

Penn State Harrisburg
Faculty Senate & Academic Council Agenda
Thursday, March 22, 2012
Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room C300
11:50-1:20 p.m.

- A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING
Approval of Senate Minutes February 21, 2012 Appendix "A"
- B. APPROVAL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Approval of the March 15, 2012 Minutes Appendix "B"
- 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
Presentation of Hybrid and Online Courses – Carol McQuiggan Appendix "C"
- I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
- J. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS
- K. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS
Minutes from Human Resources and Business Services Committee
February 15, 2012 Appendix "D"
- L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
- M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE COLLEGE

NOTE: The next meeting – Thursday, April 19, 2012 – 11:50am-1:20pm Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room

CAPITAL COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE
JOINT MEETING WITH ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES
February 21, 2012

Attendees:

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

Administrators Present: M. Kulkarni, O. Ansary, S. Peterson, S. Schappe, J. Shoup, C. Surra, K. Robinson, G. Crawford, P. Idowu, M. Walters

Absent: P. Burrowes, J. Harris, J. Ruiz, S. Wolpert

Robert Gray, Faculty Senate President opened the meeting at 11:56 a.m.

A. Minutes Approval for Faculty Senate Meeting

Gray requested a motion to approve the minutes from the January 19, 2012 meeting. A motion was made by Morcol/Strickland to approve the minutes and they were unanimously approved.

B. Minutes Approval for Academic Affairs Meeting

Gray requested a motion to approve the minutes from the Academic Affairs Meeting on January 26, 2012 meeting. R. Luquis noted incomplete information in the minutes regarding the Masters of Education in Teaching and Curriculum program. The minutes were not approved and will be sent back to the committee for clarification.

C. Communications to the Senate

1. R. Luquis noted Stephanie will be sending out a request for nominations for President Elect for Faculty Senate soon.

D. Report of the Senate President

1. R. Gray reported he received no feedback from the Senators on the Core Council report so he assumed the report was OK with faculty.
2. R. Gray noted two forums were held in January: Child Abuse and Reporting Forum, and a Physical Plant Forum. He thanked Raffy for his work in arranging and leading the Child Abuse Forum. Both forums were well attended.
3. R. Gray announced the results of the election for the University Senate Representative. James Ruiz will remain as our University Senate Representative.
4. R. Gray also noted he participated in a Faculty Governance Leaders Video Conference on Feb. 10 with the Presidents of Faculty Senate from 18 other campuses. He found the experience very informative and enlightening. The group will arrange for similar type conferences in the future. Two main issues discussed were: Core Council recommendations and campus athletics.

5. R. Gray reported he will be meeting with the Penn State Harrisburg Board of Advisors and plans to inform them of the opportunities we may provide for them with students, facilities, and faculty. His focus will be on briefing the board of our college faculty senate organization and to share two of his goals regarding faculty and student engagement in the support of the local and regional economy, and the need to define and set minimum standards throughout our college senate committees to help improve the overall quality of our institution.
6. R. Gray brought the issue of Service to the table to have a conversation among the Faculty Senators and Academic Council representatives. A lengthy discussion ensued with respect to how Service is viewed across the campus and the need to engage more faculty in Service activities. It was decided that a future discussion needed to be planned to clarify issues related to Service such as: What is expected for P&T?, convincing faculty of the intrinsic value of Service, and the need to have faculty participate for the good of the College.

E. Comments by the Chancellor

1. Kulkarni stated the retention number for students looks good for our campus. Approximately 70% of freshmen remain at our campus. Several strategies to promote retention are in place including: a.) Accepting more applicants who indicate Penn State Harrisburg as their first choice campus, b.) Improving physical and athletic facilities and promoting more athletic events and activities, and c.) Encouraging faculty and staff to reach out to students to help them feel connected to the campus.
2. Kulkarni, along with other Penn State Chancellors and Deans, met with the Board of Trustees for a discussion on moving forward in these difficult times referring to both financial difficulties and the Sandusky scandal. He noted President Erickson's main task is to keep tuition costs from skyrocketing.
3. Kulkarni noted the recent data indicate the number of freshman applications for Penn State is 2% higher than at the same time last year. This is good news for all campuses.

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

Ruiz was not able to attend.

G. Forensic Business

None

H. New Business

The presentation on Hybrid and Online Classes was postponed until the next meeting.

I. Unfinished Business

None

J. Legislative Reports

None

K. Advisory/Consultative Reports

Minutes from Faculty Affairs Committee-February 14, 2012 and
Minutes from Student Affairs Committee –January 24, 2012 were accepted.

L. New Legislative Business

None

M. Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the College

A motion to adjourn was made by Morcol/Winch at 1:24pm.

The next meeting of the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate Thursday, March 22, 2012
– 11:50am to 1:20pm Madlyn Hanes Executive Conference Room.

/jmw

**MINUTES
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Thursday, March 15, 2012
11:50 – 12:35 P.M.**

Members present: Qiang Bu, Y. Frank Chen, Rick Ciocci, Linda Null, David Witwer

Student present: Laura Brenner

Non-voting Ex Officio Member: Peter Idowu

Invited guests: Katina Moten, Richard Young

1. L. Null opened the meeting at 11:50am.
2. **Minutes Approval for January 26, 2012 meeting** – The minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed, a motion to accept was made by Witwer/Ciocci, and the minutes were unanimously approved.
3. **Approval of Courses/Programs Proposals:**
 - a. English Program Change – Patricia Johnson
The Core Council recommended that the English major at Penn State Harrisburg be changed from Bachelor of Humanities to Bachelor of Arts. The specific degree requirements in English for the General English and Secondary Education options will remain the same. The only changes deal with the number of elective credits available in each option.
Null questioned the change of BA electives. The number of credits is dependent on the number of foreign language credits that the student will need to complete. None of the courses completed for the BA are required for the major. After discussion, it was concluded that no changes needed to be made to that area.
Moten mentioned that students would like to take a major-related course in the third semester rather than wait until the fifth semester. Johnson agreed and will move a 200-level course to the third semester.
Witwer/Bu motioned to approve the program with the above suggestions and the committee unanimously approved.
 - b. BA/MA American Studies IUG – Simon Bronner
The Core Council has recommended that programs with both undergraduate and graduate degrees begin offering IUG's. The American Studies department has been considering this idea for several years.
Several concerns were addressed. In the sample sequence of coursework for the IUG, AM ST 491W is offered in the first and second year. A 400-level course should not be offered in the first year. (Additionally, when reviewing the course on the University Bulletin, it was found that AM ST 491W has a prerequisite of seventh semester standing.) The chart needs to be updated to reflect any changes in course offerings and credits and to match the suggested plan of study in the Student Handbook on page 8 of the proposal.

Instead of a separate bulletin for the IUG program itself, an updated bulletin for the undergraduate program as well as one for the graduate program should be submitted.

There was also some confusion as to which courses would double count for the BA/MA. It was recommended that the courses be bolded, rather than starred. There are 12 credits that can be double counted. It was also recommended that in the fifth year, the schedule show AM ST 580 or AM ST 600 (project or thesis) to cover both options.

Chen questioned the admission requirements of an overall GPA of 3.2 in undergraduate coursework and a GPA at or above 3.5 in all coursework completed for the American Studies major. Chen's school is trying to do an IUG and similar admission requirements were questioned. Bronner stated that he followed other IUG's regarding that information. Discussion ensued as to the requirements students must satisfy once they are in the program, and if the students could simply follow the rules of the graduate school (GPA of 3.0 or better). The Student Handbook should be updated to include this information. Also, a copy of the requirements for the MA degree should be included with the requirements for the BA on page 7.

Null stated that the entire document should be paginated from beginning to end, including the consultation. In the table for consultation at the beginning of the document, it was noted that one entry for consultation was missing.

Ciocci/Chen made a motion to approve with suggested changes and the motion was unanimously approved.

Changes to the Ph.D. American Studies program will be reviewed at the next meeting.

4. New Business

Null suggested that it would be beneficial to have a flow chart regarding the process to be followed when developing IUG programs. Rich Young will look into seeing if something is available.

5. Meetings for Spring 2012

Tuesday, April 10, 2012 W207 Olmsted 11:50am

Adjournment at 12:35pm

Hybrid Courses Guideline A-9

Purpose

To deliver administratively approved “hybrid courses” that facilitate instruction in which structured on-line experiences through course management software and other media reinforce campus-based learning.

Introduction

Hybrid courses utilize digital technology to enhance learning with multimedia sources; allow for multiple learning strategies; comply with University policies concerning access; include flexible scheduling; integrate campus-based, off-campus, technology-based learning, and student-faculty interaction; and broaden the concept of learning communities. Because of the integrative function of hybrid courses, they typically require more advance planning for the instructor than in a course solely devoted to on-campus or online instruction.

Guidelines

Defining a hybrid course: “Hybrid courses are specific packages of online and face-to-face content and processes organized to reduce or replace the number of required class sessions in order to improve effectiveness and flexibility for instructors and students and/or to achieve other efficiencies. Hybrid courses reduce by approximately 40% or more of the number of required classroom sessions, although some classroom sessions are required” (University Registrar–ARUAC–Schedule Course Section: <http://www.registrar.psu.edu/staff/isis/aruac.cfm#web>). These courses might also be called blended courses. The schedule of courses designates hybrid courses by listing the in-class meeting time (e.g. T 9-10:15AM) on the first line of the course listing and AND WEB on the second line of the course listing. *To inform students fully of the structure of the hybrid course, a hot link from the course schedule would allow for students to see the syllabus.*

Consultation and Approval: To begin, the proposer is strongly encouraged to take a self-assessment to determine if a hybrid course would be compatible with the instructor’s style (<http://weblearning.psu.edu/news/faculty-self-assessment>).

The proposer should formally consult with the Program Coordinator to inform that person of the interest in hybrid course development. The proposer should complete the **Request for Proposal for Hybrid Course Development Form** (see <http://hbg.psu.edu/facultycenter/RFPhybridcourseV4.doc>), gain the Program Coordinator’s signature, and submit the proposal to the School Director. The School Director will share all approved proposals with the Faculty Center to arrange for an initial consultation and the development of an action plan. This would facilitate labeling the course properly in the course schedule (important information for both students and advisors); it would also allow for referral of the proposer to experts who would assist with development of the hybrid course, to ensure that the course meets its *educational* goals.

Development of hybrid courses: Faculty are required to work with the Faculty Center in the design, development, and delivery of the hybrid course. The benefit of working with instructional designers is that they do course design work every day, are current with the latest

instructional technologies, are familiar with best practices, and can connect faculty to University and external teaching and learning resources. The length of time needed for a hybrid course redesign varies based on the faculty member's prior experience in online teaching, learning, and course design, the amount of time the faculty member can devote to the redesign effort, the amount of revision required, the number of online sessions to be designed, and the need for multimedia development.

All online course development completed in the Faculty Center (see <http://hbg.psu.edu/facultycenter/RedesignGuideforHybridCourses.pdf>), including the online components of hybrid courses, follows the design standards set by the Penn State Quality Assurance Standards (<http://weblearning.psu.edu/quality-matters/penn-state-quality-assurance-standards>). The standards are intended to provide a measure of quality assurance for online courses to serve the e-learning needs of Penn State students.

The faculty member is the subject matter expert who provides the course content. The faculty member teams with the instructional designers in the Faculty Center to schedule meetings, set course deliverable deadlines, and make pedagogical decisions related to the course. The instructional designer lends expertise in implementing the course in a professional and pedagogically sound manner.

Intellectual property rights: Faculty should read and understand the University's policy regarding intellectual property rights by referring to the University's Policy RA-17 Courseware located on the web at <http://guru.psu.edu/policies/ra17.html>. Additionally, school directors **must** present faculty with the "*Courseware Copyright Agreement*" available at <http://guru.psu.edu/policies/CoursewareCopyrightAgreement.doc> to be completed for each course prior to the start of its hybrid development.

Assessing hybrid courses: Hybrid courses should be available for peer review as any other class offered at the College. Once the hybrid course is developed, either the Program Coordinator or School Director will preview the proposed course, as is currently done with fully online World Campus courses, to ensure that it meets School and College standards of quality. For this review, faculty peers or administrators should use an instrument adapted from the assessment of fully online classes (*available soon*).

Presented to College Faculty Senate: April 21, 2011
Approved by Academic Council: April 27, 2011

Request for Proposal for Hybrid Course Development Form

Available online at <http://hbg.psu.edu/facultycenter/elearning.html>

Faculty Information:

Faculty Name:

Program:

School:

Office Phone: (717) 948-_____

E-mail Address: _____@psu.edu

List other faculty who might work with you (peer consultants) on the development of the hybrid course and who might also be prepared to teach it. Also note the extent of your consultations with them prior to proposal submission.

Describe your experience with eLearning (formal training, use of ANGEL or other course management system, previous hybrid/blended/online teaching experience):

Course Information:

Course Designation and Number:

Official Course Title:

Number of Credits:

Course prerequisites:

Course type:

_____ Undergraduate course

_____ Graduate course

_____ Gen Ed course

_____ Elective course

Is this a new course? _____ Yes _____ No

Describe course target audience:

Identify certificates/degrees/programs that require this course:

How often is this course currently offered?

Will this course also be available in a traditional face-to-face and/or completely online format?

_____ Same semester? _____ Yes _____ No

_____ Same academic year? _____ Yes _____ No

Provide details on course enrollment history, including current demographics; current, past and projected enrollment data; and demonstrated enrollment demand:

Do you anticipate any copyright issues with regard to the materials used in this course?

_____ Yes _____ No

If Yes, please describe or explain:

Rationale for Proposed Course:

In a few paragraphs, explain the rationale for this proposed hybrid course. Some of the items we are interested in are: 1) whether this course is part of a “group” of courses that might eventually be developed into a hybrid certificate or program; 2) details about how the proposed hybrid course meets “realistic student needs”; 3) background information on the course as it currently exists or the problem/need that the hybrid course development would address; and, 4) the potential significance of the project with respect to its potential impact on the department/program at PSH and the University.

Will the redesigned hybrid course:

_____ Use digital technology to enhance learning with multimedia sources?

_____ Allow for multiple learning strategies?

_____ Comply with University policies concerning access?

_____ Include flexible scheduling?

_____ Integrate campus-based and off-campus, technology-based learning and student-faculty

interaction?

_____ Broaden the concept of learning communities?

Assessment:

Describe the proposed course learning goals/objectives/outcomes:

Anticipated assessment strategies:

_____ Discussion boards

_____ Essays/research papers/reports

_____ Journaling

_____ Peer review

_____ Drill and practice for self-assessment

_____ Case studies

_____ Portfolio

_____ Individual Projects (student-created web pages, PowerPoint presentations)

_____ Group Projects

_____ Online quizzes

_____ Proctored exams

_____ Other:

Course Redesign for Hybrid Delivery:

Hybrid teaching is not just a matter of transferring a portion of your current course to the Web. Instead, it involves developing challenging and engaging learning activities that occur within and outside of the classroom. What types of learning activities will you design that integrates face-to-face (F2F) and time out of class (online) components?

Provide a current syllabus for this course (prior to hybrid development).

Note:

Feel free to provide any additional information you want to communicate about your course.

Signature of Faculty Applicant: _____

My signature confirms that all information provided is accurate, and that I have read and understand [Penn State's courseware development Policy RA17](#). I agree to work with an instructional designer assigned to me by the Faculty Center throughout the design, development, and delivery of this hybrid course.

Date:

Signature of Program Coordinator: _____

Date:

Signature of School Director: _____

Date:

Copy provided to Faculty Center (date): _____

Copy provided to Registrar (date): _____

Draft of Online Courses Guideline

Purpose

To deliver administratively approved “online courses” that facilitate instruction, which provide structured on-line experiences through course management software and other media for quality student learning at a distance.

Introduction

Online courses use digital technologies to provide learning with multimedia sources; allow for multiple learning strategies; comply with University policies concerning access; include flexible scheduling; integrate off-campus, technology-based learning, student-faculty and student-student interaction; and broaden the concept of learning communities.

Guidelines

Defining an online course: An online course is delivered entirely online, with no required classroom sessions. Some courses may require one or more proctored exams. Students may be enrolled in courses offered by a single campus or in courses originated by multiple campuses. The schedule of courses designates online courses by indicating WEB in the Day/Time column, and indicates an eLearning Cooperative course with ELEARNING in the Section Info column. *To inform students fully of the structure of the online course, a hot link from the course schedule would allow for students to see the syllabus.*

Consultation and Approval: To begin, the proposer is strongly encouraged to take a self-assessment to determine if an online course would be compatible with the instructor’s style (<http://weblearning.psu.edu/news/faculty-self-assessment>).

The proposer must formally consult with the Program Coordinator to inform that person of the interest in online course development. The proposer must complete the **Request for Proposal for Online Course Development Form** (see <http://hbg.psu.edu/facultycenter/RFPonlinecourseRev3.doc>), gain the Program Coordinator’s signature, and submit the proposal to the School Director. The School Director will share all approved proposals with the Faculty Center to arrange for an initial consultation with the proposer and the development of an action plan. This would facilitate identifying the appropriate offering platform (World Campus, eLearning Cooperative, or summer-only for Penn State Harrisburg), and labeling the course properly in the course schedule (important information for both students and advisors); it would also allow for referral of the proposer to experts who will collaborate on the development of the online course, to ensure that the course meets its *educational* goals. It is important to strategically consider the development of online courses in a programmatic fashion rather than the development of an isolated online course.

Development of online courses: Faculty members are required to work with the Faculty Center’s instructional designers. The benefit of working with instructional designers is that they do course design work every day, are current with the latest instructional technologies, are familiar with best practices, and can connect faculty to University and external teaching and learning resources. The length of time needed for a online course redesign varies based on the faculty member’s prior experience in online teaching, learning, and course design, the amount of time the faculty member can devote to the redesign effort, the amount of revision required, the

number of online sessions to be designed, and the need for multimedia development. Generally, at least two full semesters of design and development time are needed to create a new online course.

All online course development completed in the Faculty Center follows the design standards set by the Penn State Quality Assurance Standards (<http://weblearning.psu.edu/quality-matters/penn-state-quality-assurance-standards>). The standards are intended to provide a measure of quality assurance for online courses to serve the e-learning needs of Penn State students. The program chairperson and school director will review the online course against the Quality Assurance Standards twice during its development: after the completion of Lesson One and the Detailed Course Outline, and after full course development is completed and before the course is delivered to students.

The faculty member is the subject matter expert who provides the course content. The faculty member teams with the instructional designers in the Faculty Center to schedule meetings, set course deliverable deadlines, and make pedagogical decisions related to the course. The instructional designer lends expertise in implementing the course in a professional and pedagogically sound manner.

Intellectual property rights: Faculty should read and understand the University's policy regarding intellectual property rights by referring to the University's Policy RA-17 Courseware located on the web at <http://guru.psu.edu/policies/ra17.html>. Additionally, school directors must present faculty with the "*Courseware Copyright Agreement*" available at <http://guru.psu.edu/policies/CoursewareCopyrightAgreement.doc> to be completed for each course **prior to the start of its online development.**

Assessing online courses: Online courses should be available for peer review as any other class offered at the College. Once the online course is developed, either the Program Coordinator or School Director will preview the proposed course, as is currently done with fully online World Campus courses, to ensure that it meets School and College standards of quality. For this review, faculty peers or administrators should use the Peer Review Guide for Online Teaching at Penn State instrument available at <http://weblearning.psu.edu/holding-folder/peer-review-of-teaching>.

Presented to College Faculty Senate:

Approved by Academic Council:

Request for Proposal for Online Course Development

Faculty Information:

Lead Faculty Name:

Program:

School:

Office Phone: (717) 948-_____

E-mail Address: _____@psu.edu

List other faculty who might work with you (peer consultants) on the development of the online course and who might also be prepared to teach it, and note the extent of your consultations with them prior to proposal submission:

Describe your experience with eLearning (formal training, use of ANGEL or other course management system, previous hybrid/blended teaching experience, previous online teaching experience):

Course Information:

Course Designation and Number:

Official Course Title:

Number of Credits:

Course prerequisites:

Course type:

_____ Undergraduate course

_____ Graduate course

Gen ed course

Elective course

Is this a new course? Yes No

Describe course target audience:

Identify certificates/degrees/programs that require this course:

Will this course also be available in a synchronous (face-to-face) format?

Same semester? Yes No

Same academic year? Yes No

How often is this course currently offered?

How often do you anticipate this course being offered online?

Would this course be competing with any [World Campus](#) courses? Yes No

Would this course be competing with any [eLearning Cooperative](#) courses? Yes No

Is this course currently under development or scheduled for development by other college/school locations? Yes No

Provide details on course enrollment history, including current demographics; current, past and projected enrollment data; and demonstrated enrollment demand:

Does the course use a standard textbook? Yes No

If No, please describe or explain.

Anticipated audio/visual component needs:

Commercially produced components via CD, DVD, or VHS

Audio/visual learning objects or links to audio/visual components on the Internet

College/instructor produced audio/visual components

Penn State Library eReserves (estimated number)

Publisher produced audio/visual components

Other:

Do you anticipate any copyright issues with regard to the materials used in this course?

Yes No

If Yes, please describe or explain.

Anticipated hardware/software needs:

Course specific software

Web conferencing application

Software required for student purchase:

Hardware required for student purchase:

Other:

None anticipated at this time

Rationale for Proposed Course:

In a few paragraphs, explain the rationale for this proposed online course. Some of the items we are interested in are: 1) whether this course is part of a “group” of courses that might eventually be developed into a completely online certificate or program; 2) details about how the proposed online course meets “realistic student needs”; 3) background information on the course as it currently exists or the problem/need that the online course development would

address; and, 4) the potential significance of the project with respect to its potential impact on the department/program at PSH and the University.

Which of the following criteria are met by the course you are proposing?

- Area of unique institutional strength
- Lack of classroom capacity
- Demonstrated enrollment demand
- Combination of sections of historically under-subscribed courses
- Relieve scheduling bottleneck
- Provide flexibility in student scheduling
- Increase student access to course
- Share our courses with other Penn State campuses
- Outreach course with a potential for high enrollment
- Serve new students
- Innovative & creative use of online education

Assessment:

Describe the proposed course learning outcomes:

Anticipated assessment strategies:

- Online quizzes
- Proctored exams

- _____ Discussion boards
- _____ Essays/research papers/reports
- _____ Journaling/reflective writing
- _____ Peer review
- _____ Drill and practice for self-assessment
- _____ Case studies
- _____ Portfolio
- _____ Individual Projects (student-created web pages, PowerPoint presentations)
- _____ Group Projects
- _____ Other:

Course Redesign for Online Delivery:

Describe the types of changes you are thinking of making, addressing how these changes will effect the learning environment and the student learning in your course:

Provide a current syllabus for this course.

Signature of Faculty Applicant: _____

My signature confirms that all information provided is accurate, and that I have read and understand [Penn State's courseware development Policy RA17](#). I agree to work with an instructional designer assigned to me by the Faculty Center throughout the design, development, and delivery of this online course.

Date:

Signature of Program Coordinator: _____

Date:

Signature of School Director: _____

Date:

Human Resources and Business Services Committee

February 15, 2012

3:00 – 4:00 PM, Room E200

Meeting Minutes

Members in attendance: Margaret Lohman (Chair), Michael Stefany, Chon Kim, Joseph Steibel, Jennifer Albert, Dorothy Guy, Anita Mareno (by telephone)

Meeting began with introductions.

The meeting discussions were focused on the new Amtrak station that will be constructed adjacent to campus. In particular, the committee will concentrate their efforts on identifying benefits and services that may enhance opportunities for use of the train station by the PSH community.

M. Lohman, D. Guy, and J. Albert attended the Physical Plant Committee’s Facilities Forum that was held on February 2nd. All 3 attendees shared their insights/comments on the proposed Amtrak station regarding access to campus, parking, train schedules, reduced rates for faculty/staff/students, and ADA accessibility. It was also noted that the presenters of the Forum, Ed and Don, are open to ideas/feedback regarding all construction projects on or adjacent to campus.

The committee discussed the development of a short survey for PSH faculty, staff, and students to determine wants/needs/concerns related to the new Amtrak station. The survey results will be summarized and attached to a letter of support addressing the wants/needs of the PSH community.

Some potential areas of focus for the survey may include:

- Accessibility to/from campus (walking bridge, shuttle service, etc.)
- Level of interest and demographics of PSH employees and students who may use the train service
- Train schedules and coordination with other modes of mass transit
- Reduced fares for PSH employees and students

Electronic surveys will be distributed to faculty and staff via email in late March/early April. Paper copies will be distributed to students at the bookstore during the last 2 weeks of the semester, when many students visit the bookstore to sell back their textbooks.

In an attempt to enhance participation, the survey should have a good subject line that will grab the attention of faculty/staff receiving the electronic version. Additionally, some marketing effort will be required in order to spread the word that the committee is looking for input on the Amtrak train station.

Assignments:

- *Each committee member* should draft ideas/questions to be included in the short survey. These ideas will be presented and discussed at a follow-up meeting prior to Spring Break. The survey will be drafted and finalized so that it can be distributed electronically to

faculty and staff by the end of March. A paper survey will be distributed to students during the last week of classes and final exam week.

- *M. Lohman* will check to see if permission/approval is needed to conduct a survey involving human subjects.
- *M. Lohman* will schedule a follow-up meeting to be held prior to Spring Break.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Albert on 2/16/12