

Penn State Harrisburg
Faculty Senate & Academic Council Agenda
Tuesday, October 25, 2011
Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room C300
11:50-1:20 p.m.

- A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING
Approval of Senate Minutes September 20, 2011 Appendix "A"
- B. APPROVAL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Approval of Academic Affairs Minutes September 27, 2011 Appendix "B"
Approval of Academic Affairs Minutes October 18, 2011 Appendix "C"
- C. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE
- D. REPORT OF THE SENATE PRESIDENT
- E. COMMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR
- F. COMMENTS FROM THE UNIV. COUNCIL REP
- G. FORENSIC BUSINESS
- H. NEW BUSINESS Appendix "D"
Oranee Tawatnuntachai – Penn State Harrisburg Honors Program
- I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
- J. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS
- K. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS
Faculty Affair Committee Minutes September 22, 2011 Appendix "E"
Human Resources and Business Services Committee Appendix "F"
Minutes October 19, 2011
- L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
- M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE COLLEGE

NOTE: The next meeting – Thursday, December 8, 2011 – 11:50am-1:20pm Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room

APPENDIX "A"

CAPITAL COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE MINUTES September 20, 2011

Attendees:

Capital College Senators: S. Agili, P. Burrowes, R. Gray, J. Harris, R. Luquis, G. McGuigan, G. Morcol, M. Strickland, J. Wilburne, S. Winch, and S. Wolpert

Administrators Present: M. Kulkarni, O. Ansary

Absent: J. Ruiz, University Senate representative

Robert Gray, Faculty Senate President opened the meeting at 12:08 p.m.

A. Minutes Approval for Faculty Senate Meeting

R. Gray requested a motion to approve the minutes from the August 25, 2011 meeting. A motion was made by Harris/Wolpert to approve the minutes and they were unanimously approved.

B. Minutes Approval for Academic Affairs Meeting

R. Gray requested a motion to approve the minutes from the Academic Affairs Meeting on August 30, 2011 meeting. A motion was made by Luquis/Agili to approve the minutes and they were unanimously approved.

C. Communications to the Senate

1. S. Wolpert received a complaint from a faculty member that their college committee has not met. R. Gray mentioned one committee is still in need of a chair.
2. S. Agili noted some issues and problems with IT specifically with respect to software updates and site licenses being renewed automatically. M. Kulkarni suggested representatives from Faculty Senate meet with the Director of IT to discuss some of the concerns/problems and possible solutions. R. Gray and S. Agili will represent the Faculty Senate and meet with the IT director. Any Senators who have issues from their schools regarding IT should bring these to the attention of R. Gray and S. Agili.
3. G. Morcol discussed problems with computers and Internet capability in classrooms at the East Gate facility. M. Kulkarni stated that plans to upgrade and add technology in that building are being worked out.
4. M. Strickland noted that some communication issues arose during the recent flood. She asked if there are protocols to distribute information. M. Kulkarni shared information on how decisions were made to close campus and how the campus community was notified. Some issues with individuals receiving late or no text

- messages were due the cell phone providers or the physical location on campus where individuals had little or no service. M. Kulkarni will look into the possibility of news flashes posted on the monitors on campus for immediate information. M. Kulkarni noted that the office received a lot of positive comments regarding how the campus reacted to issues that arose due to the serious flooding in the area. R. Gray suggested that the campus looks at lessons that can be learned from the recent flooding situations.
5. M. Kulkarni commented that the campus provided free bottles of water to students in campus housing when the boil water advisory was in effect. This was made possible due to the generosity of Pepsi.

D. Report of the Senate President

1. R. Gray reported he was asked to have the Senate look at grade inflation and the trends over the past ten years. He would like to look at the grade inflation report that was submitted to the Faculty Affairs Committee in 2005.
2. The School Directors have requested that a campus-wide policy for faculty office hours be established. R. Gray suggested this be added to the Faculty Affairs committee's list of charges.
3. Nominations for the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies are being sought.
4. The School Directors have asked whether a campus Tenure and Promotion Recognition Event could be organized every year. R. Gray suggested this be added to the Faculty Affairs committee's list of charges.

E. Comments by the Chancellor

1. M. Kulkarni stated PSH is still the top Commonwealth Campus in terms of the number of students enrolled.
2. M. Kulkarni noted that there will be a decline in populations in various regions across Pennsylvania that will affect some campuses. The population declines may affect PSH as well, therefore, we need to think about this. What is special about PSH? Consider potential recruiting strategies.
3. Penn State Harrisburg's International and Honors Programs have significantly increased this year. Outside of U. Park, PSH has the largest international student population. We need to keep their needs/cultural backgrounds in mind, especially in situations such as the recent flood, holidays, and social and cultural activities.
4. The expansion to the EAB has been approved by the Board of Trustees. With the increasing enrollment on our campus, especially in STEM and business programs, there has been a need for more engineering and science labs. Relocating the labs from Olmsted to EAB will allow for restructuring rooms to accommodate meeting spaces and additional classrooms. The EAB groundbreaking is scheduled for Fall, 2012.
5. Space is an issue on our campus. Four temporary classrooms will be situated in the parking lot next to the Special Events Room by December 2011. While this is a temporary fix, it will allow us additional space until we develop other options.

6. M. Kulkarni stated that a meeting was recently held with counselors and representatives from 12 community colleges to discuss PSH programs, articulation agreements, and to promote opportunities to build relationships and share information.

F. Comments from the University Council Representative – J. Ruiz

Ruiz was not able to attend. However, he sent an email to Senate representatives regarding the new Health Benefits package.

G. Forensic Business

None

H. New Business

None

I. Unfinished Business

None

J. Legislative Reports

None

K. Advisory/Consultative Reports

None

L. New Legislative Business

None

M. Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the College

A motion to adjourn was made by Agili/Wolpert at 1:30pm.

The next meeting of the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate Tuesday, October 25, 2011
– 11:50am to 1:20pm Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room.

/jmw

**MINUTES
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Tuesday, September 27, 2011
11:50 – 1:20 P.M.**

Members present: Qiang Bu, Y. Frank Chen, Rick Ciocchi, Greg Crawford, Scott Lewis, Linda Null, David Witwer

Invited guests: Margo Boman, Katina Moten

Senate Liaison:

1. L. Null, chair, opened the meeting at 11:50am.
2. **Minutes Approval for August 30, 2011 meeting** - Ciocchi made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Chen and unanimously approved by the committee.
3. **Approval of Courses/Programs Proposals:**
 - a. ACCTG 461 International Accounting – Jean Harris –
This is a change in prerequisite from ACCTG 221 to ACCTG 471 and ACCTG 472. A motion was made by Crawford/Witwer to approve and was unanimously approved by the committee. It was noted that a grammatical error was made in the justification. Dr. Harris will work with Stephanie to resolve the matter.
 - b. PUBPL 495 Internship – Carol Nechemias
This is a minor change dealing with the range of credits. The minimum will be changed from 3 credits to 1 credit. The range makes it consistent with other Penn State internships. A motion was made by Ciocchi/Crawford to approve and was unanimously approved by the committee. It was noted that the justification should be reworded.
 - c. Integrated Undergraduate and Graduate Computer Science Program – Linda Null
This program would allow a student to receive both a Bachelor’s degree and a Master’s degree in 5 years. Twelve credits of undergraduate work can overlap into the Graduate program. Witwer asked about the admissions requirements and the wording used. “A typical student would apply after completing between 45 to 60 credits, that is, after the fourth semester and before the end of the fifth semester.” He suggested that “typical” should be removed. Null agreed. A motion was made by Crawford/Chen to approve and was unanimously approved by the committee. (Upon consultation with the Computer Science committee, they will be leaving “typical student in the proposal.”
4. Meetings for the Fall 2011 Semester:
Tuesday, October 18, 2011 W207 11:50am-1:20pm
Tuesday, December 6, 2011 W207 11:50am-1:20pm

Adjournment at 12:12pm

**MINUTES
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Tuesday, October 18, 2011
11:50 – 1:20 P.M.**

Members present: Rick Ciocchi, Greg Crawford, Scott Lewis, Linda Null, Barbara Sims, David Witwer

Non-voting Ex Officio Member: Marian Walters

Invited guests: Margo Boman, Katina Moten, Matthew Wilson

Senate Liaison:

5. L. Null, chair, opened the meeting at 11:50am.
6. **Minutes Approval for September 27, 2011 meeting** - Sims made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Witwer and unanimously approved by the committee.
7. **Approval of Courses/Programs Proposals:**
 - d. EDUC 406 Human Sexuality – Raffy Luquis
The main purpose of this change is to make the course a Health Education course. Although this is currently an Education course, Education does not offer it. HLHED is only offered at Penn State Harrisburg. It was recommended that a longer course description be provided, as University Park is now looking for that. As proposed, the course was to be changed to a General Education course, however, after some discussion, it was agreed that that designation should be removed since the course is a 400 level course. A motion was made by Ciocchi/Sims to approve with changes. It was unanimously approved by the committee.
 - e. MA SC 505 Concrete Mathematics – Linda Null
All undergraduate courses with MA SC prefix, originally at the Capital College, were eliminated after the UCA process several years ago. This proposal would change MA SC 505 to a COMP course. The title is also being changed from Concrete Math to Computation Theory to better reflect the content of the course. Additionally, the prerequisite will be changed since MA SC 370 is now MATH 315. A motion was made by Sims/Witwer and was approved unanimously.
 - f. COMP 511 Design and Analysis of Algorithms – Linda Null
The only change is the listing of prerequisites, the removal of MA SC 505. This originally was a prereq due to the large number of students taking the course from various backgrounds. This is no longer the case. A motion was made by Ciocchi/Witwer and was approved unanimously.
 - g. COMP 520 Advance Artificial Intelligence – Linda Null
The current prerequisite, COMP 511 is no longer needed due to the recent trend in enrollment in the program. The prereq will be changed to CMPSC 463 will better reflect the material needed to prepare for the course. A motion was made by Sims/Ciocchi and was approved unanimously.
8. Update from University Park Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs – M. Wilson

Currently courses with embedded study tours are being discussed. Courses with a travel component will have to travel during the semester, due to insurance and liability issues. Students must be enrolled for at least .5 credits to be able to participate in the study tour. All current courses being offered Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 are exempt at this time. The university is trying to establish rules regarding the offering of minors at any campus. Currently, any minor can be offered at any campus, as long as that campus has the resources to complete the minor. There are many duplicate minors, since each college had to create their own. If a student would like to take a minor from another campus, they must make a request of the college that created the minor and must have approval to make course substitutions.

9. Update from the Graduate School – M. Walters

The Graduate School is changing enrollment for Certificate Programs. Students wishing to receive a certificate will have to complete the application process so that the certificate and the courses show up on their transcript. In the past, only the programs kept records of certificate completion and this was becoming a problem.

10. Meetings for the Fall 2011 Semester:

Thursday, December 1, 2011 W207 11:50am-1:20pm (PLEASE NOTE DATE CHANGE DUE TO HOLIDAY GATHERING)

Adjournment at 12:25pm

/slp

Schreyer Honors College (SHC) and Harrisburg Honors Program (HHP) Admission and Program Requirements

Requirements	SHC	HHP
Admission	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3.7 cumulative GPA• 3.7 semester GPA for rising sophomores and 3.5 semester GPA for rising juniors• Have four semesters remaining.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3.5 cumulative GPA• Have two to three semesters remaining, depending on majors.
Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain a semester and cumulative GPA of 3.4.• Complete 14 honors credits during junior/senior years (no more than six credits of thesis).• Submit a thesis proposal one year prior to graduation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain a semester and cumulative GPA of 3.3.• Complete 14 honors credits during junior/senior years, including HONOR 301H; HONOR 494H (Service learning); HONOR 494M/5H (Thesis preparation); and HONOR 496H (Thesis).• Submit a thesis proposal one semester prior to graduation.

Pros and Cons for One and Two Tracks at Junior-Senior Level

	Two tracks (SHC and HHP)	One track (SHC)
Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HHP accepts applications in fall and spring (SHC does not). Therefore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HHP accommodates transfer students. ○ HHP accommodates students who have only three semesters remaining. • HHP accommodates students whose cumulative GPAs are between 3.5 and 3.7. • HHP accommodates students whose semester GPAs are below 3.5, but cumulative GPAs are still above 3.7. • The 4-year HHP allows bright students to continue participating in honors activities whether or not they are admitted to Schreyer. • The 4-year HHP preserves ideals and strengths specific to Penn State Harrisburg, such as providing credit for service learning (HONOR 493H) and interdisciplinary coursework (HONOR 301H). HHP can also be modified to meet evolving and future needs. This would be lost with a one-track program. • Honors courses and sections are more likely to be filled, since more students are eligible to take them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One program is easier to explain to students, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders. • Require fewer resources such as honors sections, honors options, honors courses, thesis readers, and filed trips.
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HHP might be perceived as inferior. The existence of two programs, differences in GPA requirements, and substantially more funding available through SHC might imply one program is “better” than another. They are actually two distinct options to suit different needs of our students. • Larger number of students taking honors options may overload faculty teaching those courses. • Larger number of students writing theses may overload faculty readers. • Need more resources such as honors sections, honors options, honors courses, and filed trips. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 63% of Harrisburg’s current honors students would not qualify at all and many more would not be admitted. • SHC only accepts applications once per year. Therefore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Very challenging to accommodate transfer students. ○ Cannot accommodate students who have fewer than four semesters remaining. • Cannot accommodate students whose cumulative GPAs are between 3.5 and 3.7 • Cannot accommodate students with semester GPAs below 3.5 (even if cumulative GPAs are still above 3.7)) • Fewer eligible students may lead to difficulty in filling honors courses. • SHC requirements cannot be modified.

Honors applications from sophomores, juniors and seniors who will graduate from Penn State Harrisburg

	Total		Current students – spring 2011 admission		Current students – fall 2011 admission		Transfer – fall 2011 admission	
	Applications	NQ*	Applications	NQ*	Applications	NQ*	Applications	NQ*
Total	54	23 (43%)	23	11	19	9	12	3
BSED	15	5 (33%)	4	2	6	2	5	1
SBA	14	6 (43%)	9	5	2	1	3	0
SHUM	7	3 (43%)	1	1	5	1	1	1
SPA	6	3 (50%)	4	1	2	2	-	-
SET	12	6 (50%)	5	2	4	3	3	1

*Not qualified for Schreyer Honors College based on GPA.

Based on fall 2011 and spring 2011 application data, how many students would be affected if only one track were offered?

- Based on GPA, 23 students would not be qualified (43% of 54 applications).
- Based on GPA, essay and dateline, 34 students would not be admitted (63% of 54 applications).
- Based on GPA, 9 current seniors are not qualified for SHC.
 - With two tracks, 19 seniors write theses (4 BSED; 6 SBA; 6 SHA; 1 SPA; 2 SET)
 - With one track – 10 seniors write theses (3 BSED; 2 SBA; 5 SHA); 7 are transfer students.

Statistics for the College

	Juniors/seniors (as of spring 2011 GPA)			Transfer students (offered for fall 2011 admission)			Total
	GPA 3.7+	GPA 3.5+	Difference	GPA 3.7+	GPA 3.5+	Difference	Difference
# of students	285	469	184	42	83	41	225
20% apply/accept	57	94	37	8	17	9	46
15% apply/accept	43	70	28	6	12	6	34
10% apply/accept	29	47	18	4	8	4	22

Based on the College's admission data, how many students would be affected if only one track were offered?

- Based on GPA alone, between 22 and 46 would not be qualified for SHC.

**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes
September 22, 2011
Olmsted Building, W-207, 11:50 a.m. – 1:20 p.m.**

In attendance: D. Boisvert, T. Buttross, S. Chang, G. Morcol, S. Poyrazli, S. Rudrabhatla, and C. Sabina

Guest: R. Luquis, president-elect of the Faculty Senate

- 1) The committee reviewed the three charges that we initially received from the Faculty Senate Committee. Lengthy discussion took place for charge #1 and charge #2.
 - a. Charge #1: “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.”

The committee discussed the Research Council Grants and the type and level of services the research graduate office provides. While recognizing many positive aspects of this office, the committee came up with a few preliminary suggestions to address other needs the faculty have:

- 1) The application process for the Research Council Grants (RCGs) could be streamlined further to lessen the bureaucracy and to help the faculty members develop familiarity with the grants administered by agencies similar to NSF, NIH, or NIMH;

- 2) The RCG amount (\$7500) falls short for many of the projects undertaken by the faculty members in science, engineering, and technology type programs. 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; and

- 3) A grant writer for our campus could be appointed. This person could help the faculty members with grant writing, paying specific attention to how the grant is written. 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 the organization of the content.

We will generate a list of recommendations related to this charge.

- b. Charge #2: “Investigate what promotion and tenure advantages faculty have for publishing a patent application, and obtaining a US patent.”

The committee first discussed the patent application process. A faculty member is not able to apply for a patent on his or her own. They must first submit their patent application to the Penn State Harrisburg graduate research office. Dr. Walter’s office then sends the application to another office at University Park.

This office's operating budget is \$250,000 a year. A patent application can cost up to \$20,000. This office decides which patents may be most important and how many patents they can file considering the budget they have. Once a faculty member submits a patent application to this office, it takes around 10 months before the faculty member learns if the university will file the patent application. While waiting on this decision, no data can be published. 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 could 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.

Our 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.
- 3) Consider requesting the patent office at University Park to expedite review of patent submissions from faculty in their tenure review year and or the year prior to tenure review.

We will generate a list of more comprehensive recommendations for this charge.

- 2) The committee reviewed the additional new charges we received. Please see the agenda attached to this document for details.
 - a. Creation of a campus-wide office-hour statement: The committee worked on an initial statement. We will modify this statement to produce a final version before the end of this academic year.

“The faculty members are expected to have office hours and be available to their students. The type (in-office versus online; or a combination of both) and number of office hours should be determined by each school. Faculty teaching online courses are expected to follow the World Campus policy. Individual schools will decide how to implement a relevant policy for full-time vs. part-time faculty or based on the number of courses different faculty members may teach.”
 - b. Recognizing newly tenured and promoted faculty members on our campus: Our current recognition is through an announcement at the all-college meeting. Some suggestions the committee thought can be considered are:

- i. Have these faculty members sit in the first row during the all-college day and perhaps give them a special gift at this meeting,
- ii. Provide a separate luncheon/reception, or
- iii. Have these faculty members recognized again in their first school meeting during the academic year and have a cake that is supplied by the college (i.e., chancellor's office).

Dr. Poyrazli will speak with Dr. Kulkarni to finalize these suggestions.

- c. Grade inflation on our campus: Some discussion took place regarding previous efforts on our campus to look into the issue of grade inflation.. A committee member thought a study was conducted by the University Faculty Senate several years ago. In addition, the Faculty Affairs Committee in 2008 generated a report. Dr. Poyrazli will get a copy of these reports so that we can determine how to approach this new charge.

Actions:

- 1) The subcommittee for Charge #1 will generate a list of recommendations. The subcommittee includes Drs. Sukmoon Chang, Danielle Boisvert, and Sairam Rudrabhatla.
- 2) The subcommittee for Charge #2 will generate a list of recommendations. The subcommittee includes Drs. Sairam Rudrabhatla (chair) and Chiara Sabina.
- 3) Dr. Senel Poyrazli will check to see if indeed the World Campus has an office-policy statement. Depending on the answer, the statement for new charge (a) will be modified.
- 4) Dr. Senel Poyrazli will speak with Dr. Kulkarni to finalize suggestions for new charge (b).
- 5) Dr. Senel Poyrazli will track down a copy of the grade inflation report generated by the Faculty Affairs Committee in 2008 and the University Faculty Senate grade inflation study, if it exists.

Human Resources and Business Services Committee
Meeting Minutes - October 19, 2011

1. Members in attendance: Michael Stefany, Jennifer Albert, Rich Young, Peg Lohman, Anita Mareno, Chon Kim, Lu Zang, Raven Harrison
2. Discussion of Committee Charges:

Three charges were presented by the Faculty Senate leadership to the committee for its consideration: (a) examine possible benefits of the new Amtrak station for PSH faculty/staff/students, (b) work with the bookstore to review its services to the PSH community, and (c) review policies for the enhancement of a work climate that supports individual differences and promotes fairness and equity. The committee began its work by discussing which of these charges to focus on in the 2011-12 academic year. Committee members discussed issues that they believed were germane to each of the three charges and may warrant further study. Issues discussed included:

 - (a) Amtrak:
 - Need to develop a better understanding of the design plan for the station, including accessibility considerations (e.g. sidewalks, transportation to/from campus).
 - Assess faculty, staff, and student need and interest in using the train station. For example, students may be interested in using train to go into downtown Harrisburg.
 - Coordination of train services with other modes of mass transportation (e.g. CAT) and explore incentives for using these modes of travel.
 - With respect to faculty, it would be useful to learn more about the number of faculty interested in commuting via train and parking capacities for stations along train routes.
 - Investigate the possibility for reduced train fares for PSH employees and students.
 - (b) Bookstore:
 - Cost of textbooks and the pros/cons of switching to e-books.
 - Issues related to the availability of international editions of textbooks.
 - Process for acquiring desk copies of textbooks.
 - (c) Work Climate:
 - Inventory current diversity policies to examine their alignment with each other and the degree to which they promote a climate that supports diversity as well as fairness and equity.

In addition to the three aforementioned charges, the possibility of reviewing the state budgeting and funding process was discussed, specifically in relation to examining current business systems to assess their responsiveness to the needs of the college and its staff.
3. Committee Tasks and Assignments – The committee decided to focus its work on examining possible benefits of the new Amtrak station for PSH faculty/staff/students. Toward that end, it was decided that a prudent next step is for the committee is to learn more about the construction/development plans that are underway for the station. Rich Young volunteered to contact a colleague at the physical plant who has knowledge of the

Amtrak station project and invite him to our next committee meeting. We will also identify a representative from Amtrak to attend the same meeting so that we can learn from both parties more about the evolving plans for the train station. After this informational meeting, the committee will decide on the concerns that it would like to examine in order to enhance opportunities for PSH employees and students to use and enjoy the services that will be offered by the new train station.

4. Schedule – Representatives from the physical plant and Amtrak will be contacted to inform them of the committee's charge. The committee will invite these individuals to its next meeting, which will be held in three to five weeks.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Peg Lohman on 10/21/11.