus, lack of nightlife in the town, and not being able to use athletic fields.
- Charge two was to review the college marketing plan. The committee learned that the marketing department is comprehensively staffed and their plan is complex and not clearly defined. The procedure they have followed thus far is to market the campus based on limited media advertising and on campus events. The committee decided they could not do better.
- Charge three was to review and recommend policies in cooperation with academic affairs to ensure the procedures are in place to evaluate distance education. The committee felt this charge would be better left to individual programs that already have assessment objectives, outcomes, evaluators, and procedures that are used in their own courses in their own disciplines.
- Charge four was to look for easily implemental changes that will save time for faculty and staff. The committee found none.
- Charge five was to collect ideas from faculty about expanding our graduate programs, using focus groups, survey, or other methods. The committee felt this was better left to individual programs and the graduate school, and they were already undertaking this task.
- Other issues discussed by the committee were student preparedness, particularly in math and science, the widespread use of online homework aids, use of feedback from employers, graduate schools, and alumni, makeup times for snow days, and greater community outreach. Dr. Kulkarni pointed out that the EI of

incoming students has been steadily increasing, so incoming students are increasingly better prepared. Mazis said the Senate would try to disseminate this information more effectively to the faculty, many of whom seem unaware of this trend

Faculty Affairs Committee – Chair Rhoda Joseph

The report was available for review

- The committee met in person five times during the academic year.
- The first charge reviewed the P, Q, and R designations of graduate faculty. The report provided a table outlining the different responsibilities in each of the categories. There are ambiguities that still call for resolution in a case-by-case basis.
- The second charge was to report on the implementation of the new FT1 promotion guidelines. Since they were not finalized during the academic year, the issue was tabled. Dr. Kulkarni reported that the guidelines had been passed in the previous Academic Council meeting and would be implemented in the fall semester. He also explained that since these dossiers will be less extensive than tenure and promotion and will stay on the local campus, the timeline for their procedures is more relaxed and less rushed than tenure and promotion, and we have enough time.
- The third charge was to make recommendations on the final exam policy. The policy was summarized in the committee's final report. It is important to make sure that all faculty are aware of this policy, particularly junior faculty. It is especially important they give final projects of at least 10% of the grade during final exam week and correlatively no assignment the last week of classes can be more than 10% of the grade.
- Charge four was to examine the fairness of the process by which faculty and staff awards are given (particularly supplemental submissions require for the award nominees). The process is very time consuming due to the high document requirement for these awards. The committee suggests conducting a survey of the faculty during the next academic year to determine perceptions about these awards.
- Charge five was to look for easily implementable changes that save time for faculty and staff. From the feedback solicited by colleagues, one theme emerged, increased workload and responsibilities. It has been particularly noticeable due to retirements and resignations of both faculty and staff. It was suggested that there are too many conflicting events for faculty members during common hours (school level meetings could be streamlined), and office hour policies should be clearly defined across the schools.
- Additional items that were brought forth by faculty were, more transparency during the promotion and tenure process, treatment of FT1's by the graduate school when proposing new courses, faculty parking, and a faculty bathroom. Dr. Kulkarni responded that he was not in favor of either faculty parking or faculty bathrooms as it would create an atmosphere where one group seemed privileged over others. Dr. Ansary and Mazis clarified that it is the lack of equal mentoring

about the tenure and promotion process that needs to be addressed and not unfairness about the process itself.

Human Resources and Business Services Committee – Chair Mohammad Ali (William Kline reported)

The report was available for review.

- The committee conducted several surveys regarding PSU web tools, Aetna health insurance and the effect of the centralization of services on the college. There was confusion created by the centralization of how to obtain proper information that will have to be resolved. The health insurance seems to be doing all right with the majority of faculty and staff, but it is too early to get an adequate idea.

PSU Web Tools Survey

The primary purpose of the survey was to assess the usage and satisfaction of staff and faculty at PSU Harrisburg with the web tools. We had a total of 40 respondents [5% support Departments, 35% Behavioral Sciences, 20% Business Administration, 15% Humanities, 12.5% Public Affairs, and 15% Science, Engineering, and Technology] with an average of 8.43 years' service at PSU.

1. The participants were asked to rate the effectiveness with each self-service section in Lionpath on a scale of 1-7 (where 1 signifies Poor and 7 signifies Great). The overall trend is that most of the web tools are not used by the faculty and the ones who do use them do not rate them very highly regarding effectiveness.
 - Student Delegation: More than About 65% never or rarely used it. The mean was 3.5.
 - Academic Planning: More than 50% never used it. The mean effectiveness was 3.77.
 - Enrollment: The highest percentage never or rarely used it. The mean effectiveness was 4.23.
 - Degree Progress/Graduation: the highest percentage never or rarely used it. The mean effectiveness was 3.72.
 - Faculty Center: Used by most faculty with the mean effectiveness of 3.96.
 - Advisor Center: Used by most with the mean effectiveness of 3.6.
 - Research activities: almost no one uses the web tools.
 - Starfish: The mean effectiveness is 3.6.

Open-ended question and Recommendations

2. In the open-ended question, it was asked that if the respondents wanted to change one thing about LionPath or Starfish, what it would be. After reading the comments, the trend in the above means is supported. In most cases the comments are negative. However, a closer look reveals the main areas of concern and the following recommendations, presented in the ranking order of importance:
 - The web tools are not intuitive and need to be made more user-friendly and easy to use.
 - There should be a link between LionPath and Starfish so that users can move from one to the other seamlessly.

- Prerequisite check for courses should be made available.
- Degree audits should be generated in a way to make it easier to read them.
- What if degree audits should have student ID on them and should be made more intuitive.
- Improved fonts and readability in all web tools.

William Kline suggested that since many of the web tools and programs are not being used by faculty that either there be more training or even more possibly advantageous that we drop some of these unused features. It was also raised as a suggestion that Starfish be implemented for graduate students, and Dr. Idowu reported that this is being looked into.

Aetna Health Insurance Survey

As per the Human Resources and Business Services Committee mandate the committee was supposed to survey staff and faculty to ascertain the views of the staff and faculty regarding the health insurance change to Aetna. We had a total of 85 responses [51.2% support Departments, 15.5% Behavioral Sciences, 8.3% Business Administration, 7.1% Humanities, 8.3% Public Affairs, and 7.1% Science, Engineering, and Technology]. The results and recommendations are as follows:

1. 70% of the participants had used Aetna health insurance more than once and less than nine times.
2. Several aspects of Aetna insurance were assessed based on a scale of 1-7 (where 1 signifies Poor and 7 signifies Great). The overall trend is that staff/faculty satisfaction with most of the aspects of Aetna is just about satisfactory.
 - Aetna prescriptions, mean 4.39
 - Quality of service providers, mean 4.65
 - Customer service, mean 4.06
 - Aetna (overall), mean 3.99
 - Overall cost, mean 3.92
3. In the end, two open-ended questions were asked. Based on the replies, following issues were identified:
 - QUESTION 1: If you had to change one thing about Aetna, what would it be? (major concerns ranked regarding importance and occurrence in the replies):
 - High cost
 - Coverage regarding specialists, international network, behavioral health care, and vaccination coverage
 - Better pharmacy services
 - Better and more comprehensive network and providers
 - More insurance cards
 - QUESTION 2: Any other comments (the overall comments were negative and reflected the issues identified in the previous question), the problems were:
 - High cost
 - Less coverage
 - Insurance cards
 - Bad customer service
 - Lesser and bad coverage for behavioral healthcare

- Several of the participants asked to change Aetna and go back to Blue Shield

RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no point of reference. However, the current health insurance is rated at the satisfactory level. The means of all of the categories is satisfactory or lower. These results are also supported by the open-ended questions that highlight several recurring concerns. As evident from the preceding section, following recommendations are made:

1. Cost seems to be a significant concern. It is recommended that the cost may be reassessed and be brought closer to the previous health insurance.
2. Efforts should be made to convey to the insurance company the inadequacy of their customer service.
3. Coverage may be improved regarding specialists, international network, behavioral health care, and vaccination coverage.

Centralization of Police and Human Resources Survey

As per the Human Resources and Business Services Committee mandate the committee was supposed to survey staff and faculty to ascertain the impact of centralization of Human Resources Services and Police Services. We had a total of 95 responses [46.3% support Departments, 17.9% Behavioral Sciences, 6.3% Business Administration, 7.4% Humanities, 6.3% Public Affairs, and 15.8% Science, Engineering, and Technology]. The results and recommendations are as follows:

1. Only 2.1% participants had not used any of the services in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. Whereas, 81.1% (77 respondents) had availed HR Services and 42.1% (40 respondents) had used Police Service.
2. The overall satisfaction with the two services was measured on a scale of 1-7, the results show that:
 - The mean satisfaction with Police Service was 5.425 (where 1 signifies Poor and 7 signifies Great).
 - The mean satisfaction with Human Resources Service was 4.14 (where 1 signifies Poor and 7 signifies Great).
3. In the end, an open-ended (optional) opportunity was provided to the survey takers to put in any comments they deem necessary. Based on the replies, following issues were identified in Human Resources Services and Police Service (Ranked regarding importance and occurrence in the comments).
 - Police Service (the overall comments were positive with regards to police personnel)
 - One major concern was that before centralization the police service felt more like community policing in which there was a better connection and rapport between police and the PSU (Harrisburg) community. Now police officers can be sent to Harrisburg campus from all other campuses, and they might have diminished understanding of local needs and even lesser rapport with the local community.

- Human Resources Services (a resounding majority of the comments were negative with regards to HR Services (local and University Park)
 - The most important and recurring issue was “increased confusion.” Several aspects of confusion were pointed out by the respondents. These aspects included:
 - There is little understanding of what queries can be answered at the local level and what needs to be referred to University Park.
 - Most of the times people are just asked to contact UP and often the information from UP is incomplete.
 - Often wrong information or inconsistent information is provided at the local and UP levels.
 - Often two different answers are provided by the local HR and UP HR.
 - Some respondents believe that the confusion regarding who does what is due to centralization.
 - Due to centralization, there is a slower turnaround, which leads to delayed actions at Harrisburg.
 - The system lacks efficiency; people are all the time sent around to different people that often end up in no clear resolution of issues. Often answers to basic questions are not forthcoming from the local HR representatives.
 - Centralized request process is too impersonal and lacks efficiency.
 - The personal touch, which used to exist in the older setup, has deteriorated.
 - With centralization, the accessibility of HR representatives has reduced at the local level. Emails do not get prompt responses and often there is no response at all.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Mechanisms should be created, or the existing structures need to be improved to socialize the police force better. This socialization should include an awareness of the local needs and interaction with other stakeholders on campus. Most of these things can be done during the orientation process of newly appointed police officers, but it is recommended that it should be a continuous process. Hence, communication and coordination between the police department and other departments may be enhanced.
2. The HR services at the Harrisburg campus may be made more responsive to the needs and queries of faculty and staff.
3. At the higher level, a better understanding needs to be developed between the HR services, local and University Park, as to their sphere of influence and duties. There seem to be so many comments that hinted towards issues created by the demarcation of duties leading to confusion, misinformation, information discrepancies, and delay.

Information Systems Technology and Library Committee – Chair Gloria Clark (Jennifer Keagy reported)

The report was available for review.

- Charge one was to survey faculty to see to what extent current classroom setup and technology are meeting their needs. *These are a few highlights from the report:*
 - *71 faculty from the five schools participated*
 - *44% reported themselves as proficient in computer technology*
 - *58% reported using technology in the classroom daily*
 - *73% reported being comfortable or very comfortable integrating technology into their courses*
 - *10% felt that technology training received was adequate*
 - *13% were extremely satisfied with classroom technology services*
 - *See the report for a number of challenges faced using classroom technology*
- Charge two was to look for easily implementable changes that save time for faculty and staff. *Suggestions:*
 - *Arrange slack in the podium set up for mouse to be used on the left side*
 - *Increase the number of outlets for laptops*
 - *Ensure that active learning spaces and chairs be compatible with the room setting*
 - *Acquire feedback from students about the learning spaces*
 - *Change the way the faculty listserv is used to communicate with faculty. Emails cover many topics not relevant to all.*
- The Committee read and discussed the 2017 Horizon Report and noted these upcoming developments in technology:
 - *Significant Challenges Impeding Technology Adoption in Higher Education*
 - *Improving Digital Literacy*
 - *Integrating Formal and Informal Learning*
 - *Advancing Digital Equity*
 - *Managing Knowledge Obsolescence*
 - *Rethinking the Roles of Educators*
 - *Important Developments in Educational Technology for Higher Education*
 - *Adaptive Learning Technologies*
 - *Using mobile technology for classroom learning*
 - *Important Future Developments in Educational Technology for Higher Education*
 - *The Internet of Things*
 - *Next-Generation Course Management System – CANVAS will receive suggestions or change; Yammer group will improve CANVAS; One Note collaboration tool adds enhancement to group work*
 - *Artificial Intelligence*
 - *Natural User Interfaces-intuitive computer use*
- Peter Swan suggested that we still need to clarify the details of each classroom and the way it is set up and functions to match it to the pedagogical needs of the faculty. David Witwer objected that much of this discontent about rooms seems to be senior faculty being forced to see how junior faculty must put up with any room assigned to them and they should learn to adapt as junior faculty are forced to do. Mazis said it really was an issue for all faculty of the inefficiency of being assigned rooms that don't fit the type of class and then there being massive room change requests that

swamp the registrar and staff, and how it would more efficient to match the rooms properly from the beginning.

International and Intercultural Affairs Committee – Chair Nihal Bayraktar (Brian Maicke reporting)

The report was available for review.

- The committee's first charge was to promote and increase international and intercultural awareness throughout the college community. The following suggestions were shared:
 - Meeting with club president of Purple Hand, which is a club for LGBTQA students. The concerns of the students are listed in the committee's final report.
- Charge two was to work with DEEC to make campus friendlier to LGBTQA student. The DEEC is working on the climate assessment survey. They are working to identify new survey questions to address the issues of the LGBTQA students, faculty, and staff. To complete the charge, the committee reviewed the 2015 climate assessment report.
- Charge three was to work with the DEEC to investigate methods to identify and address issues pertaining to intercultural representation on campus. Committee members once again reviewed the climate assessment report and provided recommendations.
- Charge four was to work with the student affairs committee, marketing, police, housing & food services, human resources, student services and others as necessary to designate a 24-hour contact for emergency student aid and publicize availability on website and message board.
- Further information is included in the final committee report.

Dr. Kulkarni spoke of the need to find more spaces for students to gather. Dr. Ansary reported on a new app for students to use for campus navigation being developed.

Physical Plant Committee – Chair Heidi Abbey-Moyer

The report was available for review.

- **Charge #1:** In conjunction with several key faculty and staff at Penn State Harrisburg and University Park, and President of the Faculty Senate, discussed and reviewed learning spaces on campus to improve communication about and workflows for the assignment of and ongoing improvements to classrooms. (See the attached Addendum #1, “Classroom Review and Suggestions,” which was shared with the President and President Elect of the Faculty Senate on May 4, 2018.) Recommended redesign of campus “Emergency Procedures” sign for improved readability, clarity, and design, all of which facilitate improved preparedness and efficient, effective responses to a variety of emergency situations on campus. (See the attached Addendum #2, redesign of the “Emergency Procedures,” which was shared with Police Services for consideration on April 27, 2018.)
- **Charge #2:** Addressed this charge with M&O’s hiring an additional full-time position to clean in the Olmsted Building and the Library after 2 PM.
- **Charge #3:** As part of Charge #1, discussed and worked on improvements to communication/workflow for sharing classroom details with faculty and program coordinators in all academic schools on campus.

Heidi Moyer especially wanted to thank Craig Welsh for his work on designing the new Emergency Procedures poster to be hung up around campus. Dr. Kulkarni stated these new signs could be placed around campus to supplement the standard signs which are not as readable and he would personally make that happen.

“OLMSTED CLASSROOM REVIEW & SUGGESTIONS”

Summary of Room Inventory:

- **About the Inventory:** Room inventory was completed on May 1, 2018, using the Office of Physical Plant’s room listing and capacity; two people conducted the room inventory of classrooms in the Olmsted Building.
- **Several rooms were found to be in excess of seating capacity.** For rooms that were at or below capacity, some were found to have no rear or side egress, which presents a safety issue, extra stacked chairs or tables, broken or stained chairs. It is recommended that these items should be removed.
- **Several rooms were found to have only 14" to 18" between rows of seating.** This is also a safety issue and not within code as outlined in the University’s “Classroom and Technology Design and Construction Minimum Requirements” document from January 2017. Additionally, Office of Physical Plant has stated that the new chairs (swivel/skittle) are larger and because of their size, one cannot use the 20 sq.f.t per person rule used for “regular” chairs. For rooms with these chairs, the number of chairs should be reduced not only for safety purposes, but also for pedagogical purposes as well. Faculty and students also noted that because of the number of chairs in these rooms, there was very little space between groups and the faculty found it hard to move between groups to check in on their discussions.
- **Additional Feedback from Faculty and Students:** Approximately 20 faculty and students were informally asked what they thought of the swivel/skittle chairs and not one faculty or student said that they liked them. In fact, the reactions noted were “We do not

like them,” and “I hate them,” as well as “Unless the classroom is carpeted, it's like an ice skating rink with these chairs.” Additionally, the students and faculty noted that students do not put their book bags under the chairs in the basin because they are not easy to access. This also presents safety issues and pedagogical challenges because it takes more effort/time to move the chairs into small groupings. Faculty were also asked about the new instructor's tables that have been placed in newly designed rooms and some of the comments received include: “They are too big,” and “I hit my knee on the basin on the back every time,” and “The swivel tablet is cumbersome and annoying.”

Recommendations:

- Create and send an official survey to students and faculty to gather more feedback about the furniture (chairs/whiteboards/instructor platforms).
- Request that the Office of Physical Plant determine new capacities for rooms based on egress and furniture required (or in place.)
- Similar to the “Experimental Classroom” at University Park, set up two rooms (two different sizes) as test rooms for new furniture and technology; gather regular and ongoing feedback about the rooms and use the information to make changes before ordering the same furniture for new room makeovers.
- Create a committee comprised of faculty, staff from the Office of Physical Plant, teacher education faculty, and the Faculty Center to evaluate the feedback and make recommendations for rooms.
- Reconsider the purchase of additional swivel/skittle chairs until recommendations can be made for different types of furniture, especially makes/models of furniture that are accessible for all students, especially those of size and different abilities.
-

Peter Swan stated that it would be an issue for the senate to implement an ongoing means of working with Dr. Ansary to get the rooms to match faculty needs, and also pressed for the gathering of more student feedback about these issues.

Strategic Planning – Elizabeth Beckett-Camarata

The report was available for review.

Student Affairs – Chair Shashi Marikunte

The report was available for review.

- Student Affairs Committee has the standing charge of considering policies involving those aspects of student life on the campus that are of concern to graduate and undergraduate students, as well as policies that are not specifically covered in other Committees, including, but not limited to, career development and placement, housing, health, student conduct, student organizations, and extracurricular activities; reviews and makes recommendations relating to the quality of student life, the functions of student affairs operations, student awards and scholarships, and athletic programs, including student eligibility and schedules for athletic events; reviews and makes recommendations for student awards, scholarships, fellowships, and the Who’s Who Award in cooperation with the Student Activities Office and the Office of Financial Aid.

- Student Affairs Committee also assist International and Intercultural Affairs Committee in creating a 24 hour contact for emergency student aid. International and Intercultural Affairs Committee will have the lead role in this charge.
- The committee also look for easily implementable changes that save time for faculty, staff and students.
- Student Affairs Committee met two times during this academic year: Friday, November 3rd, 2017; and Tuesday, February 27th 2018. In addition to this committee chair also attended one International and Intercultural Affairs Committee meeting on November 7th, 2017 and several meetings of Student Facilities Fund.

IV. **Report from the Chancellor, Mukund Kulkarni**

- Kulkarni appreciates all of the goodwill and sentiments that have been addressed to him regarding his impending retirement. He was only planning to stay at Penn State Harrisburg for two years, but ended up staying 33. His unassuming demeanor has helped him to succeed in his career. Always remember to be humble and polite.
- He shared three points with the senate;
 - He was grateful for the acceptance into the Penn State culture. It is difficult to come to a strange land, but he was able to grow here.
 - Faculty choose academia as a profession because they do not like masters and want to do their own things. This allows them to see the world in a broader sense in which they receive greater satisfaction. Think broader, give a little bit, and get more.
 - Kulkarni emphasized the excellent experience he has had over the years with the faculty senate. He hopes that it will continue.

V. **Report from Academic Council**

- The FT-1 promotion policy has been approved by the academic council. It will now be implemented in the schools.
- Idowu reported on the efforts of the Graduate School Enrollment Advisory Team. They have found that greater communication is the key to future success. The chancellor's award to incoming students has been successful, and they recently held an accepted students day.

VI. **Report from the University Council Representative – Martha Strickland**

None

VII. **Recommended Committee Charges for the 2018-2019 Academic Year**

Recommendations from the various committee reports will be compiled over the summer months to create the charges for the next academic year. Kulkarni asked that past reports be reviewed, as the same charges seem to appear every few years. Mazis mentioned that a possible charge would be to increase efforts in outreach.

VIII. **Identify Forum Topics for the 2018-2019 Academic Year** Due to the abrupt cessation of the meeting because of the tornado warning (see below) Mazis did not get to announce that two of the forum topics to be suggested in the fall are one on the New Faculty Senate Structure and the other one on the Chancellor's and Faculty's Vision for the Future of the Campus

IX. **Identify Agenda Items for the 2018-2019 Academic Year**

Due to abrupt adjournment because of tornado warning unable to be addressed at this meeting

X. **Discussion for the good of the order**

Due to abrupt adjournment because of tornado warning unable to be addressed at this meeting

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned due to a tornado warning at 4:30 pm.

/slp

<http://harrisburg.psu.edu/faculty-senate/constitution-bylaws-and-standing-rules>

Constitution, Bylaws and Standing Rules

Standing Rules

Article II — The Capital College Senate Committee Structure

Section 1

The President of the Capital College Senate is an ex officio, nonvoting member of all Standing Committees. He/she may authorize any member of the Senate to represent him/her at Committee meetings.

Section 2

With the approval of the Capital College Senate President, any Standing Committee may add to its membership or appoint ad hoc subcommittees. All Committees are encouraged to invite other Faculty, students, administrators, and staff to render testimony and advice on particular questions as circumstances dictate.

Section 3

Except for service on the Executive Committee of the Senate, members of the Capital College Senate may not serve as chairs or as voting members of Standing Committees.

Section 4

Except for members of the Senate, any full-time Faculty member may serve on Senate Committees. By the first academic day following March 1, the President identifies Faculty willing to serve on Committees. Committee members are appointed annually by the President, with the advice of the Senate, for a two-year term on an alternating basis.

Except for members of the Senate, any full-time Faculty member may serve as a member of Senate Subcommittees. Subcommittee membership is not limited to members of the full Committee. Members of a Subcommittee may be appointed by the President of the Senate or elected in a manner approved by the Senate. Any business transacted by a Subcommittee must be reported to the full Committee. Unless otherwise specified by the Senate, the rules under which a Subcommittee operates are established by the full Committee to which it reports.

The Student Government Association of Capital College is authorized and requested to appoint student members of Standing Committees and Subcommittees to serve as voting members for one (1) year terms. If a student graduates or otherwise is unable to serve a full term, the Senate requests that the SGA appoint another student to complete the term.

If a committee or subcommittee does not meet for two consecutive months during the academic year, does not provide the Senate with monthly reports of its business (such as meeting minutes, or activity reports, etc.), or fails to attend to its duties under these Bylaws, by majority vote of the Capital College Senate, the Committee Chair may be removed from office.

Unless approved by the Committee Chair, the absence of a voting committee member from three (3) consecutive committee meetings constitutes an automatic resignation from the Committee. Any Committee member may be removed by a majority vote of the Senate. If a Committee member resigns or is removed, the Senate may appoint a replacement Committee member or authorize the Committee to act without the member providing the Committee shall have the minimum number of members. As appropriate, the President, with the approval of the Capital College Senate, may appoint members to Committees.

Section 5

At its first meeting in the Fall, each Standing Committee establishes a schedule for regular meetings for the Fall semester and the secretary of the Committee shall report the meeting schedule and the class schedules of Committee members for the Fall semester to the Secretary of the Senate.

At its first meeting in the Spring, each Standing Committee establishes a schedule for regular meetings for the Spring semester and the secretary of the Committee shall report the meeting schedule and the class schedules of Committee members for the Spring semester to the Secretary of the Senate.

Section 6

Standing Committees take up questions and tasks assigned by the Capital College Senate or brought directly to the respective Committee by any member of the College community. Regardless of the source of the question or task assignment, Committee recommendations must be submitted in writing to the Capital College Senate for approval. Standing Committees have jurisdiction within the boundaries established by the "Duties" assigned to them by these Bylaws.

Section 7

All Capital College Senate Committees are available for consultation with the Chancellor and with other administrators. Such requests for consultation are forwarded via the Capital College Senate.

Section 8

Standing Committees:

(8.1) Committee on Campus Operations

1. Membership: Seven to ten (7 – 10) members. The preferred membership is one (1) member from each School and the Library and one (1) voting student member. One to three (1-3) at-large members may be appointed depending on the committee's workload. No more than three (3) members may be from a single academic unit. The Chancellor or his/her representative, the Senior Associate Dean, the Director of the Library, the Director of the Instructional &

Information Technology, the Director of Physical Plant and Maintenance, and the Senate President are ex-officio, nonvoting members.

2. Duties: The Committee on Campus Operations

- communicates to, and solicits feedback from, college faculty about the Capital College Strategic Plan, Master Plan, and Integrated Plan;
- reviews the College marketing plan and advises the Capital College Senate regarding the plan, the planning process, and future directions for the campus;
- reviews and makes recommendations relating to the physical plant, space utilization, and campus beautification, including long-range planning and development; the functions of facilities and maintenance operations; the development and promulgation of safety and security, including fire prevention plans;
- review and make recommendations relating to the classroom configurations;
- serves as a liaison between administrative officials responsible for the physical plant and safety and the Faculty; and
- serves in a consultative and advisory capacity to the Manager of Human Resources and Business Services, the Manager of Physical Plant, Maintenance and Operations and the managers of the various resources and services through the Capital College Senate.

3. Standing Subcommittees

Members of the Committee are authorized to meet as Subcommittees. Any business conducted is ratified by the full committee not later than its next meeting.

(8.2) Committee on Curricular Affairs

1. Membership: Seven to ten (7 – 10) members. The preferred membership is one (1) member from each School and the Library and one (1) voting student member. One to three (1-3) at-large members may be appointed depending on the committee's workload. No more than three (3) members may be from a single academic unit. The Chancellor or his/her representative, the Senior Associate Dean, and the Senate President are ex-officio, nonvoting members.

2. Duties: The Committee on Curricular Affairs

- reviews, evaluates, and recommends new courses, programs, and other curricular proposals in accordance with published University and College Curricular Procedures;
- reviews and evaluates all other curricular matters, including proposals for courses and programs;
- reviews and evaluates curricular planning including enrollment projections and management, faculty requirements, academic admissions standards;
- reviews and recommends policies, in co-operation with the Committee on Faculty Affairs, to ensure that educational evaluation procedures are in place to assess all learning activities, including, but not limited, to the following: residential courses, world-campus courses, hybrid courses, credit and non-credit instruction through continuing and distance education, instruction through computer networks, radio and television, technical assistance programs, cooperative extension activities, and extended access courses and degrees;

- serves in a consultative and advisory capacity to the Chancellor, Associate Dean for Research, Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies, and the Sr. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs through the Capital College Senate; and
- serves as an advisory board for curricular support and learning activities.

3. Standing Subcommittees:

Members of the Committee are authorized to meet as Subcommittees. Any business conducted is ratified by the full committee not later than its next meeting.

(8.3) Committee on Faculty Affairs

1. Membership: Twelve (12) members. The preferred membership is two (2) members from each School, one (1) member from the Library, and one (1) appointed at-large member. The Chancellor, or his/her representative, the Senior Associate Dean, the Director of the Library, the Director of the Instructional & Information Technology, the Director of the Faculty Center, the Regional HR strategic Partner, and the Senate President are ex-officio, nonvoting members.

2. Duties: The Committee on Faculty Affairs shall

- reviews and recommends policies concerning relations with other educational institutions, research centers, and related organizations;
- reviews, monitors and makes recommendations relating to the professional, cultural, social, and material welfare of the Faculty;
- reviews and recommends policies pertaining to faculty workload, faculty development, faculty promotion and tenure policies and procedures, instruction evaluation techniques, and privacy and faculty rights issues;
- reviews and makes recommendations regarding questions of integrity, ethics, and of intellectual properties;
- review guidelines and procedures for awarding faculty teaching, research, and service award(s), and as requested by the Chancellor, reviews nominations for faculty teaching, research, and service award(s);
- advises on research policies, guidelines, and procedures relating to research;
- review, monitor, and make recommendations pertaining to research units and institutes;
- reviews and recommends policies for the evaluation of faculty who perform administrative functions, and for professional staff who provide academic support services;
- investigates and is the Faculty's voice concerning the adequacy and other attributes of the University's provisions for salaries, retirement benefits, sabbatical leaves, hospitalization and medical insurance, investment and saving plans, travel reimbursement, educational benefits, recreational benefits, and other prerequisites, benefits and conditions of faculty employment;
- reviews and recommends policies pertaining to academic and / or research related computing and information systems, including telecommunications and administrative issues;
- reviews and makes recommendations regarding the functions of the Library and policies affecting the Library's collections and services, including long-range planning and development;
- assists Enrollment Services in selecting Faculty to attend recruitment functions;

- facilitates appropriate Faculty participation in marketing of the College and other outreach activities;
- reviews and recommends policies, in co-operation with the Committee on Curricular Affairs, to ensure that educational evaluation procedures are in place to assess all learning activities, including, but not limited, to the following: residential courses, world-campus courses, hybrid courses, credit and non-credit instruction through continuing and distance education, instruction through computer networks, radio and television, technical assistance programs, cooperative extension activities, and extended access courses and degrees; and
- serves as a formal liaison with all administrative units that impact faculty matters.

3. Standing Subcommittees

- Three Standing Subcommittees should be organized. The Standing Subcommittees are: the Research Subcommittee, the Teaching Subcommittee, and the Service Subcommittee. Any business conducted is ratified by the full Committee not later than its next meeting.

(8.4) Committee on International, Intercultural, and Diversity Affairs

1. Membership: Seven to ten (7 – 10) members. The preferred membership is one (1) member from each School and the Library and one (1) voting student member. One to three (1-3) at-large members may be appointed depending on the committee's workload. No more than three (3) members may be from a single academic unit. The Chancellor or his/her representative, the International Student Advisor, and the Senate President are ex-officio, nonvoting members.

2. Duties: The Committee on International, Intercultural, and Diversity Affairs

- promotes and increases international, intercultural, and diversity awareness throughout the College community, and review and make recommendations regarding international, intercultural, and diversity activities.
- reviews and recommends policies for the enhancement of a climate for Faculty, staff, and students that supports individual differences and promotes fairness and equity;
- assures that outreach activities are appropriate to assist the College in achieving its diversity goals;
- reviews and recommends policies for the enhancement of diversity programming initiatives in all areas of diversity (gender, disability, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity), among Faculty, staff, and students; and
- serves in a consultative and advisory capacity to the Penn State Harrisburg Diversity and Educational Equity Committee (DEEC) and the managers of the various resources and services through the Capital College Senate on international, intercultural, and diversity issues.

3. Standing Subcommittees

Members of the Committee are authorized to meet as Subcommittees. Any business conducted is ratified by the full committee not later than its next meeting.

(8.5) Committee on Student Affairs

1. Membership: Thirteen (13) members. The preferred membership is two (2) members from each School, one member from the Library and two (2) voting student members. One undergraduate student shall be appointed by the SGA and one graduate student by the Graduate Student Association. The Director of Student Affairs, the Athletic Director, the Faculty Athletic Representative, and the Senate President are ex-officio, nonvoting members.

2. Duties: The Committee on Student Affairs

- considers policies involving those aspects of student life on the campus that are of concern to graduate and undergraduate students, as well as policies that are not specifically covered in other Committees, including, but not limited to, career development and placement, housing, health, student conduct, student organizations, and extracurricular activities;
- serves as the principal agency for representing students' concerns to the Capital College Senate and a point of origin for student proposals;
- reviews and makes recommendations relating to the quality of student life, the functions of student affairs operations, student awards and scholarships, and athletic programs, including student eligibility and schedules for athletic events;
- reviews and makes recommendations for student awards, scholarships, fellowships, and the Who's Who Award in cooperation with the Student Activities Office and the Office of Financial Aid;
- monitors and makes recommendations to the Capital College Senate regarding enrollment services, outreach, marketing, continuing education, and distance learning activities of the College;
- monitors enrollment projections data in cooperation with the Office of Enrollment Services; ensures maximum possible student participation in the Faculty Senate committees, in cooperation with the SGA and GSA advisor;
- serves as a liaison between the Faculty, the Office of Student Affairs and the SGA;
- advise and monitor athletic standards related to the educational function of the College and University;
- help promote a sound academic climate for the intercollegiate athletic program; and
- support the *NCAA Division III Philosophy*^a.

^a.NCAA Academic and Membership Affairs Staff, *2012-2013 NCAA Division III Manual*, NCAA, July 2012 or latest edition.

3. Standing Subcommittee:

Three standing subcommittees should be organized. The standing subcommittees are: the Athletics Subcommittee, the Awards & Scholarship Subcommittee, and the Student Engagement Subcommittee. Any business conducted is ratified by the full Committee not later than its next meeting.

(8.6) Executive Committee of the Senate

1. Membership: President, President-Elect, Secretary, the Immediate Past President of the Capital College Faculty Senate, and the University Council Representative from the Capital College.

2. Duties: The Executive Committee of the Senate

- acts for the Capital College Faculty Senate when it cannot meet, subject to ratification by the Senate at its next meeting
- is available for consultation with the Chancellor when the Senate cannot meet or is not in session.

(8.7) Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning

Based on the needs of strategic planning and the recommendation of the Senate, the Senate President should charge the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning.

1. Membership: Seven to ten (7 – 10) members. The preferred membership is one (1) member from each School and the Library and one (1) voting student member. One to three (1-3) at-large members may be appointed depending on the committee's workload. No more than three (3) members may be from a single academic unit. The Chancellor or his/her representative, and the Senate President are ex-officio, nonvoting members.

2. Duties: The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning

- represents the Senate on the College's Strategic Planning Committee; accordingly, the Senate Strategic Planning Committee's chair will co-chair the College's Strategic Planning Steering Committee;
- consults with other Senate committees on aspects of the Strategic, Master, and Integrated Plans that impact academic programs, and make recommendations related to potential impact on the academic mission of the College;
- reviews and recommends action on matters of College planning that affect the missions of the College;
- reviews functions of the College that contribute to, or inhibit, planning process; and
- other planning activities as approved by the Faculty Senate President

3. Standing Subcommittees

Members of the Committee are authorized to meet as Subcommittees. Any business conducted is ratified by the full Committee not later than its next meeting.