

Penn State Harrisburg
Faculty Senate Agenda
End-of-Year Meeting
Friday, May 3, 2013

Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room C-300/12:00-5:00 p.m.

- I. LUNCH, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (12:00 P.M.)
- II. REMARKS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT, Catherine Rios
 - a. Presentation to the Outgoing President
 - b. 2013-2014 List of Capital College Senators Appendix "A"
 - c. 2013-2014 List of University Senators Appendix "B"
 - d. Election of Faculty Senate Secretary
 - e. Election of Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate
- III. COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE CHAIRS
 - a. Academic Affairs – Linda Null Appendix "C"
 - b. Athletics Committee – Rebecca Weiler-Timmins Appendix "D"
 - c. Enrollment Management and Outreach – Heidi Abbey Appendix "E"
 - d. Faculty Affairs – Senel Poyrazli Appendix "F"
 - e. Human Resources – Nihal Bayraktar Appendix "G"
 - f. Information Systems and Technology – Appendix "H"
 - g. International and Intercultural Affairs – Greg Crawford Appendix "I"
 - h. Physical Plant – George Boudreau Appendix "J"
 - i. Strategic Planning Committee – Bing Ran Appendix "K"
 - j. Student Affairs – Karin Sprow Forte Appendix "L"
- IV. REPORT FROM THE CHANCELLOR, Mukund Kulkarni
- V. REPORT FROM ACADEMIC COUNCIL, Omid Ansary
- VI. REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE
- VII. COMMITTEE CHARGES FOR THE 2013-2014 ACADEMIC YEAR
- VIII. IDENTIFY FORUM TOPICS FOR THE 2013-2014 ACADEMIC YEAR
- IX. IDENTIFY AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE 2013-2014 ACADEMIC YEAR

APPENDIX "A"

**CAPITAL COLLEGE
FACULTY SENATE
2013-2014**

NAME	SCHOOL	ROOM	WORK #	E-MAIL ADDRESS
1. Sedig Agili (School – 1 yrs.)	SET	W256	948-6109	Ssa10@psu.edu
2. Glen Mazis (School – 2 yrs.)	HUM	W356	948-6530	Gam7@psu.edu
3. Mukund Kulkarni (Chancellor)	ADMIN	C-119	948-6105	msk5@psu.edu
4. Robert Gray (At-large – 1 yr.)	SSET	W256	948-6636	Rxc31@psu.edu
5. Eric Doerfler (School – 1 yr.)	BSED	W314	948-6513	Red1012@psu.edu
6. Eric Delozier (LIB – 2 yrs.)	LIB	LIB	948-6373	epd103@psu.edu
7. Paul Thompson (School – 2 yrs.)	SPA	W157e	948-6755	pbt1@psu.edu
8. Martha Strickland (At-large – 1 yr.) Secretary	BSED	W331	948-6525	MJS51@psu.edu
9. Girish Subramanian (School – 2 yrs.)	SBA	E355	948-6150	ghs2@psu.edu
9. Chiara Sabina (At-large – 1 yr.)	BSED	W311	948-6066	cus16@psu.edu
10. Catherine Rios (1 yr.) President	HUM	W356	948-6659	car33@psu.edu
11. Richard Young President Elect (1 yr.)	SBA	E355	948-6151	rry100@psu.edu
12. Raffy Luquis, Immed. Past President (1 yr.)	BSED	W331N	948-6730	Orl100@psu.edu
13. (Student)	SGA			Ard5274@psu.edu
Non-Voting Member:				
14. James Ruiz Univ. Senate Council Rep. – 1 yr.	SPA	W160	948-62920	JMR33@psu.edu
15. Staff Asst. – Stephanie Ponnett	Admin.	C-114R	948-6062	SLP29@psu.edu

1 year denotes 1 year remaining on a 2 year term while 2 years denotes 2 years remaining on a 2 year term of service.

APPENDIX "B"

CAPITAL COLLEGE UNIVERSITY SENATORS 2013/2014

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Gregory Crawford (LIB)
717-948-6079
Room 115, Library
Term: 2011-2015
Gac2@psu.edu | Alternate:
Aaron Wachhaus (SPA)
717-948-6043
Room 160, Olmsted
Taw203@psu.edu |
| 2. | Jane Wilburne (BSED)
717-948-6615
Room W331, Olmsted
Room W331
Term: 2013-2017 | Seth Wolpert (SSET)
717-948-6752
Room W256, Olmsted
Sxw33@psu.edu |
| 3. | Matthew Woessner (SPA)
717-948-6489
Room W160, Olmsted
Mcw10@psu.edu
Term: 2013-2017 | Martha Strickland (BSED)
717-948-6525
Room W331, Olmsted
Mjs51@psu.edu |
| 4. | Aldo Morales (SSET)
717-948-6379
Room W-256, Olmsted
AWM2@psu.edu
Term: 2010-2014 | Sairam Rudrabhatla (SSET)
717-948-6560
TL174
Svr11@psu.edu |
| 5. | Robin Veder (HUM)
717-948-6330
Room W365 Olmsted
rmv10@psu.edu
Term: 2010-2014 | Student Representative |
| 6. | James Ruiz (SPA)
948-6292
Room W-160, Olmsted
JMR33@psu.edu
Term: 2012-2016 | |
| 7. | Matthew Wilson (HUM)
948-6191
Room W356, Olmsted
Term: 2011-2015
Mtw1@psu.edu | |

FINAL REPORT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS 2012-13

Attendance

Name	9/4/12	10/9/12	11/6/12	12/4/12	2/12/13	3/13/13	4/16/13
Qiang Bu (SBA)	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Excused*	Present
Y. Frank Chen (SET)	Present	Present	Present	Excused*	Present		Present
Richard Ciocci (SET)	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Greg Crawford (LIB)	Present	Present	Present	Excused*	Present	Present	Present
Scott Lewis (BSED)	Present	Present	Present		Present	Present	Present
Linda Null (SET) Chair	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Odd Stalebrink (SPA)		Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
David Witwer (HUM)		Present	Present	Present	Present		Present

* Electronic participation

Committee Accomplishments

Courses Reviewed and Approved/Approved Pending Changes/Not Approved

CET 343	Soils & Fluid Mechanics	HIST 003	The American Nation: Historical Perspectives
P ADM 521	Performance Measurement & Management	HUM 100	Foundations in Humanities
ECUC 476	Assistive Technology and Universal Design	TRDEV 418	Instructional Methods in Training and Development
EDUC 474	Evidence-Based Practices for High Incidence Disabilities	TRDEV 431	Basic Technology Skills in Training
EDUC 478	Secondary Transition Collaboration and Services	TRDEV 432	Video Production in Training
CMPSC 413	Algorithms Lab	TRDEV 475	Career and Succession Management
CMPSC 426	Object-oriented Design	TRDEV 497	Special Topics
CMPSC 438	Computer Network Architecture and Programming	TRDEV 465	Performance Analysis
CMPSC 444	Secure Programming	TRDEV 421	Presentation Skills for New Trainers
CMPSC 470	Compiler Construction	TRDEV 470	Human Resource Development tools and Techniques
CMPSC 487W	Software Engineering & Design	TRDEV 533	Distance Learning for Trainers
CMPSC 460	Principles of Programming Languages	TRDEV 503	Performance Consulting
CMPSC 425	Advanced object-oriented programming	TRDEV 530	Multiplatform Delivery Skills
CMPSC 488	Computer Science Project	TRDEV 563	Strategic and Critical Human Resource Development
CMPSC 441	Artificial Intelligence	TRDEV 537	Technologies in Learning and Development
CMPSC 462	Data Structures	TRDEV 561	Facilitation Theories and Practice
CMPSC 463	Design and Analysis of Algorithms	TRDEV 528	Instructional Systems Design Applications
CMPSC 469	Formal Languages with Applications	TRDEV 567	Instructional Leadership Theories and Development
		TRDEV 590	Colloquium

Programs Reviewed and Approved/Approved Pending Changes/Not Approved

Phase out of ENVE (BS)	Computer Science (Minor)
B.S. CE & M. Eng. ENVE (IUG)	Criminal Justice (MA)
ENVE (M. Eng)	Health Administration (MHA)
Mathematical Sciences (BS)	Training & Development (MEd)
Computer Science Major (BS)	English/ Social Studies (Sec Ed)
Writing (Minor)	B.S. and M.A. Applied Research Psych (IUG)
Human Resource Management (Minor)	

Other Committee Accomplishments

A subcommittee has been formed to develop a Faculty Course and Program Proposal Handbook detailing how course proposals and program changes are done and explaining the various steps involved in the process; this handbook should be completed by August 2013. In addition, a CSCS training workshop was held for faculty. The Committee has successfully continued a “paperless” operation; all course proposals are available via CSCS, while program proposals, agendas, minutes, and other supporting documents can be found on ANGEL.

Committee Concerns

A major concern of the Committee is the on-going problem with lack of proper external consultation on both course and program proposals. Faculty members often do not know who should be included in this consultation. The Committee recommends that each School provide one or two contact people responsible for providing this consultation information when faculty members are submitting proposals.

The Committee also notes that a number of faculty members encounter problems when attempting to use the CSCS system. The Committee recommends continued CSCS training sessions and also suggests that School Directors encourage their faculty to attend. In addition, the proposed handbook should assist faculty members not only with the CSCS system, but also with the entire curricular process.

The Committee also notes the complexity in coordinating paper-based program changes with on-line course proposals. While faculty members submitting changes to both courses and programs have generally presented their course and program changes as “packages,” the Committee encourages continued development and implementation of the on-line program proposal system so all curricular changes are handled in a uniform manner.

Suggestions for Charges for 2013-14

- Maintain the Course and Program Proposal Handbook developed for faculty members (preferably on the college website)
- Continue to collaborate with the developers of the on-line program proposal system to assure that campus-specific issues continue to be addressed in the system
- Assist in the roll-out of the on-line program proposal system, when completed
- Organize additional CSCS training sessions for PSH faculty

**Athletics Committee of the Faculty Senate
Penn State Harrisburg
2012 – 2013 Report**

Duties: The Athletics Committee shall 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 Statement. The report is submitted by Rebecca Weiler-Timmins (chair) on behalf of committee members:

Thomas Arminio

David Buehler

Rahsaan Carlton

Joseph Cecere

Kara Hoy

Hossein Julia

Charles Kupfer

Attendance: The committee was officially formed in the Fall of 2012 and had the first meeting in January of 2013. Therefore, the committee met two times during the spring semester. All members attended both meetings. Thomas Arminio replaced James Ruiz late in the semester and quickly became a part of the email communications with the committee.

Charge for the 2012-2013 Academic Year:

1. Review and evaluate the current communication process between athletes and faculty regarding absences from classes.

Rahsaan Carlton, Athletic Director, provided an overview of the communication process that occurs between the athletes and professors when classes are missed due to athletic events. The committee reviewed 67-00 Athletic Competition and 42-27 Class Attendance policies as well as the class absence form. Policy 42-27 became the center of conversation due to the possible ambiguity in the statement, “Instructors should provide, within reason, opportunity to make up work for students who miss class for regularly scheduled, University-approved curricular and extracurricular activities (such as Martin Luther King Day of Service, field trips, debate trips, choir trips, and athletic contests).” These three documents guided the conversation for our committee. The following recommendations were provided:

- A. Student Athletes and Policy 42-27: The student athletes provide their professors with the Class Absence Form at the beginning of their season. It is suggested that the students continue to be proactive and talk with the professor about missing class and that the students inquire about how to make up the work ahead of time.
- B. Faculty and Policy 42-27: In order for the faculty to have a better understanding of the policy, it must be distributed and discussed in multiple ways:
 1. The policy should be emailed to all professors at the beginning of the academic year by the Chancellor, Dr. Kulkarni.
 2. A faculty representative from the Athletics Committee will speak at a school meeting to discuss Policy 42-27 in order to provide a better understanding of the policy.

3. The committee is currently creating a “best practices” for faculty to reference when an athlete misses a class.
 4. A recommendation was put forth to tag student athletes in the elion system for faculty reference.
- C. A motion was put forth to the Faculty Senate and presented at the Joint meeting of the Senate and Academic Council on February 19, 2013: “A motion that the college provide discipline specific assistance for athletes as with other students covered under policy 42-27 who must miss labs or other classes. Such assistance must be coordinated in advance by students.” The Faculty Senate and Academic Council suggested that the motion need to be more specific and include a Best Practices for faculty, create a process for faculty to go through when presented with a conflict, and put a clause in the syllabus that provides a time frame with how and when to make up work and tests.

Suggested New Charges for the Upcoming Year 2013-2014:

1. Continue to evaluate the current communication process between athletes and faculty regarding absences from classes.
2. Address the issue of needing athletic tutoring from the learning center for athletes missing classes due to contests, especially 300 and 400 level courses or labs.
3. The Athletic Department and teams are in the beginning stages of competition as a Division III institution. Therefore, it is imperative that we begin to review how to integrate athletics into the campus community.

Enrollment Management and Outreach Committee

Chair: Triparna Vasavada

Committee members: Heidi Abbey, Ma'moun Abu-Ayyad, Gina Brelsford, Jesse Middaugh,
Bill Milheim, Charia Sabina, Craig Welsh

Report Prepared by Gina Brelsford and Heidi Abbey

April 24, 2013

Charges from 2012-2013

- Complete and disseminate results from a survey questionnaire to assess students' needs including classroom, dorm & living space, research opportunities, work-schedule, cafeteria food, choice, and price, and transportation.
- Establish a liaison with Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to discuss enrollment trends and other related issues.
- Review and evaluate academic planning including enrollment projections and academic admissions standards

Actions:

- Completed three focus groups (2 graduate and 1 undergraduate) during the fall and spring semesters. Based upon internal committee discussions, we decided that focus groups would allow us to acquire more useful data rather than utilize questionnaires. We intended to run two graduate and two undergraduate groups, but it was challenging to recruit students to participate even with an incentive of free food. Questions used during the focus groups include the following:

What is your experience with campus life and facilities?
Note all the items that come up and make sure that following items are covered if they do not emerge in the discussion naturally.

- 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

How does our campus compare to other campuses? (Strength and weakness)
How do you like the new schedule and why?
Do you have any problems with registering for courses? 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? What do you think about classes offered on week-ends? Do you know about the hybrid courses? What are your thoughts about it?
What do you think about courses offered in summer?
What is your perception/opinion about around-campus life? What would you like to see in the nearby areas of campus?
Is there anything that you would like to share about the campus life and campus facilities?

- The bulk of the committees work was completed in the fall semester through focus group creation and implementation (see appendices for focus group data). The results from these groups include these general themes:
 - a. There could be more research opportunities for students, and communication about the opportunities that do exist needs to be improved.
 - b. The price of food is high. It is expensive and not diverse enough for our student population.
 - c. Opportunities for international students to learn conversation English would be valued.
 - d. Student transportation options could be improved, especially between the hours of 3:15-9:15 pm and on the weekends.
 - e. Prayer/mediation room is greatly needed on campus.
 - f. A need for more informal student mentoring.
 - g. There is not a lot of interest in taking classes on the weekends.
 - h. Robust communication tool that effectively reaches all students is needed.
 - i. Some international students mentioned concerns or difficulties with their home countries related to taking online courses.
- Committee views on the focus group process:
 1. Free food was not a draw as it does reflect diverse backgrounds and thus was not an effective recruitment tool.
 2. Acquiring student participants was challenging.
 3. Challenge covering all topics during these focus groups.

Recommendations for next year:

- Connect with other committees or groups assessing students needs and requests to streamline data collection process
- Continue data collection through surveys or focus groups
- Address student requests through action steps
- Provide focus group data to the incoming faculty senate president and incoming EMOC chair

APPENDIX “F”

The Final Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate Penn State Harrisburg 2012-2013 Academic Year

Our committee received two specific charges at the beginning of the semester:

- 1) Examine issues related to summer compensation for faculty members.
- 2) Discuss the recommendations from charge one and two from the 2011-2012 committee and work with the ORGS office and recommend specific actions to be taken by the Faculty Senate.

The committee met both in Fall and Spring semesters. All members were actively engaged in the tasks that were assigned to the committee. In the following pages we indicate our recommendations and response to the above charges.

Our recommendations for Charge #1 are below.

Related to Charge #2, our committee met with Dr. Marian Walters on February 14, 2013. We discussed the recommendations from last year related to the following charges: “Review and make recommendations pertaining to the provisions in place in the college to faculty in the process of formal grant proposal writing and submission” and “investigate what promotion and tenure advantages faculty have for publishing a patent application, and obtaining a US patent.”

Dr. Walters provided background information about her office and how some positive developments took place over the past years (increase in funds for the Research Council Grants, creation of interdisciplinary grants as a separate category, etc.). The meeting was mostly informational. Based on Dr. Walters’ and the faculty senate liaison Dr. Morcol’s feedback, the committee decided that the recommendations that were generated last year should be forwarded to the chancellor’s office for consideration. We will include these recommendations again as part of our final report so that they can easily be forwarded by the Faculty Senate to the chancellor’s office.

Faculty Affairs Committee Members (2012-2013 academic year):

P. Ahrens, J. Beckett-Camarata, S. Chang, C. McCormick, C. McQuiggan, G. Morcol (Faculty Senate Liaison), Senel Poyrazli (chair), I. Shvartsman, and P. Swan.

Recommendations Related to the Topic of Summer Compensation and Contracts (Charge #1)

The committee met on September 27, 2012 to discuss a particular charge that our committee received: “Examine issues related to summer compensation for faculty members.” After the meeting, further information was gathered to finalize the committee’s recommendations. Below are the summary of our discussion and our recommendations:

1. 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.”
2. The committee also discussed the summer compensation the full-time faculty receive in relation to teaching. The full-time faculty get 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 these courses may end up being paid less than the 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 current compensation rate increased, and, in addition, recommends that a minimum level of compensation for teaching a summer course be established. This minimum level should be above the adjunct faculty compensation rate and, at the same time, the 11% upper-limit rule should be kept.
3. Currently a number of full-time faculty members prefer not to teach during the summer for a variety of reasons. Other faculty members may refuse to teach in the summer if summer teaching is tied to summer service. This creates problems running graduate courses as teaching these courses require graduate-faculty status and the recruitment of adjuncts is not a solution. The committee believes that adherence to the policies F-2 and F-3, as outlined in point 1 above and introducing the changes outlined in point 2 above, will result in more full-time faculty interested in summer teaching.

Enclosures:

Academic Guidelines and Policies, F-2. Summer Compensation for Teaching Faculty

Academic Guidelines and Policies, F-3. Compensation for Faculty Performing Non-Teaching
Duties During Summer Sessions

Penn State Harrisburg Academic Guidelines and Policies

F-2. Summer Compensation for Teaching Faculty

Purpose

To establish a summer compensation policy for faculty on standing appointments.

Introduction

For a course in which the number of registered students is inadequate to allow full salary payment (11 percent of the 36-week salary or the amount shown on the contract), we will offer a faculty member one of the following options: (1) teach the course at a reduced salary or (2) cancel the course. We will compensate faculty at the following rate:

All contract letters will indicate how many students must be registered to yield a compensation rate of 11 percent.

All questions regarding compensation should be referred to the School Director.

If a course does not produce sufficient student credit hours to achieve the 11 percent of the salary (or other amount as stated on the contract), it will be necessary for the faculty member and the College to decide at least three work days in advance of the start of each term whether the instructor will teach the under-subscribed course at a reduced rate of compensation or whether the class is to be canceled or offered to another faculty member.

Approved: Academic Council April 1, 2002

Revised: Academic Leadership Council May 18, 2004

Revised: Academic Council April 8, 2009

F-3. Compensation for Faculty Performing Non-Teaching Duties During Summer Sessions

Introduction

The College acknowledges the importance of maintaining a critical level of service to undergraduate and graduate students during the summer. Some faculty members, such as Program Coordinators and others on 36-week contracts, may be asked to perform certain non-teaching duties during that period.

Purpose

These guidelines establish the conditions and the practices governing appropriate compensation for administrative or non-teaching services performed during the summer.¹

General Guidelines

1. Teaching and administrative duties will remain distinct areas for compensation purposes. Since administrative costs must be calculated separately, faculty members on administrative or non-teaching assignments will receive a separate contract for those services.
2. Compensation for summer employment will be provided only for those services actually performed during the summer.
3. Performing non-teaching and/or administrative duties during the summer is not a condition of employment for Program Coordinators.
4. Summer employment must be approved in advance and under specific conditions by the School Director and the Chancellor.
5. The School Director must determine the specific duties to be performed and establish the dates when the services will be delivered. Program Coordinators will be required to provide a list of services for the Director to evaluate before any Memorandum of Service or Letter of Employment is prepared.
6. The employment letter must outline the specific administrative duties and the delivery date[s] of all services.
7. Coordinators performing such functions as supervising internships will be compensated according to the formulae in the Guideline 18: "Compensation Practices for Summer Internship Supervisors."
8. The quality of the performance must be evaluated by the School Director at the end of the summer employment period in accordance with the written description of duties or anticipated outcomes agreed to prior to the beginning of the summer session.

Approved: Academic Council

Revised: Academic Council September 16, 2003

Revised: Academic Council April 8, 2009

¹Summer teaching is covered by [F-2](#) entitled "Summer Compensation for Teaching Faculty."

Recommendations Pertaining to the Provisions in Place in the College to Faculty in the Process of Formal Grant Proposal Writing and Submission (Charge #1 from the 2011-2012 academic year. The recommendations below were discussed with Dr. Walters on February 14, 2013)

The committee discussed the Research Council Grants (RCGs) and the type and level of services the research graduate office provides. While recognizing many positive aspects of this program and the office that administers it, the committee came up with several recommendations to better serve the research needs of Penn State Harrisburg faculty:

- 1) The committee questioned the role of RCGs as seed-money for larger grants. Funding should also be available for stand-alone projects that are legitimate research initiatives and will lead to further publications and other desirable outcomes.
- 2) The committee also saw a need for start-up funding, particularly for faculty members who are approaching deadlines for promotion to associate or full professor.
- 3) Research Council Grants should not be given on a one-per-project basis, in disciplines where the outcomes will be far larger than a single, short article, presentation, etc. Those disciplines which emphasize book-length manuscripts of several hundred pages should be permitted to apply for individual grants that cover discrete portions of a large project.
- 4) The application process for the RCGs could be streamlined further to lessen the bureaucracy. The committee questions the recent addition of the school directors as additional members of the review team. RCGs are faculty-supported, and this step could give too much power to the directors.
- 5) ORGS should seek ways to modernize the grant application process. The current requirement of filling out the PIAF form, using programs that are not available to Penn State Harrisburg faculty members, creates added complications and wasted work each time the process is completed.
- 6) Faculty members who do seek external funding could be helped to develop familiarity with grant administration policies of agencies such as NEH, NSF, NIH, NIMH, etc.
- 7) A grant writer for our campus could be appointed. Another possibility may be to share a full-time person between two campuses (York, Schuylkill, etc.). This person could help the faculty members with grant writing, paying specific attention to how the grant is written to fulfill granting agency requirements. The committee recognizes that the faculty members are responsible for the content area and this grant writer will likely not be able to help with the content but with its organization.
- 8) In some fields, the RCGs amount (\$7,500) falls short for many of the projects undertaken by faculty members. To gather their pilot data or have preliminary data to be able to apply for external grants, these faculty members could be supported through RCGs that have an increased upper-level limit.
- 9) The committee saw the need for discipline-based review of applications. The current policy, of having the review predominantly include faculty members in other schools, may lead to instances of denial of funding because the review team may not have the

proper background to correctly evaluate what is acceptable scholarship in other disciplines.

- 10) Following the point raised in number 9, scholars from the relevant colleges at the University Park campus could be asked to serve as reviewers so an RCG proposal could be guaranteed to be reviewed by people from the applicants' disciplines.
- 11) The research council could meet regularly to discuss the evaluations by different reviewers as a way to ensure transparency and also as a way for reviewers to be educated about a discipline that they may not know much about.
- 12) These regular meetings should lead to improved feedback on unsuccessful applications. Members noted that some faculty feel frustrated by the review process, and this may have a negative impact on further grant writing and research.
- 13) Penn State Harrisburg should consider allowing RCGs to be used to buy-out courses in exchange for developing an external grant proposal. Several committee members questioned the large discrepancy between the required buyout amount and the amount actually paid to an adjunct instructor hired to cover the course when buyouts are permitted.
- 14) Develop school-level criteria for research council funding, to assure that funding meets discipline-based criteria and standards.
- 15) Emphasize the importance of these grants, by recognizing recipients at ceremonies, making public announcements, and other means.

Investigation Related to What Promotion and Tenure Advantages Faculty have for Publishing a Patent Application, and Obtaining a US Patent (Charge #2 from 2011-2012 academic year. The recommendations below were discussed with Dr. Walters on February 14, 2013)

The committee first discussed the patent application process. A faculty member is not able to apply for a patent on his or her own. Any findings/breakthroughs from research conducted on University facilities belong to the Penn State University. All researchers give their rights to any new patentable developments/technology when they sign for employment at the University <http://guru.psu.edu/policies/Ra11.html>.

The current patent process, as understood by the committee, follows. Faculty members/researchers must submit their invention disclosure to the Penn State Harrisburg office of research. Dr. Walter's office then sends the application to the Tech Transfer office at University Park. This office's operating budget is estimated at around \$250,000 a year (Information obtained from Ron Huss seminar at Penn State Harrisburg). A provisional/final patent application can cost \$20,000 or more depending on the number of claims and number of countries in which it is filed. This office decides which patents may be most important and how many patents it can file considering the budget it has. Once the faculty member invention disclosure is sent to the Tech Transfer office, it takes around 10 months before the faculty member learns if the university will file the provisional patent application. While waiting on this decision, no data can be published according to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) laws. As a result, the faculty member may lose around one year of crucial time in his or her tenure and promotion process. When the provisional patent is received, then the faculty member can proceed with research publications. At a much later date (sometimes years later) when products related to this patent are marketed, then the revenue/royalty is shared between the faculty member and the university.

The committee's discussion led to the following recommendations:

- 1) Have a licensing officer from the University Park office visit our campus, meet with relevant faculty members, provide guidance, and provide feedback for the patent application;
- 2) Modify the P&T criteria, especially in relevant schools, to include patent applications and patents. The committee recognizes that some patents may not be as important, while some others may be counted as a peer-review publication or more. Individual schools should decide what weight should be given to patents. Furthermore, these decisions should be appropriately communicated among college and University P&T committees.
- 3) Consider requesting the patent office at University Park to expedite review of patent submissions from tenure-track faculty.

**Human Resources and Business Services Committee of the Faculty
Senate
Penn State Harrisburg
2012-2013 Report**

(prepared by Dr. Nihal Bayraktar)

Meetings: The committee met 3 times in Fall 2012 and 3 times in Spring 2013.

Voting members

NIHAL BAYRAKTAR (CHAIR) – attended 6 meetings
MICHAEL STEFANY – attended 3 meetings
RICHARD ROBERT YOUNG – attended 3 meetings
RAYMOND F GIBNEY JR – attended 5 meetings
ERIC P DELOZIER – attended 6 meetings
ANITA MARENO (joined on Nov. 14, 2012) – attended 4 meetings
MARY NAPOLI (joined on Nov. 14, 2012) – attended 1 meeting
JOHN KIM – attended 2 meetings

Non-voting ex-officio members

DOROTHY JEAN GUY – attended 3 meetings
JOSEPH STEIBEL – attended 3 meetings

Guest (Faculty Senate representative)

SEDIG SALEM AGILI – attended 3 meetings

Student

DAHLIA PARKER – attended 0 meeting

Charges and Accomplishments for the 2012-2013 academic year

Charge I. Review policies for the enhancement of a work climate that supports individual differences and promotes fairness and equity. As part of this process, establish collaboration or liaison with the Climate Assessment subcommittee of the DEEC.

Accomplishments: P&T policies are reviewed. HR and some AD reviewed.

- 1) The committee contacted the Diversity and Educational Equity Sub-Committee on Climate Assessment. Mr. Michael Behney (one of the writers of Climate Assessment Survey in 2011/12) attended the second committee meeting and presented the latest Climate Assessment Survey in 2011/12. During the presentation, Mr. Behney answered the committee members' questions about the survey study. See Appendix A for summary of the report related to faculty outcomes.
- 2) The committee reviewed diversity related materials given at <http://hbg.psu.edu/diversity/> such as
 - Diversity Plan 2004-2009 Final Report (PDF)
<https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/HarrisburgDiversityPlan2004-2009FinalReport.pdf>

- Diversity Plan, 2010-2015 (PDF)
<https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/HarrisburgDiversityPlan2010-2015.pdf>
 - 2009 Climate Assessment <https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/DEEC-2009-v2.0.pdf>
 - 2011/12 Climate Assessment
<https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/Climate-Assessment-2012-DEEC.pdf>
- 3) According the committee members one significant outcome of the survey is that “Approximately 30% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty disagreed that they would recommend PSU Harrisburg as a good place to work to a friend” (page 2 of the climate assessment report). A faculty forum can be organized to discuss the outcomes of the climate assessment survey and to understand why some faculty members are not happy on the campus. What are their concerns and problems? The committee believes that investigating the reasons behind why some faculty members are not happy on campus would be more important than only reviewing policies.
- 4) The committee members questions some outcomes of the survey study, since the number of respondents can be an issue in terms of how well the survey study reflects the overall opinion of faculty. The members think that the survey questions can be better asked so that more information can be collected.
- 5) The committee reviewed P&T policies of Penn State Harrisburg and Schools to understand the possible impact of policies on diversity and campus climate. Some opinions on college level and school level P&T policies:
- a. When school policies are compared to each other, there are differences in language such as how they define good service, research or teaching contributions. The School of Behavioral Sciences and Education has the most detailed P&T policies. Some information in the policies can be confusing.
 - b. Women are underrepresented or not represented at all in some P&T committees such as School of Humanities (1 female member), School of Public Affairs (no female member), School of Science, Engineering and Technology (no female member).
 - c. Fostering diversity or improving campus climate is not much mentioned in the College-level or School-level P&T policies. One exception is that the School of Humanities and the School of Public Affairs openly list “a record of contributions to the University’s efforts to enhance equal opportunity and diversity” in their P&T policies related to service expectations. In this way, they encourage these activities. Fostering diversity concept may fit in service expectations in each School.
- 6) Mrs. Guy identified several HR, HRG and AD policies that the Committee would review to accomplish Charge I (policies for the enhancement of a work

climate that supports individual differences and promotes fairness and equity).

- 7) Based on selected HR, HRG and AD policies, the following voting members participated in the review process:

List of voting members and division of labor

NIHAL BAYRAKTAR (AD29, AD41, AD42, HRG11, HRG18)

MICHAEL STEFANY (HR01, HR05, HR06, HR09)

RICHARD ROBERT YOUNG (HR10, HR11, HR13, HR17)

RAYMOND F GIBNEY JR (HR18, HR20, HR22, HR23)

ERIC P DELOZIER (HR38, HR40, HR59, HR68)

ANITA MARENO (HR70, HR71, HR76, HR80)

MARY NAPOLI (HR81, HR82, HR82, HR85)

JOHN KIM (HR87, HR93, HR94, HRG02)

- 8) The locations of the policies:

- Policy reviews Administrative (AD) policies are at:

http://guru.psu.edu/policies/#ADMIN_P

- Human resources (HR) policies are at:

http://guru.psu.edu/policies/#HUMAN_P

- Human resources guidelines (HRG) are at:

http://guru.psu.edu/policies/#HUMAN_G

- 9) The criteria used while reviewing HR, HRG and AD policies

- a. In the policies, identify the parts that help fostering diversity and improving campus climate.

The definitions can be found at

<https://harrisburg.psu.edu/diversitydocs/HarrisburgDiversityPlan2010-2015.pdf> (A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State Harrisburg 2010-2015)

- b. If you believe that there are missing points in terms of fostering diversity and improving campus climate, please list your suggestions.

- 10) The complete review is listed in Appendix B. Here are some main issues:

- a. Applications of policies are not uniform across the University (not even across Schools on the same campus) and there is no guarantee that faculty members can be accommodated.
- b. Some Schools do not provide enough flexibility in terms of scheduling of classes for faculty members who might be in need. A member shared her experience on how difficult it was for her to schedule time for breastfeeding. One reason behind why some Schools are less flexible in terms of needs of parents would be the limited number of female faculty members in the School. Female faculty members may have a difficult time to convince supervisors that she may need more flexibility during breastfeeding period.
- c. The climate assessment survey results indicate that many faculty members have concerns about discrimination or intolerance. The high rate of faculty who witnessed intolerance based on Climate Assessment Survey result can be due to the way the question is asked. In most cases it is not clear whether the incident is acceptable or not and may depend on personal values. Thus it is important that people should know where to apply if they experience any intolerance stated in

the policies. This way issues can be cleared out more easily. AD29 states that "The Pennsylvania State University is committed to preventing and eliminating acts of intolerance by faculty, staff and students, and encourages anyone in the University community to report concerns and complaints about acts of intolerance to the Affirmative Action Office or the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity, and in cases involving students, reports also may be made to the Office of Judicial Affairs."

- d. The policy guidelines are not necessarily flexible to accommodate faculty members' requests in case of emergencies. For example, some meetings can be through telecommunications or short-term online teaching would be possible. The application of the policies highly depends on decisions of administrators. Some members had concerns that some of their requests had been rejected without giving any specific reason. If such flexibility cannot be given, at least a clear explanation needs to be provided to prevent people to feel discriminated. Rejections of flexibility requests without giving any reason can cause diversity related issues. Such flexibilities should be open to everyone equally. In terms of applications of some policies, it seems as if faculty versus staff may have different considerations; expectations are different for faculty and staff.
- e. More transparency is needed for the review process of program coordinators' appointments. Some chairs never change and it seems there is no official evaluation of them. There should be some rotation to allow other faculty members to serve as program coordinators. There might be some school specific rules. The problem is that such rules are not available to everyone.

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.

Accomplishments: Since the committee members were not aware of any specific complain about viewing P&T materials, the focus of discussion at the meetings was current policies on viewing P&T materials. After reviewing P&T policies and with Mrs. Guy's explanations (please see Appendix C), the committee believes that the policies related to viewing P&T materials are clearly specified. The candidates might be reminded about the policy specifically to prevent any misunderstanding.

It has been 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.)*

Possible Charges for Next Academic Year (Suggested by the members of the committee at the committee meeting held on April 4, 2013)

- 1) Review policy regarding naming conventions of events and traditions across campuses with the impact on inclusion and exclusion of various groups
 - a. This charge is based on some campuses having Easter Egg hunt and others having Spring Egg hunt.
 - b. Christmas tree has been renamed Holiday tree, but menorah is still menorah.
- 2) Assess stakeholder perceptions of policy implementation and impact on diversity and perceptions of inclusion.
 - a. Focus on specific policy and gain greater understanding of issues surrounding specific policy.
- 3) Assess methods for increasing stakeholder participation in forums to discuss diversity climate to further understand climate issues
 - a. Without a greater understanding of the reasons respondents perceive a poor climate, any policy reviews and changes could create more issues
- 4) Promote better understanding of school or program administered events through greater transparency
 - a. Each program and school within the college has individualized method for determining program coordinators. More explicit explanation and documentation would aid in preventing perceptions of poor climate
- 5) Review business policy for faculty copy and scanning allowances. In addition, review policy for security and retention of documents on printers and scanners.
 - a. Each faculty is allocated 200 copies a month in the home department. A change was made that when limit is reached scanning capabilities cease. This is problematic. Faculty are allocated 110 pages in open labs.
- 6) Review business center policies to facilitate efficiencies and timeliness regarding copies.
 - a. Faculty are requested to provide copies to administrative assistants 48 hours (2 business days) in advance. Faculty are not respecting this policy. Also, consistency on what is to be sent to copy center. (ex. Do syllabi need to be printed?)

**APPENDIX A.
IMPORTANT POINTS RELATED TO FACULTY FROM CLIMATE ASSESSMENT REPORT
2012**

CLIMATE ASSESSMENT REPORT 2012 - SUMMARY – PAGES 1-2

Faculty

- Analyses of the responses indicate few significant differences by gender or by race. This is a major change from prior surveys in which female faculty were more critical than male faculty.
- In general, associate professors differ in their opinions from other faculty members. This is a change from previous surveys in which assistant professors were more critical than other ranks.
- Faculty have an overwhelming positive view of the importance of diversity on campus as shown by the 96% agreement with questions on the need for a learning institution to have an environment that includes ideas of individuals from diverse backgrounds and that college graduates must be prepared to work in environments characterized by diversity.
- Faculty who have worked at the campus for 7 to 12 years disagree more frequently with those who have been here a shorter or longer time.
- Nearly 30% of the faculty report witnessing two or more incidents of intolerance, although this is a decline from the 40% who witnessed such incidents in 2009.
- Over a quarter of the faculty report feeling isolated or left out of social events.
- Over 40% of tenured and tenure track faculty report being put down intellectually by another faculty member at least once.
- Females report experiencing discrimination because of their gender much more frequently than males.
- A third of those who are GLBTQ report feeling singled out in a social setting on campus in a way that made them feel uncomfortable. Over 40% report being singled out 2 or more times.
- Among the faculty, 60% believe that institutional barriers that promote discontent and conflict are being addressed; yet, this leaves 40% who believe otherwise. Only 47% of females agree that such barriers are being effectively addressed. This is consistent with previous surveys.
- Approximately 30% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty disagreed that they would recommend PSU Harrisburg as a good place to work to a friend.
- The qualitative measures suggest that, while the campus has improved in faculty perceptions of the campus climate, there are areas that need work. Among these are the use of adjunct and non-tenure track faculty, the overall climate on campus, the recognition of the needs of the GLBTQ community, increased communication, the nature of diversity, and continuing classism between faculty and staff and between different types of staff.

CLIMATE ASSESSMENT REPORT – SUGGESTED ACTIONS Page 58

Faculty

- In contrast to previous surveys, the 2012 Climate Assessment showed no major differences perceptions between male and female faculty on the campus climate.
- Tenured and tenure-track faculty, however, disagreed more with the statement “Penn State Harrisburg is a caring community where service to others is encouraged and the well being of each individual is important” than did non-tenure track faculty.
- Also in contrast with previous surveys, females and males generally agree that that the teaching and learning environment of the College is good.
- In terms of the work environment females are slightly more likely than males to disagree with the following items, although the differences are not statistically significant: “PSU Harrisburg offers the same opportunities for faculty members who come from diverse groups as for those who do not;” “I would recommend PSU Harrisburg as a good place to work to a friend who is looking for a teaching position;” “PSU Harrisburg offers an environment that is conducive to the development of strong interpersonal relationships among faculty members from different backgrounds.”
- Female faculty were slightly more likely to report hearing sexist comments or negative comments about gays, lesbians, bisexual, and transgendered people. Likewise, more females than males reported being subjected to gender discrimination.
- Faculty who have been at the College for between 7 and 12 years were more likely than other faculty to report being put down intellectually. Females are more apt than males to report feeling isolated or left out at a social event. Females report observing acts of intolerance and witnessing a student or faculty member being treated negatively as compared with male faculty.
- 48% of females agreed that institutional barriers promoting discontent and conflict are being addressed as compared with 70% of males.
- Qualitative measures do not cluster into distinct groups although the major topics covered were the use of adjunct and non-tenure track faculty, the overall climate on campus, issues related to GLBTQ, communication, and the general nature of diversity with an emphasis on classism.

APPENDIX B.

REVIEW OF SELECTED HR AND AD POLICIES (CHARGE I of HRBS Committee)

List of voting members and division of labor

NIHAL BAYRAKTAR (AD29, AD41, AD42, HRG11, HRG18)

MICHAEL STEFANY (HR01, HR05, HR06, HR09)

RICHARD ROBERT YOUNG (HR10, HR11, HR13, HR17)

RAYMOND F GIBNEY JR (HR18, HR20, HR22, HR23)

ERIC P DELOZIER (HR38, HR40, HR59, HR68)

ANITA MARENO (HR70, HR71, HR76, HR80)

MARY NAPOLI (HR81, HR82, HR82, HR85)

JOHN KIM (HR87, HR93, HR94, HRG02)

Dr. Michael Stefany

Review of HR01, HR05, HR06, HR09 relating to diversity and campus climate:

HR01 - Fair Employment Practices

I found **HR01**, "Fair Employment Practices" to be both straightforward and concise in terms of the university's stated policy towards nondiscrimination and equal access to employment. My only suggestion would be to perhaps add "political affiliation" or "native language" to the list of personal criteria the university does not discriminate against—as Hispanics and others may be U.S. citizens in terms of the already-listed "national origin," but not necessarily native English-speakers.

HR05 - "Regular" and "Nonregular" University Employees

For **HR05**, which defines "regular" and "nonregular" university employees and conditions of employment, I have a couple suggestions relating to the "Family and Medical Leave" section (page 3): Although the FMLA mandates 12 weeks of unpaid leave or 26 weeks of military caregiver leave per year for childbirth, adoption, care of family illness, etc., perhaps the university could add additional time for someone whose family resides in another country, as overseas travel time and time change adjustments would add to the difficulty of such a situation for faculty and staff originating outside of the U.S. Also, adding "same-sex domestic partner" to the listing under "c." ("seriously ill child, spouse, or parent of the employee") would help as well.

HR06 - Types of Appointments

I found **HR06**, which defines the types of university appointments (standing, FT, supplementary, visiting, non-remunerated), to be well-explained enough that I have little to suggest other than possibly extending some employee benefits to FT-II and visiting appointees in order to facilitate a greater workforce diversity (though this would probably end up being too expensive).

HR09 - Reasonable Accommodation for University Employees

HR09, which defines terms such as "disability," "qualified employee with disability," "essential functions," "reasonable accommodations," "undue hardship" and explains GINA and the process for determination of disability, was both balanced and very straightforward. My only suggestions would be to somehow soften the term "impairment," which is used three times when defining "disability" on page 1—would "challenge" or "difficulty" be a more neutral term? Also, whereas the *process* through which the university determines whether or not an employee should be granted "reasonable accommodation" is explained well (pp. 3-4), no specific *time limit* (or, deadline) for the proceedings is given—which could serve as a deterrent for some individuals seeking employment.

Prof. Richard Young

Penn State Harrisburg
Committee on Human Resources and Business Processes
Policy Summaries

HR10: Distinguished Professorships

The policy makes provisions for the nomination and selection of distinguished professorships, stipulates the number possible given the size of the faculty, and states that these individuals have a five year albeit renewable term. As such there are no references to diversity whether by gender, national origin, minority status, or sexual persuasion. The policy appears to be strictly merit based and is otherwise blind.

HR11: Affirmative Action in Employment

This policy establishes the terms and conditions under which equal employment opportunity and affirmative action are implemented. It designates a University-wide Affirmative Action Office, determines how it will function, and establishes a mechanism for resolution of complaints. The intent of the policy is obvious and after a careful reading, appears to be the cornerstone for the diversity initiatives vis-à-vis the hiring process.

HR 13: Recommended Procedure for Hiring New Faculty

The policy articulates the roles of the dean, department and unit heads, and search committees in the faculty hiring processes. While it recognizes that some differences may exist among the various colleges of the University, the need for national advertising of the position announcements in order to achieve a diverse candidate pool is clearly emphasized. Note that it is the search committees that identify qualified candidates, but that their output is only recommendations from which the dean or the applicable unit head takes into consideration. This policy appears to work hand-in-hand with HR11 with regard to diversity matter.

HR 17: Sabbatical Leave

The policy stipulates who is eligible, under what conditions, how a sabbatical is to be applied for, and the proportion of salary to be paid to faculty, exempt staff, and librarians during sabbatical. The policy also provides for an application and approval timeline, requirement for reporting on work performed during the sabbatical period, and eligibility for educational privileges. There are no diversity issues stated in this policy and it appears to be based strictly on merit thereby being otherwise blind to the characteristics and/or background of the faculty members seeking sabbatical.

Dr. Raymond Gibney**Policy HR18 GRADUATE STUDY LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

"For a member of the teaching faculty, a leave of less than one (1) semester is not granted. For a member of the library, the research faculty, or eligible exempt staff personnel, there is no minimum requirement."

This may create feelings of lack of support in that a tiered approach exists which essentially creates an underclass of "teaching faculty". Teaching faculty may develop a perception that different rules are applied to them in comparison to other individuals.

Policy HR20 BREASTFEEDING SUPPORT

"A woman may breastfeed her child in any place, public or private, where the mother and child are otherwise authorized to be present."

This may be culturally insensitive. Penn State employees and students come from diverse cultural backgrounds. In a traditional, conservative Muslim culture this is unacceptable behavior. This policy may create a divisive a culture and create feelings of exclusion for certain segments of the Penn State Community.

Also, males may request this time since the father of the child may be able to bring the child to the nursing mother from a daycare center. Along the same lines, it was also noted that since the rules are somewhat flexible and at the discretion of the School Director. This creates difficulty since some School Directors are male and may not be knowledgeable regarding breastfeeding requirements or may not be sympathetic to the needs of a nursing mother regarding course scheduling.

Policy HR22 SEARCH PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

" In such instances, however, the unit must provide equal promotional opportunity to women and minorities, documented by advertising the vacancy in the Intercom and considering fairly all applicants internal to the University. Additional efforts should be made to encourage Penn State women and minorities to apply."

This clause may create a perception that women and minorities are receiving extra attention and consideration since they are "encouraged to apply". A possible unintended consequence might be the perception that men and non-minorities are discouraged to apply.

Also there is no distribution requirement for faculty across levels (instructor, assistant, associate, and professor) as well as inclusion of staff.

Policy HR23 PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

On page 14, a statement regarding diversity of reviewing committees could be included. Thus, committees should include gender, racial, religious, and ethnically diverse faculty. Staff might also feel that should have input into the process.

Mr. Eric Delozier

HR38, HR40, HR59, and HR68 Policies Review

Policy HR38 University Courses for Training Faculty and Staff gives administrators and deans the authority to require a regular full-time faculty or staff member to attend a University course that provides the necessary skill or knowledge needed to carry out the responsibilities of a position. There does not appear to be any specific part of the policy that corresponds to the campus Framework to Foster Diversity document. In fact, the policy itself is broad enough that there's an implied relationship between the two. It does appear, however, that one editorial change is warranted wording. At the end of the document, the reference to Human Resources Development Center Courses should read Center for Workplace Learning & Performance (CWLP) instead.

Policy HR40 Evaluation of Faculty Performance stipulates that faculty undergo annual and extended performance reviews. The third sentence of the fourth paragraph (under Rationale) that reads "They are a means of ensuring that the diverse talents..." can be tied to Challenge 4: Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce of the Framework document.

Policy HR59 Employment of Relatives defines conditions where relative may be employed in the same unit. There doesn't appear to be any direct relevance between this policy and the Framework document.

Policy HR60 Postdoctoral Appointments outlines conditions of postdoctoral appointments. There doesn't appear to be any link between this policy and the Framework document.

Dr. Anita Mareno

Report on the following policies: HR-70,71,76,80

HR70 - Dismissal of Tenured or Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members

HR-70: I had some concerns with parts 2 and 3 of section A of this policy. In particular it seemed unfair that administrators are not required to respond the responses of the affected faculty member; the potential nonresponsiveness on the part of the administrator could easily escalate the situation and further create an inhospitable environment for the accused faculty member. My other overall concern pertained to dismissal of faculty members due to financial exigency or program elimination. There appears to be no procedure governing the dissolution or partial dissolution of a program. Thus there is potential for favoritism in this process.

HR71 - Committing Employment for a Wage Payroll Job

HR-71: This policy outlines procedures to be followed when hiring a person for a wage payroll job. I saw no problems with this policy.

HR76 - Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

HR-76: This policy specifies faculty rights in disputes. I found this policy to be sound; the section on conciliation was particularly important ; it mentions the use of an ombudsperson to help resolve matters before they become hardened into serious disputes.

HR80 - Private Consulting Practice

HR-80: This policy outlines conditions governing the private consulting of individuals classified as full time academic or academic administrators. I didn't find any problems with this policy.

Dr. Mary Napoli

**HR Policy Review
Summaries for HR 81; HR82; HR 83; HR85**

Policy HR81 UNIVERSITY-NAMED PROFESSORSHIPS

The purpose of the policy is to outline how funding from benefactors and the universities, when appropriate, is utilized to support outstanding University faculty with resources to further the scholar's contributions to teaching, research, and service. The benefactor establishes a University-named professorship to support scholarship within the University.

The funding can be used for salary supplementation, graduate assistant stipends, staff assistance, travel, etc.

Notes about Diversity:

The word 'diversity' does not exist in the policy.

In short, this policy outlines the University's policy on University-named professorships.

On another note, the term "secretarial assistance" is still utilized to refer to staff assistants.

Policy HR82 UNIVERSITY-NAMED CHAIRS

The purpose of this policy is to provide distinguished scholars with the opportunity to continue and further their contributions to teaching, research, and public service through the provision of salary and supplementary funds. The funds can be used for a variety of needs. The university-named chair must be a full-time member of the University faculty with an academic rank of Professor, Senior Scientist, or Librarian. It is an appointment made by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University upon recommendation of the Dean of the appropriate college, consistent with the conditions of the grant or funding.

Notes about Diversity:

The word 'diversity' does not exist in the policy.

Policy HR83 UNIVERSITY ENDOWED FELLOWSHIPS

The purpose of the policy is to provide supplementary funds to outstanding members of the University faculty to assist in continuing and furthering the scholar's contributions in teaching, research, and public service. The monies provided by gifts or designated University funds appropriated for this purpose can be used for travel, assistants stipends, etc. The Department concerned will still provide a suitable salary for the honored faculty. The individual must be a full-time member of the University with the academic rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor; senior scientist, senior research associate, or research associate, librarian, associate librarian, or assistant librarian. The term of the appointment shall be determined by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University upon recommendation of the dean of the appropriate college, consistent with the conditions of the grant.

To establish a fellowship, an endowment of not less than \$250,000 is required.

Notes about diversity:

The word 'diversity' does not appear in the policy. The policy is contingent upon funding.

Policy HR85 AFFILIATE ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

The purpose of the policy is to recognize the academic qualifications of certain administrative or staff members (other than academic deans and department heads) who may occasionally perform educational services, yet whose primary responsibilities do not involve teaching and research. These individuals are not eligible for tenure and are not subject to the University's tenure regulations ([HR23](#)).

Appointment to an affiliate faculty rank is made in an academic department, and must have the approval of the Department Head and the College Dean; for commonwealth campuses, the

concurrence of the Chancellor and the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses is also required.

Notes about diversity:

The word 'diversity' does not appear in the policy.

Dr. John Kim

Review of HR87, HR93, HR94, and HRG02

HRG 02 Alternate Work Arrangements outlines employee-friendly policies, such as a flexible work schedule and telecommuting, which are increasingly important to contemporary workers. As mentioned in HRG 02, a flexible work schedule is designed to provide a greater flexibility for employees to establish their own programs of working hours within the workweek without changing the number of hours to be worked, while telecommuting allows employees to perform their regular job responsibilities away from their primary business location using telecommunication and information technology as appropriate. This policy would be a good alternative for all workers, especially for people with disabilities, women, and single moms/dads facing child/elder care. HRG 02 clearly stipulates requirements, responsibilities, and procedures for alternate work arrangements. However, if the policy is comprehensively reevaluated and reworded with reference to disability, gender, or marital status, then it would be a more effective policy better working for all workers.

HR87 EVAN PUGH PROFESSORSHIPS specifies the selection criteria, nomination procedures, appointment schedule, and financial benefits of Evan Pugh Professorships.

HR93 UNIVERSITY-NAMED DEAN'S CHAIRS outlines the purpose and responsibility for appointment, source of funds, and early activation on University-named dean's chairs.

HR94 UNIVERSITY-NAMED DEPARTMENT HEAD'S and CHAIRS is intended to supplement University support for outstanding University faculty and specifies the purpose and responsibility for appointment, source of funds, and early activation.

I found the three policies above to be sound, and there were no missing points in these policies with regards to the diversity criteria.

Dr. Nihal Bayraktar

Policy AD29 STATEMENT ON INTOLERANCE (<http://guru.psu.edu/policies/AD29.html>)

The purpose is given as “the University provides educational programs and activities to create an environment in which diversity and understanding of other cultures are valued.”

The definition of intolerance is “An act of intolerance refers to conduct that is in violation of a University policy, rule or regulation and is motivated by discriminatory bias against or hatred toward other individuals or groups based on characteristics such as age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, genetic information, national origin, political belief, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation gender identity or veteran status.”

The policy reads that “If any violation of University policy, rule or regulation is motivated by discriminatory bias against or hatred toward an individual or group based on characteristics such as age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, genetic information, national origin, political belief, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or veteran status, the sanction will be increased in severity and may include termination or expulsion from the University.”

It also includes “The expression of diverse views and opinions is encouraged in the University community.”

The policy states that “The Pennsylvania State University is committed to preventing and eliminating acts of intolerance by faculty, staff and students, and encourages anyone in the University community to report concerns and complaints about acts of intolerance to the Affirmative Action Office or the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity, and in cases involving students, reports also may be made to the Office of Judicial Affairs.”

REVIEW COMMENTS: This policy is very important for improving campus climate and fostering diversity. In my opinion it is well written and its coverage is large. Despite this clear policy against intolerance and supporting expression of opinion, the climate assessment survey results [Report on the Penn State Harrisburg Climate Assessment: 2012] indicates that

- almost 12% of faculty strongly disagree or disagree to “Penn State Harrisburg exhibits a campus climate that is accepting of people who have diverse backgrounds.” Only 44.5% is strongly agree to this statement.*
- 1/3 of faculty hear racist comments and 10% make such comments. Almost 45% of faculty hear sexist comments and 15% make comments. 37% of faculty hear negative comments about gays, lesbians, bi-sexual, or transgendered people and 10% make negative comments.*
- 36.2% of faculty have personally experienced discrimination because of gender; 33.9% due to political beliefs; 21.6% due to racial, ethnic or cultural background; 19.7% due to religion; 8.9% due to disability; and 8.1% due to sexual orientation.*
- 35.6% of faculty witnessed or experienced an act of intolerance.*

All these results indicate that even though the university has a clear policy on intolerance, it is not fully enforced. One reason might be some people may not be aware of the policy.

One important result of the survey study is that almost 1/4 of faculty disagree or strongly disagree that “I would recommend Penn State Harrisburg as a good place to work to a friend who was looking for a teaching position.” Only 35.3% strongly agree. This result can be partially caused by the lack of enforcement of such policies, preventing the improvement of campus climate.

It is important to be sure that people know where to apply if they experience any intolerance stated in the policies. The high rate of faculty who witnessed intolerance based on Climate

Assessment Survey result can be due to the way the question is asked. In most cases it is not clear whether the incident is acceptable or not and may depend on personal values.

Policy AD41 SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The policy states that "Sexual harassment of faculty, staff or students is prohibited at The Pennsylvania State University."

REVIEW COMMENTS: The policy is very detailed on definition of sexual harassment and resolution of it. I could not see any missing point in the policy. Since the climate assessment report [Report on the Penn State Harrisburg Climate Assessment: 2012] does not include any specific information on sexual harassment, it is not clear whether anybody faces this problem on the campus. If there is no problem, it means that the policy is well enforced.

Policy AD42 STATEMENT ON NONDISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT

The policy reads "The Pennsylvania State University is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to programs, facilities, admission and employment without regard to personal characteristics not related to ability, performance, or qualifications as determined by University policy or by state or federal authorities. It is the policy of the University to maintain an academic and work environment free of discrimination, including harassment. The Pennsylvania State University prohibits discrimination, harassment against any person because of age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, genetic information, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or veteran status and retaliation due to the reporting of discrimination or harassment. Discrimination, harassment, or retaliation against faculty, staff or students will not be tolerated at The Pennsylvania State University."

The definitions are given as "Discrimination is conduct of any nature that violates the policy set forth above by denying equal privileges or treatment to a particular individual because of the individual's age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or veteran status." And "Harassment is a form of discrimination consisting of physical or verbal conduct that..."

REVIEW COMMENTS: This policy is very similar and related to AD29. All review comments apply to this policy as well. One additional result from the climate assessment report [Report on the Penn State Harrisburg Climate Assessment: 2012] can be added here: 1/3 of faculty strongly disagree or disagree that "Penn State Harrisburg promotes equal opportunities for promotion and tenure of its faculty". Only 30% strongly agree to this statement. It shows that there is a big concern about equal opportunities on the campus and this outcome questions enforceability of this policy.

**HR Guideline 11 FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE
AND**

HR Guideline 18 PAID PARENTAL LEAVE FOR FACULTY

REVIEW COMMENTS: These guidelines are very detailed and give rights to faculty beyond “the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993” I could not find any point that they may cause discrimination or deteriorating campus climate. Maybe the policies can be more sensitive about cultural differences.

APPENDIX C.

Mrs. Guy's note on viewing P&T materials.

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.
- 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
Information Systems Technology and Library Committee Final Report
Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Committee Members:

Patrick Burrowes
Roger Bussard
Refik Culpan
Eric Delozier
Omar El Ariss
Carolyn Grasse-Bachman
Kaushal Pathak
Zina Taran
Aaron Wachhaus
Matthew Woessner
Gloria B. Clark, Chair

Non-voting Ex Officio Members:

John Hoh
Kate Tompkins
Greg Crawford
Christopher Weaver

Committee Charge for AY 2012-2013

Survey faculty members to assess their technology needs in the following areas classroom technology and office computing equipment (beyond Zimbra), including printer, software, internet, etc.

1. The ISTL worked on, but did not bring this project to completion. After preparing a survey to be posted on Survey Monkey, we were invited to collaborate with the Physical Plant Committee because they had a similar charge to survey faculty needs. Dr. John Hoh and Dr. Gloria Clark attended a Physical Plant Committee meeting and learned that they had already sent survey questions out to faculty and were reviewing their answers. It was decided at that time not to pursue our survey, since it would have been repetitive.

At that meeting, however, it was decided that the ISTL and Physical Plant Committees should meet together at least once a year, since some of their work overlaps. We look forward to collaborating with members of that committee on technology matters.

2. Dr. John Hoh met with ISTL Committee and shared both updates to classroom facilities and plans for the future.

Here are some highlights of Dr. Hoh's reports to the committee:

A look at spaces for classrooms; better environments for learning
Designs simple; flexible; functional; consistent; comfortable; attractive
Successes with labs around campus
Clean look and feel

People who need to be involved: furniture folks; AV Vendors; Physical plant; Registrar; Librarians; Faculty Committees; Upper management; students
Golden Rules: consensus on design is not possible; vision; get out and see what is possible; learn from failures; build on successes; simple is better
New Ideas: means to evaluate new service requests; means to retire old equipment (VCRs); Signage is helpful; collaboration suites; presentation practice room-one button video space; Future: what is the impact of the portable devices; Cost effective video capture- Swivl.com. Works with ITouch and videorecords;

Desktops and laptops as a mode of user engagement are the past, not the future
it's about mobility, secure access and licensing

Steelcase Road Trip: Hoh, Crawford, Ansary and others went to Michigan to see classroom set ups and team rooms.

E-200 will be re-purposed to have Skype Google Hangout facilities

73.6% of students would like to have access to software off campus

February 20 Academic Virtualization Summit Collaboration between Campuses

Library 109 will look like Library 108

Virtual Learning Network Room- allows for teaching at another campus (Library 110)

iPod touch Case like iPad case that students can check out of the library-20 of them

Library 203 1-2-5 classroom. Some technology there and students can bring their own. Will seat 32.

Auditorium 100 seats, more of a general purpose classroom

Creating some semi-private space; add news feeds; using wall dividers called Trellis

A resource: SCALE-UP Student-centered active learning environment with upside-down pedagogies

3. This is not part of our original charge but the committee received reports from Christopher Weaver on web accessibility issues.

Christopher Weaver, college web manager, gave a report on Search engine optimization on our college webpage to allow better “findability.” For example, a significant change was made to our Master of Business Administration. Previously, the page was found on page 7 of Google results. Made a change to how page was referenced in the background, now number it comes up as number three on page one. Now looking at other programs to see how they fare in Google

searches. MSIS was also changed in the background to show up as one of the top two in a Google search.

Christopher also updated us on the progress on Access issues with our webpages.

4. The ISTL Committee had access to and discussed sections of the 2012 *Horizon Report* published by the New Media Consortium. The following quotation from the Horizon Report explains the New Media Consortium, of which Penn State is a member:

The NMC (New Media Consortium) is an international community of experts in educational technology — from the practitioners who work with new technologies on campuses everyday; to the visionaries who are shaping the future of learning at think tanks, labs, and research centers; to its staff and board of directors; to the advisory boards and others helping the NMC conduct cutting edge research (3).

<http://www.nmc.org/>

The *Horizon Report* highlights the future impact of technology on higher education. The following key trends were noted for this year: Time to adoption One Year or Less- Mobile Apps and Tablet Computing; Two to Three Years-Game-based Learning and Learning Analytics; Four to Five Years-Gesture-Based Computing and the Internet of Things.

Final Note:

I would like to thank all of the committee members for their dedicated service to this committee. Above all, I would like to thank Dr. Hoh for his willingness to report to the committee, patiently answer our questions and participate in our discussions.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gloria B. Clark

Summary:

Over the academic year, the International and Intercultural Affairs Committee (IIAC) met 6 times. As Chair, I wish to thank the members of the IIAC for their willingness to meet and to discuss issues related to the committee charges. This year, the Committee focused primarily on the "international" portion of the Committee's name since the number of international students has grown substantially and this growth has called into question the services provided to these students.

Charges:

The charges for the committee as received from the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate were 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.

The first charge received most of the focus of the work of the IIAC for the year. The second charge can be handled through the use of the Office of Global Programs' Penn State Global Reach Portal, a database of faculty expertise and interest in international research as well as education abroad programs and international alumni (<http://global.psu.edu/GIS/Portal.cfm>).

Meetings:

At its first meeting on September 11, the committee received reports on the enrollment of and services provided to international students as well as updates on upcoming events related to international students. In addition, the committee was briefed on the college sponsored international travel/study abroad programs. Updates were provided at all subsequent meetings for both international student services and international programs.

The October 22 meeting focused on how the learning center (represented by Janice Smith) and DUS (represented by Leyla Spahich) were coping with the increase in the number of international students. **The IIAC proposed a motion to the PSH Senate that the Senate provide its support to request additional staffing for services to international students (the motion was approved by the Senate).**

Rob Coffman led an excellent discussion of the work of the admissions staff in the realm of international students. The main countries of focus for recruitment are China, South Korea, and

India. There is no specific target for numbers, but the goal is to increase international representation. In the future, there are plans for recruitment in South America (especially Brazil) and Puerto Rico. Admissions has also hired a recruiter whose areas of responsibility include international recruiting.

Housing and Food Services, represented by Craig Cook, Director of H&FS, was the focus of the February 5, 2013, meeting. Discussion centered on the provision of different meals to meet the needs of international students, the possibility of instituting a “guest chef” program, and the provision of international television programming for students. **The need for such programming is being addressed through ITS and the administration upon the request of the IIAC.** The Committee also discussed with Marie-Louise Abram needs of her office, especially integrating faculty-led programs and courses within the strategic plan of the College and with the curricula of the schools. **The IIAC proposed a motion to the PSH Senate recommending that the administration establish a faculty group to provide assistance to the Office of International Program in the areas of strategic planning and curricular integration.** The motion was presented and discussed at the PSH Senate meeting of March 19 with the final result being that this recommendation be included as a possible charge for the IIAC for next year.

Peter Idowu (Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies) briefed the IIAC on the status of international graduate students at the March 21, 2013, meeting. The number of full-time international graduate students has grown substantially over the last 4 years, partially as a result of agreements between specific PSH and UP programs to share applications. Peter is working to expand the number of programs which share applications. He is also actively promoting the re-creation of a Graduate and Professional Students Association. China and India provide the most international graduate students to PSH.

At the final meeting of the Committee, Chancellor Kulkarni visited to discuss internationalization of the college and services to international students. He envisions continuing growth in the number of international students, but stresses that there is a lack of strategic planning for what we are doing in international programs. He wants our international programs related to strategic initiatives and also related to learning objectives. He would also like to see the mix of countries represented by our international students to grow.

Suggestions for future charges:

1. Hold focus sessions with international students to determine their specific needs and desires for programs. Of special concern is how the college can help improve the experience of international students at PSH.
2. Serve as a body for guiding the strategic planning and curricular integration of international programming for the College.
3. Assist faculty in infusing internationalization into their courses and programs.

Attendance record:

September 11, 2012:

Members present: Lewis Asimeng-Boahene, Amit Banerjee, Gregory Crawford, Richard Scheib, Martha Strickland (Senate Liaison), Robin Redmon Wright. Members Excused or Absent: Michael Becker, Michael Barton, Sai Kakuturu, student representatives. Others Present: Marie-Louise Abram, Donna Howard

October 22, 2012:

Members present: Michael Barton, Michael Becker, Gregory Crawford, Hao Dong (Graduate Student), Sai Kakuturu, Martha Strickland (Senate Liaison), Udodi Ukwuani (Undergraduate Student). Members Excused or Absent: Amit Banerjee, Lewis Boahene, Richard Scheib, Robin Redmon Wright. Guests Present: Marie Louise Abram, Donna Howard, Janice Smith, Leyla Spahich.

November 29, 2012:

Members Present: Amit Banerjee, Michael Becker, Gregory Crawford, Hao Dong (Graduate Student), Sai Kakuturu, Richard Scheib, Martha Strickland (Senate Liaison), Robin Redmon Wright. Members Excused or Absent: Marie Louise Abram, Michael Barton, Lewis Boahene, Donna Howard, Udodi Ukwuani (Undergraduate Student). Guests present: Robert Coffman.

February 5, 2013:

Members Present: Amit Banerjee, Michael Barton, Lewis Boahene, Gregory Crawford, Richard Scheib, Martha Strickland (Senate Liaison), Robin Redmon Wright. Members Excused or Absent: Michael Becker, Hao Dong (Graduate Student), Donna Howard, Sai Kakuturu, Udodi Ukwuani (Undergraduate Student). Guests present: Marie Louise Abram, Craig Cook (H&FS)

March 21, 2013:

Members Present: Marie Louise Abram, Michael Becker, Lewis Boahene, Gregory Crawford, Donna Howard, Sai Kakuturu, Martha Strickland (Senate Liaison), Robin Redmon Wright. Members Excused or Absent: Amit Banerjee, Michael Barton, Hao Dong (Graduate Student), Richard Scheib, Udodi Ukwuani (Undergraduate Student). Guests Present: Marie Louise Abram, Donna Howard, Peter Idowu (Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies).

April 4, 2013:

Members Present: Amit Banerjee, Michael Barton, Lewis Boahene, Gregory Crawford, Sai Kakuturu, Martha Strickland (Senate Liaison), Robin Redmon Wright. Members Excused or Absent: Michael Becker, Hao Dong (Graduate Student), Richard Scheib, Udodi Ukwuani (Undergraduate Student). Guests Present: Marie Louise Abram, Donna Howard, Chancellor Kulkarni

**PENN STATE HARRISBURG
FACULTY SENATE PHYSICAL PLANT COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT 2012-2013**

Committee Members:

Heidi Abbey, Jeremy Blum, George Boudreau (chair), Bev Cigler, Ed Dankanich, Eric Doerfler, John Hoh, Yuting Hsu, Sam Monismith, Parag Pendharkar, Jason Petula, Jordan Simkins, Anne Verplanck

2012-2013 Activities

The Physical Plant Committee met four times during the 2012-13 academic year – September 4, November 27, April 1, and April 22; a fifth meeting, on February 26, was cancelled due to schedule conflicts and illnesses.

Our fall meetings consisted primarily of communicating with Edward Dankanich and John Hoh about developments in the campus’ physical plants and needs for improvements therein. Numerous significant changes took place during the 2012-2013 academic year, including:

- Completion of renovations and improvements to Vartan Plaza, including installation of a new fountain that incorporates the globe sculpture and new benches
- Completion of a new wing on the Capital Union Building (CUB), including new locker rooms, offices, workout rooms, and other changes.
- Planning, and then re-planning the significant expansion of the Educational Activities Building (EAB). Final plans for that project call for a large addition north of the existing structure, which will house large 120-seat classrooms, many labs, performing spaces, and other uses. Former committee chair Bev Cigler served as a member of the EAB design committee.
- Completion of new parking areas west of Olmstead, and expanded parking near the housing units.
- Expansion and modernization of instructional technologies in classrooms and laboratories throughout the campus.

PSH Senate’s Physical Plant Committee Charges for 2012-2013:

- Query faculty on their needs for classroom and lab space in the Olmsted building. Collaborate with the Information and Technology committee on this task.
- Complete memorials for Drs. Hoffman and Sachs.
- Establish a liaison with Campus Police to assess progress with regard to emergency procedures and campus safety including availability of cameras, classroom security, and other safety equipment.

Fulfillment of Charges:

Charge One: Classroom and Lab Needs in Olmsted

Committee members discussed the changes in classroom and lab space at each of our meetings this year, including the November meeting, in which -- at the invitation of John Hoh -- we met in the "skittles room" of the Penn State Harrisburg Library.

John Hoh put the completion of this task succinctly as we planned the April 22 meeting: in fourteen months, everything will change, with the completion of the new wing on the Educational Activities Building and the removal of a large number of lab space to that location. That meeting was also attended by Dr. Gloria Clark, chair of the IT/Library faculty committee, so we could begin plans to collaborate on needs for instruction space and labs in the next fifteen months.

Ed Dankanich revealed at that meeting that the transformation of the EAB will free up over 5,000 square feet of space in Olmsted by the fall of 2014. One of the committee's most significant charges in the time between then and now will be to evaluate the best way that space can be put to use.

In addition, John presented the committee with a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation on initiatives his staff are undertaking that will change the way PSH students use technology to learn. At the committee chair's request, John has provided an electronic copy of the presentation for all committee members and our liaisons in the Faculty Senate. George Boudreau also recommended that all faculty would benefit by viewing the PowerPoint, to acquaint themselves with new opportunities and options in preparation for next year's classes.

In April, the committee chair asked each faculty representative to poll his/her school colleagues for a needs assessment on classroom, lab, and building needs. These responses will be attached to our final meeting minutes, once all schools have reported in.

Charge Two: Memorial Benches

The committee can report a fifty percent success rate, at this juncture, on the charge to complete fundraising for memorial benches to our late colleagues Howard Sachs and Louise Hoffman.

The plan was to ask faculty in each of these deceased colleagues' schools to raise the approximately \$1500 needed to pay for a plaque on the newly installed benches on Vartan Plaza. The School of Science, Engineering, and Technology undertook the effort to honor Dr. Sachs, and completed its fundraising efforts by early 2013. A bench honoring Howard Sachs is now located between the Library and TL Buildings.

Fundraising efforts in the School of Humanities have been less successful. While a subcommittee consisting of Heidi Abbey and George Boudreau was established last spring, efforts to encourage other faculty to contribute have not borne fruit. As of mid-semester, only a few hundred dollars have been received. No office or administrator has been willing to support the effort by the writing of a fundraising letter.

The committee agreed at its April meeting that this situation shows a profound need to organize and streamline fundraising efforts for initiatives like this one. Standardized fundraising programs, clear lines of administrative support, letters and forms prepared in the eventuality of future fundraising needs, and a faculty-wide expectation of support for campus fundraising efforts are clearly needed, the committee agreed during discussions at each of our meetings this year.

Charge Three: Liaising with Campus Police

The committee invited Chief Kevin Stoehr to its meeting on April 1, and fulfilled this third charge with a comprehensive discussion of improvements and needs. Drawing from the minutes of that meeting:

Chief Stoehr reported that the campus initiative of transitioning from traditional metal keys to swipe cards is progressing, with the Swatara Building now completed as a test case. Use of these swipe cards will allow building entry to be limited by hours, access needs, and for access to be terminated far more easily than having to re-core locks. As this project moves into the Olmsted Building, several complicating factors will need to be addressed: the numerous entry points; the building's 24-hour use needs; and other issues.

The campus' new camera system initiative is also underway. Cameras will be placed in all common areas and halls. Chief Stoehr reported that some bugs are being worked out, as in the case in Swatara where it was discovered headlights were tripping the light sensors and turning on lights and cameras in rooms; this problem is now resolved. Sam Monismith questioned whether this system had recording capability.

Improved campus lighting is also underway. Chief Stoehr reported that paths to the Alice Demey School have been lit, as well as temporary lighting added to the softball fields. Committee members raised the issue of better lighting to the new housing areas, as well as the new train station site.

Committee Charge Suggestions 2013-2014

- Hold a campus-wide forum in October 2013, similar to that held in spring 2012, to update the campus community on developments in the physical plant, IT, and Student Services, once again inviting Ed Dankanich, John Hoh, and Don Holtzman to participate.
- Evaluate the campus-center smoking ban, an initiative that has now failed, by committee observation. If the ban is to continue, a clear line of enforcement is essential.
- Work with Ed Dankanich, John Hoh, and their offices, to carry out the process of planning the repurposing of the spaces in Olmsted to be vacated when labs and classes move to the EAB in 2014. Have each school's committee representative serve as a conduit for that school's faculty to express ideas and needs.

George Boudreau, Chair

APPENDIX “K”

Strategic Planning Committee Capital College Faculty Senate 2012-2013 Academic Year

Thursday, Mar. 28, 2013, 3 – 4 pm, (C113 Olmsted)

Attending: Thomas Bowers; Erdener Kaynak; Shashidhara Marikunte; Bing Ran (Chair); Sairam Rudrabhatla, Antoine Tate, Aaron Wachhaus; Samuel Winch
Administrators Present: M. Kulkarni, O. Ansary, R. Luquis, C. Rios
Absent: Robert Russell; Premal Vora

- I. Welcome and Call to Order. Meeting was called to order at 3 pm.
- II. Strategic Planning Committee Charges: Begin working in the planning process for the college strategic plan during 2013 – 2014 AY. Seek assistance from the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor in this endeavor.

Dr. Kulkarni introduced the background and the tasks for the on-going strategic planning efforts at Penn State and at the Capital College. Dr. Ansary provided supporting details related to the strategic planning efforts at the College. The college and the University’s efforts in a new round of strategic planning have been postponed until the new President coming into office. However, a short-ranged strategic planning for the next 2 - 3 years will be conducted at Capital College.

The scope of this planning will be:

1. Physical plan. Our current physical plan (2007 – 2017) has been successfully implemented and a new plan is undergoing.
2. Academic plan. After reviewing the Core Council Report implementations, especially in enrollment, faculty hiring, degree offered, and student life at campus, we will make plans for the next 2 – 3 years.
3. Athletics.
4. Vision / Mission. We will review our current vision and mission, concentrating on various issues related to the growth of the College.

The current stage of strategic planning is at the data collection. We will continue our efforts in September 2013.

- III. Next Meeting. The committee decided that the next meeting will be held when the required information is collected and distributed.
- IV. Adjournment occurred at 4 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Bing Ran

APPENDIX “L”

Student Affairs Committee Report
2012-2013 Academic Year
Report Prepared by Karin Sprow Forté, Committee Chair
Report Reviewed by Committee

The Student Affairs Committee had a productive year. We met on September 13, 2012, October 23, 2012, November 13, 2012, December 13, 2012, January 10, 2013, February 4, 2013, March 25, 2013, and April 22, 2013. The committee members are as follows: Dinesh Pai, Amy Sauertieg, Denise Meister, Kimberley Schreck, Paul Thompson, and myself. Ugar Yucelt was replaced on the committee due to his medical leave. Shobha Potlakayala was excused from meetings due to medical leave. Raven Harrison (undergraduate student) and Katherine Baker never attended meetings. Non-voting members were Felicia Brown-Haywood and Joseph Cecere. Glenn McGuigan was the Senate Liaison.

All assigned charges were completed as explained below.

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.

Dr. Felicia Brown-Haywood (Director of Student Affairs) and Janelle Heiserman (Cocurricular Programs Coordinator) were invited to discuss the allotment of money for lodging for students by the Student Activities Committee. The committee was concerned about the amount allotted for each student (\$100 per night), and the students are not allowed to pool their money to stay at a better hotel. The main concern is the safety of the hotels and neighborhoods in which the students then stay during conferences/trips. Drs. Meister, Sauertieg, and Shreck cited experience with student travel when students were forced to stay in unsafe neighborhoods due to the limited funds. Dr. Brown-Haywood told the committee that members of the Student Affairs Fee Committee feel that students applying for funds should pay for some of their own trip and that \$100 is fair. She also mentioned that it would be possible to bring the issue up with the Student Activities Fee Committee in the future.

The Committee recommends that the Student Activities Fee Committee consider increasing the \$100 maximum provision for lodging for students. In addition, the Committee recommends that the Student Activities Fee Committee consider allowing students to pool their money to purchase a room together. These recommendations are made with the understanding that student safety is an important consideration.

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

The Committee reviewed current policy regarding the purchase of textbooks to be used for borrowing at the library. The Committee feels that the students are burdened with the

high cost of textbooks and were hoping the library might be able to provide some relief by loaning textbooks. Glenn McGuigan was invited to speak to the Committee about this issue. He informed the Committee that it is not fiscally or physically possible for the library to purchase the textbooks for every course offered. The cost is the primary roadblock, as these purchases would leave no money for other books and research materials. In addition, access to the textbooks would be limited, even if they were placed on reserve and could only be borrowed for short time periods. The Learning Center has made an effort to purchase some of the expensive math and science textbooks (through a grant from SAF) and offers them for two-hour loan.

Joseph Steibel, manager of the campus bookstore, was also invited to speak to the Committee. He explained the various options for students to reduce their expenses on books, such as book rentals, ebooks, and used books. The Committee also brought information about what is done in their departments to help students in this area, including using one book for multiple courses, allowing students to use older editions, making a custom book through the publisher, giving students the option to purchase books, and moving to all ebooks.

The Committee recommends that faculty members should be more informed about the financial burden placed on students when they must purchase expensive textbooks, as well as the ways faculty can adapt to lower those costs. The Committee also recommends that all departments should invite Joseph Steibel to one of their upcoming meetings to help faculty understand these issues. Finally, the Committee recommends that students receive instruction in the topic of smart book buying to the first-year seminar.

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

The Committee invited Dr. Felicia Brown-Haywood (Director of Student Affairs) and Janelle Heiserman (Cocurricular Programs Coordinator) to discuss the methods currently in use by Student Affairs to involve and engage the graduate and part-time evening students in the campus community. It was clear from their presentation that there are many activities that are designed to accomplish this goal, as well as the establishing of the Office of Student Engagement, dedicated to involving evening, adult, and veteran students and their families. Currently, activities include mixers, souper-bowl, and business card exchanges. There appears to be a disconnect between knowledge of existence of the activities and the target audience. They publish the activities on the Penn State Harrisburg Weekly email and post flyers for the various events, but concern that the word is not getting to the students was expressed by the Committee.

The Committee recommends that the Student Affairs Office explore other avenues for advertising their programming, possibly including notifications sent to faculty who are teaching at night for them to announce in their classes. Other possibilities include the use of Facebook, Twitter, Zimbra calendar, or a semester activity schedule distributed to the faculty.

4. Awarding of student awards and scholarships took place on two dates in Spring 2013 with the assistance of Carolyn Julian, Student Aid Adviser and Veterans Affairs Coordinator, and Robert Coffman, Director of Enrollment Management. The Committee first awarded the freshman scholarships for incoming students on March 25, 2013.

The Committee intended to award the Board of Advisors graduate scholarship at this meeting, but the small number of applications and the incomplete state of the applications made this impossible. Carolyn Julian re-released an announcement about the availability of the scholarship to encourage additional applicants with a new deadline of April 12, 2013. Additional applications were received, so the Committee was able to award the scholarship at the April 22, 2013 meeting along with the upperclassmen scholarships.

The Committee recommends that the due date for applications for the Board of Advisors Scholarship be moved to a later date to allow time for graduate programs to complete their admissions process.

The committee agreed to forward these recommended charges to the Faculty Senate for the 2013-2014 academic year:

1. Explore topics that could be addressed during the first-year seminars to benefit the students.
2. Explore ways to adjust common hour scheduling to enable SGA members to participate in other clubs and prevent faculty and students from missing concurrently scheduled meetings.
3. Explore the possibility of inviting student members to serve on the Student Affairs Committee rather than appointing them in an effort to improve student attendance.

Attendance Record

September 13, 2012

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

Excused Absence: Ugar Yucelt, Amy Sauterieg, Shobha Potlakayala

Absent: Katherine Baker, Raven Harrison

October 23, 2012

In Attendance: Glenn McGuigan, Denise Meister, Amy Sauterieg, Karin Sprow Forté, Paul Thompson

Excused Absence: Joe Cecere, Kim Schreck, Katherine Baker, Shobha Potlakayala, Ugar Yucelt

Absent: Raven Harrison

Guests: Felicia Brown-Haywood, Janelle Heiserman

November 13, 2012

In Attendance: Joe Cecere, Glenn McGuigan, Denise Meister, Karin Sprow Forté, Paul Thompson

Excused Absence: Joe Cecere, Ugar Yucelt, Amy Sauterieg, Shobha Potlakayala

Absent: Katherine Baker, Raven Harrison

Guest: Joseph Steibel

December 13, 2012

In Attendance: Glenn McGuigan, Denise Meister, Karin Sprow Forté, Dinesh Pai, Amy Sauertieg, Kim Schreck

Excused Absence: Shobha Potlakayala, Paul Thompson

Absent: Joe Cecere, Katherine Baker, Raven Harrison

**CAPITAL COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
END-OF-YEAR MEETING
MAY 3, 2013**

Attendees:

Capital College Senators: S. Agili, E. Delozier, E. Doerfler, R. Gray, R. Luquis, G. Mazis, G. Morcol, C. Rios, M. Strickland, P. Thompson, R. Young

University Senate Council Representative: J. Ruiz

Committee Chairs: H. Abbey (for T. Vasavada), N. Bayraktar, G. Boudreau, L. Null, S. Poyrazli, B. Ran, K. Sprow-Forte, R. Weiler-Timmins

Administrators/Academic Council: O. Ansary, G. Crawford, P. Idowu, M. Kulkarni, S. Peterson, S. Schappe, J. Shoup, C. Surra and M. Walters

Student Government Representative: Kenny Seaman

I. Welcome and Introductions

Catherine Rios, Senate President, opened the meeting at 12:25 p.m.

II. Remarks from the Senate President

Rios began her remarks by thanking everyone for their participation in the senate over the past year. She stressed the need for faculty service to the campus community and is excited about the changes and opportunities that she sees in the coming year. She would like to foster interdisciplinary relationships between schools and is looking to employ new communication and collaborative techniques.

Introductions were made around the table. A certificate of appreciation honoring R. Luquis' presidency was presented.

The Faculty Senate members for the 2013-2014 academic year were reviewed. University Senators for the 2013-2014 academic year were also reviewed.

The position of Secretary of the Senate needed to be filled for the 2013-2014 academic year.

Martha Strickland agreed to continue in the position for another year.

The position of Parliamentarian of the Senate needed to be filled for the 2013-2014 academic year. Paul Thompson was nominated and elected by a unanimous vote.

III. Committee Chair Reports

Academic Affairs Committee –Chair Linda Null

The report was available for review.

- The report listed all courses and programs that were reviewed over the past academic year.
- The major concern of the Committee is the large number of incorrect submissions and lack of consultation they receive. It is recommended that each school have a process in place to review items coming before academic affairs to make certain all information is ready to be presented.
- The committee will be creating a handbook outlining the curricular process and hope to have it posted online by August.

- University Park will be creating a list with all potential people who should be consulted on different proposals.

Athletics Committee – Chair Rebecca Weiler-Timmins

The report was available for review.

- The committee was recently formed during the Spring 2013 semester. Their main concern is to integrate athletics and academics to make sure that both sides are supported.
- The committee will be creating a best practices policy for student absences and will involve faculty members when creating the policy.
- Kulkarni stated that the Faculty Senate should support athletics as an important part of the educational process.

Enrollment Management and Outreach Subcommittee – Heidi Abbey

The report was available to review.

- The committee held several focus groups to address their charges to determine student perceptions of campus life and facilities. The students were concerned with the high price of food, lack of diversity in food selections, how to do research and obtain funding for the research.
- International students requested more “conversational” English opportunities, where they would be able to learn the “slang” and sayings that are often used by students and in the classroom.
- Ansary asked if the committee had any recommendations on the findings. They did not, however, that may be something to explore next academic year.
- Surra asked if any commuters were surveyed and was looking for additional activities for them to participate. K. Seaman (SGA) mentioned that they were planning to offer more programming for graduate students in the 2013-2014 academic year.

Faculty Affairs Committee – Chair Senel Poyrazli

The report was available for review.

- The committee reviewed the summer compensation contracts and made several recommendations that were presented at previous Faculty Senate Meetings. The faculty does not want to be required to perform service during the summer months, and if they are asked to do so, would like to receive compensation. It is sometimes difficult to get faculty members to teach summer graduate courses.
- Ansary noted that our compensation is higher than any other campus.
- The policy will be reworked to include advising and service.
- The summer terms are not always financially viable for the campus, therefore additional money per credit is not an option. Revenue from World Campus classes does not come to our campus.
- The administration encourages faculty to create online summer courses, which we would own. The courses have been rather successful over the past few summers, as students are allowed to be at their homes and take the courses they need.

Human Resources and Business Services Committee – Chair Nihal Bayraktar

The report was available for review.

- The committee was asked to review policies for the enhancement of a work climate that supports individual differences and promotes fairness and equity. The committee reviewed several HR and AD policies and their notations were included in their report.
- According to the committee members one significant outcome of the survey is that “Approximately 30% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty disagreed that they would recommend PSU Harrisburg as a good place to work to a friend” (page 2 of the climate assessment report). A faculty forum can be organized to discuss the outcomes of the climate assessment survey and to understand why some faculty members are not happy on the campus. What are their concerns and problems? The committee believes that investigating the reasons behind why some faculty members are not happy on campus would be more important than only reviewing policies.
- The committee reviewed P&T policies of Penn State Harrisburg and Schools to understand the possible impact of policies on diversity and campus climate.
- Charge two was to 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.

Information Systems Technology and Library Committee –

The report was available for review.

- The committee is looking at new learning environments and the improvements that are happening from the IT department.
- Students are requesting access to specific software programs from their computers. Several programs are now available through www.webapps.psu.edu. ITS is still expanding and adding programs.
- Faculty request input when ITS develops new classroom space and technologies.

International and Intercultural Affairs Committee – Chair Gregory Crawford

The report was available for review.

- The committee’s first charge was to explore ways to help new international students make the transition to life at Penn State Harrisburg. The committee met with Housing & Food Services, the Learning Center, DUC, the Graduate School, Admissions and Dr. Kulkarni to address the needs of international students.
- Additional support needs to be provided to the international students, as their population on our campus is increasing.
- The committee would like to see international concepts integrated into the curriculum.

Physical Plant Committee – Chair George Boudreau

The report was available for review.

- Profound changes are occurring throughout campus. E. Dankanich has been helpful in providing information to the committee about the projects that are occurring on campus.
- The committee is still trying to secure funding for various memorials on campus.

Strategic Planning – Chair Bing Ran

The report was available for review.

- The committee only met one time this past year, as the strategic plan has been on hold due to the changes in administration.
- R. Pangborn recently issued nine guidelines for the campus strategic planning committees and the committee will begin to craft a short term strategic plan.

Student Affairs – Chair Karin Sprow-Forte

The report was available for review.

- The committee was concerned with the allotment of SAF monies for students, particularly hotel accommodations. The committee was concerned about the amount allotted for each student (\$100 per night), and the students were not allowed to pool their money to stay at a better hotel. Students should be required to pay for some of the costs of SAF trips.
- The committee explored providing classroom textbooks in the library for students to borrow during the semester. The cost for the library to purchase all of the textbooks would expend their budget for the year; therefore, it is not fiscally responsible to do so. Joseph Steibel, manager of the campus bookstore was invited to talk to the committee about various options for students to reduce their expenses, such as book rentals, e-books and used books.
- The committee was asked to explore ways to engage graduate students in programs on campus. They recommend that the Student Affairs Office explore other avenues for advertising their programming.

IV. Report from the Chancellor, Mukund Kulkarni

- Kulkarni thanked everyone for their service to the college.
- Faculty and staff employment numbers for the spring semester were provided: 270 FT staff, 226 FT faculty, 123 FT2 faculty – wage employees were 84 (non-student only) and 226 (including students).
- Fourteen of our faculty members have been recognized with international, national and regional awards for their research, writing, teaching and service. Thirteen faculty members have written or edited books and numerous others have published articles, papers, and creative works.
- Enrollment numbers and trends have changed dramatically since 2001. In fall 2001, we had a total enrollment of 3,239, 39% full-time, 61% part time. Fall 2012 showed a major shift, total enrollment of 4,376, 71% full-time, and 29% part-time.
- Penn State Harrisburg has also shifted to an even greater undergraduate presence: Fall 2011, 46% graduate, 54% undergraduate. Fall 2012, 22% graduate and 78% undergraduate.
- While our graduate school enrollment has dropped over the past several years, we are second to University Park in Master degree enrollment, and award the second most graduate degrees in Penn State University.
- Penn State Harrisburg is increasing the number of non-resident students as well. The number has increased from 6% in 2001 to 21% in 2012.

- It is too early to predict with any certainty what this fall's enrollments will be, but if things remain on our current trajectory we can expect a total enrollment in excess of 4,600 students.
- Our fall 2013 freshman class comes to us from many varied backgrounds and geographic regions: 16 service areas, 34 counties, 33 states, 22 countries, 115 intended majors and 435 high schools.
- International enrollment continues to grow. Fall 2012 enrollment included 225 international students from 33 countries. Spring 2013 international enrollment grew to 240. We currently have 169 paid accepts for international students (as of 4/29/13).
- Our freshman class is very diverse. For the second year in a row, white Americans do not make up the majority of our freshman class.
- Construction has begun on the EAB addition. Completion is estimated for May 2014 and will add 54,405 square feet of classrooms and engineering labs.
- Many projects were completed by the Physical Plant in 2012-2013. The following projects are slated for 2013-2014: CUB Phase 2 new front entrance/ 2nd floor classrooms, Olmsted elevator replacement, Olmsted Auditorium renovation, Security installations in Olmsted/CUB/ Sci Tech, Library classrooms- single button studio/ 109 computer lab/203 studio, Olmsted offices in W304 and E307, OPP exterior restrooms for athletic fields, EAB existing building renovations, EAB new building construction, baseball field batting cage and Olmsted W14 communication lab.
- Important issues that Kulkarni would like to focus on for the 2013-2014 academic year include: Strategic Planning (new communication received), college getting more formal rather than informal (Importance of policies and procedures), budgetary constraints, need for investment in support services and infrastructure, larger classes, increasing attention to fulfilling expectations of outside stakeholders, athletic, intra-mural and other extra-curricular opportunities, and the changing role that technology is shaping instruction, communication, advertising.

V. **Report from Academic Council, O. Ansary**

- Ansary thanked everyone for their work over the past year.
- Ansary discussed the additional challenges that we will face scheduling classes with the increased enrollment.
- International students also bring a new set of challenges to teaching and our campus in general.
- All minors are available at any campus as long as they have the courses to support the minor. ACUE is working to rename some of the minors that have the same names, but different requirements.

VI. **Report from the University Council Representative – James Ruiz**

The April 2013 Commonwealth Caucus discussion with Angela Linse Executive Director and Associate Dean Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence on the lagging response rate of online SRTes. The take-away points are contained below.

- The commonly held belief that 67% was the necessary response rate for SRTEs to be considered valid is a myth. At one time, the 67% was a recommendation, but even that was withdrawn. However, it was not established as to what was the necessary response rate for them to be considered valid.
- Schreyer is unable to generate summary reports on SRTEs because it does not have the funding and programmers to build the reporting tool. A Memo of Understanding was sent to Dr. Bowen asking for that support.
- Other summary data, such as the reporting of median scores and modes, is prohibited by Senate policy.
Faculty members are the ones responsible for interpreting the SRTEs but she did not say that others could not do the same. It seemed she was encouraging faculty to examine their scores and help others understand them.
- Although with the overall response rate has declined to $\pm 50\%$ since the implementation of the online SRTE process, the average scores had not changed overall. She stated there has been a slight increase in the scores. She stated there is no evidence that the results are not representative.
- Dr. Linse has agreed to respond to questions from the University Senate regarding concerns about the online SRTEs. Should anyone have any questions or concerns about the online SRTEs, please send them to me Jim Ruiz jmr33@psu.edu that they may be compiled and passed on to Dr. Linse.

Senate Self-Study on Senate Organization, Senate Administrative Offices, Senate Reports, Communication, Membership and Engagement, and Transparency

Perhaps the most important accomplishment of former Senate President Larry Backer is the legislation generated by a Senate self-study. Dr. Mohamad Ansari (Berks) chaired this committee and below are the seven recommendations that were proposed and passed by the University Senate as a result of this study.

- Recommendation 1. The Self-Study Committee recommends an amendment of the Bylaws, Article II - Senate Council, Section 1c to empower the Senate Council to make the decision on whether an informational report, mandated or otherwise, is to be placed on the agenda for presentation and discussion or is to be placed on the agenda only and disseminated to the Senate and the University Community.
- Recommendation 2. The Self-Study Committee recommends an amendment of the Standing Rules, Article II - Senate Committee Structure, Section 6 to empower the Standing Committees to approve mandated informational reports for publication to the Senate agenda. The Standing Committees shall continue to send all Informational Reports to the Senate Council.
- Recommendation 3. The Self-Study Committee recommends creation of a link on the Senate website, next to the links to Agendas and Records, for the online delivery of all Informational reports. The Senate office shall continue to archive these reports for future long-term reference.
- Recommendation 4. The Self-Study Committee recommends establishment of a Senate Discussion Forum.

- Recommendation 5. The Self-Study Committee recommends an amendment of the Bylaws Article I – Officers, Section 5 to expand the duties of the Secretary of the Senate to include, “The Secretary in consultation with other Senate Officers shall review and disseminate issues of serious concern, from the Senate Discussion Forum, to the Senate Council.”
- Recommendation 6. The Self-Study Committee recommends an amendment of the Bylaws, Article III – Election to the Senate, to revise Section 7 as set forth herein.

SECTION 7

Duties of Senators:

- Attendance at the Senate plenary meetings. Absence at three or more plenary meetings in a single academic year, if repeated in the subsequent academic year, the senator may resign if he or she wishes, but otherwise shall be replaced by the unit’s alternate representative. This provision does not pertain to sabbatical, medical, other leaves of absence, or otherwise absence related to professional responsibilities.
 - Attendance at the assigned standing committee meetings.
 - Communication between the University Faculty Senate and the unit faculty governance organization, pertaining to the activities of the committee to which the senator is assigned.
- Recommendation 7. The Self-Study Committee recommends that the Office of the University Faculty Senate shall directly communicate, on all Senate matters as appropriate, with faculty governance leaders to be followed by the same with deans or chancellors, when appropriate. The Senate office shall send pertinent documents directly to the relevant elected leaders of faculty governance units with copies to deans or chancellors, when appropriate.
 - Recommendation 8. The Self-Study Committee recommends establishment of a Senate Newswire (or equivalent), which shall replace the current Senate Newsletter.

Revision to Senate Policy 67-00, Section 5(2) Athletic Schedules Monitoring Student-Athlete Time Absent from Class

Original

Athletic teams or individual team members shall be allowed to be absent from the University for no more than seventy-five class periods in one semester. The number of class periods missed shall be kept on record by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee and the respective athletic departments. It shall be the joint responsibility of those bodies to enforce these limitations.

Revised

Athletic teams or individual team members shall be allowed to be absent from the University for no more than ~~seventy-five class periods~~ **eight class days** in one semester. **A full class day will be counted as absent if student-athletes are absent from classes prior to noon. A half-day will be counted as absent if student-athletes are absent from classes between noon and 2:15 p.m. Student-athlete absences after 2:15 p.m. or for championship competitions would not count towards the eight class day total.** The number of class ~~periods~~ days missed shall be kept on record by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee and the respective athletic departments. It shall be the joint responsibility of those bodies to enforce these limitations.

VII. Recommended Committee Charges for the 2013-2014 Academic Year

Academic Affairs Committee

- Maintain the Course and Program Proposal Handbook developed for faculty members (preferably on the college website)
- Continue to collaborate with the developers of the on-line program proposal system to assure that campus-specific issues continue to be addressed in the system
- Assist in the roll-out of the on-line program proposal system, when completed
- Organize additional CSCS training sessions for PSH faculty

Athletics Committee

- Continue to evaluate the current communication process between athletes and faculty regarding absences from classes.
- Address the issue of needing athletic tutoring from the learning center for athletes missing classes due to contests, especially 300 and 400 level courses or labs.
- The Athletic Department and teams are in the beginning stages of competition as a Division III institution. Therefore, it is imperative that we begin to review how to integrate athletics into the campus community.
- Inform the campus faculty and staff about the responsibilities of being a Division III school.

Enrollment Management and Outreach

- Connect with other committees or groups assessing students' needs and request to streamline data collection process
- Continue data collection through surveys or focus groups
- Address student requests through action steps
- Provide focus group data to the incoming faculty senate president and incoming EMOC chair
- Work with the Marketing department to develop better communication between the schools and their office

Faculty Affairs Committee

- Work with the administration to update the summer compensation policy to include wording related to non-teaching activities
- Determine ways to get the faculty more involved in governance (UP Faculty Senate, Capital College Faculty Senate and committees)
- Examine the impact of larger class sizes on faculty and support staff
- How can faculty prepare for the larger populations of international students

Human Resources and Business Services Committee

- Review policy regarding naming conventions of events and traditions across campuses with the impact on inclusion and exclusion of various groups
- Review business policy for faculty copy and scanning allowances. In addition, review policy for security and retention of documents on printers and scanners.
- Review business center policies to facilitate efficiencies and timeliness regarding copies.

Information and Technology Committee

International and Intercultural Affairs Committee

- Hold focus sessions with international students to determine their specific needs and desires for programs. Of special concern is how the college can help improve the experience of international students at PSH.
- Serve as a body for guiding the strategic planning and curricular integration of international programming for the College.
- Assist faculty in infusing internationalization into their courses and programs.

Physical Plant Committee

- Hold a campus-wide forum in October 2013, similar to that held in spring 2012, to update the campus community on developments in the physical plant, IT, and Student Services, once again inviting Ed Dankanich, John Hoh, and Don Holtzman to participate.
- Evaluate the campus-center smoking ban, an initiative that has now failed, by committee observation. If the ban is to continue, a clear line of enforcement is essential.
- Work with Ed Dankanich, John Hoh, and their offices, to carry out the process of planning the repurposing of the spaces in Olmsted to be vacated when labs and classes move to the EAB in 2014. Have each school's committee representative serve as a conduit for that school's faculty to express ideas and needs.

Strategic Planning Committee

- Begin working in the planning process for the college strategic plan during the 2013-14 AY. Seek assistance from the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor in this endeavor.

Student Affairs Committee

- Explore topics that could be addressed during the first-year seminars to benefit the students.
- Explore ways to adjust common hour scheduling to enable SGA members to participate in other clubs and prevent faculty and students from missing concurrently scheduled meetings.
- Explore the possibility of inviting student members to serve on the Student Affairs Committee rather than appointing them in an effort to improve student attendance.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

/slp