

Subject: Agenda for Penn State York Campus Senate Meeting

Date and Time: January 3, 2019 (Spring Orientation): 12:10-1:15 p.m.

Location: Conference Center

Attendance: Joel Burkholder, Mark Casteel, Marshall Coyle, James Crivaro, Joe Downing, Barb Eshbach, Ann Fetterman, Deirdre Folkers, Joy Giguere, Sukhdeep Gill, Fred Haag, Amy Harmon Krtanjek, Cecilia Heydl-Cortinez, Ali Kara, Joe Kasten, Andy Landis, Fulgentius Lugemwa, Asif Mahmood, Michael Marcus, Sonia Molloy, Maureen Muller, Nicole Muscanell, Jennifer Nesbitt, Marcy Nicholas, Judy Owen, Jessica Petko, Jon Price, Mary Ritchey, Haiduke Sarafian, Javed Siddique, Noel Sloboda, Joan Smeltzer, Kip Trout, Anne Vardo-Zalik, Emily Wenk, Steven Lentz, Walter Arnold, Sue Ruch, Ryan Service, Andrew Caldwell, Francine Baker, David Christiansen, Barb Dennis, Robert Farrell, Suzanne Shaffer, Peggy Violette, Jen May, and Karen Muller

I. Approval of minutes from the November 13, 2018 Senate Meeting

- Minutes approved

II. Communications from administration, faculty, and committees

A. Announcements from the Chancellor, Dr. Dave Christiansen

- Office of Planning and Assessment have asked Dave Christiansen to send a link to a questionnaire regarding volunteer activities in the York community

B. Announcements from the DAA, Dr. Bob Farrell

- Update on Promotion and Tenure Committee: there is one dossier being reviewed this semester (second-year for Sonia Molloy)
- The DAA will continue random classroom drop-ins; interested in hearing what we have to say and our interactions with students
- Jamaira put cards for updating contact information on the table, please fill those out if need be
- Request that offices like Student Affairs, Bursar, Advising, etc. please stay open later than usual since next week classes begin (we want offices to stay open until 6:00 p.m. to be able to help students)
- At 3:00 p.m. today, 107 Romano is now a technology classroom, Joe Royer and Loren Brewster will be there to go over how the classroom technology works

C. Announcements from University Senators

- Deirdre: inter-university relations is looking at confusions arising from new teaching-line ranks/titles; issue of the discrepancy of full professors between University Park (UP) and the campuses; the university committee on curricular affairs is looking at university policy on one-semester courses; academic integrity report discussion has not moved

forward; there will be a report on benefits next meeting; university planning is no longer referencing faculty and staff offices, they will now be referred to as use spaces to promote a democratic use of light (stated snarkily); president Barron did a shortened form of a presentation to the advisory board speaking to the value of the commonwealth campuses (75 percent of Pennsylvania residents live within 15 miles of a campus; 82 percent of the campuses are Pennsylvania residents; 57 percent of University Park students are Pennsylvania residents; 17 percent of commonwealth caucus students are adults; 37 percent of campus students are first-generation)

- Jennifer Nesbitt: the striking thing that Barron said was that he wants people to feel uncomfortable when they say “branch; it is a more positive vision of “one university geographically dispersed,” he seems to value the work that we do here

D. Announcements from Senate Committee Chairs

- Nicole Muscanell, Faculty Affairs Committee: we have three faculty colloquia planned for the spring (Kasten; Vardo-Zalik; Molloy); please contact Nicole if you want to get on the docket
- Andy Landis, Honors Committee: We are offering three honors courses this spring; students need to come to you in the first three weeks in order to fill out the paperwork and get the process started to take the course as an honors course

E. Announcements from Faculty Council Representatives, Dr. Joe Downing and Joan Smeltzer

- Joan Smeltzer: December 3 was the one meeting of the semester (conducted on zoom with about twenty participants); the question from Dr. Brazier regarding application for new tenure-line faculty as faculty leave – he made it pretty clear that it was NOT necessary for the campus to have a major in that discipline in order to request a tenure-line position and it will be considered; the situation with instructional design specialists, and it got waylaid, so nothing really to report except Brazier indicated they are aware of the situation and are working on it
- Joe Downing: the University is working with the president’s initiative on the Graham Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership Studies (The Graham Center) to make it part of our annual performance

F. Announcements from Faculty

- Ann Fetterman: Penn State York Reads initiative, *Not a Book*; encourage clubs to get involved to help fundraise; Barb Eshbach bought a stack of books from Martin Library;

write a check to Martin Library to help fund books; we have until April to reach \$3,000 goal (we're at \$548 currently)

G. Announcements from Staff

- Suzanne Shaffer: thank you to Judy Owen and Jen Nesbitt for leading the faculty learning communities in the Fall to support teaching and research (the research/writing group will continue to meet every Friday this semester); Bob Bartell is going to lead a new teaching group, which will read *Small Teaching* (meetings to be scheduled) – this is an excellent professional development opportunity for teaching-line faculty

H. Announcements from Student Governance

I. Announcements from Senate Chair, Dr. Javed Siddique

- Next meeting will be February 7 and we will hold the election for University Senator to replace Jane Sutton's position; the nomination process will occur before that meeting

J. Announcements from Senate Chair-Elect, Dr. Andy Landis

III. Unfinished Business

IV. New Business

Motion by Faculty Affairs Committee to revise the Scholarship Award By-Laws (see attachment)

- Asif Mahmood: The intent is to improve the nomination process and simpler, because as it stands currently, it's too complex
 - o First change: allow self-nominations (last year, there were only two nominations and they were both adjunct faculty); not all of us know what our colleagues are doing
 - o Second: nominees from previous year who didn't win should be automatically nominated the next year
- Anne Vardo-Zalik: how many times can you lose and be re-nominated?
- Robert Farrell: perhaps there should be a time limit, so that it doesn't become too unwieldy
 - o It's demoralizing to be on there year after year and not win, so there should be a limit
- Fred Haag: but you can always decline
- Jennifer Nesbitt: if you read the next sentence, the DAA will notify all nominees and they can decide to accept or decline; it's already dealt with
- Robert Farrell: I understand what Jennifer is saying, but there should be an explicit statement that there is a limit for the number of times a person can be re-nominated after losing
- Andy Landis: it should just be a re-nomination for the following year after having been nominated
- Maureen Muller: isn't Digital Measures and a one-page research statement redundant?

- Ali Kara: the first one is mainly referring to the list of scholarly achievements; the second puts everything into context, so there is a difference
- Jennifer Nesbitt: This is a motion from a committee, so changes to the prose that's on the screen need to be made in the form of a motion at some point; also, one of the rationales for the changes is the effort to minimize the excess of paperwork but why is the bullet point regarding supplemental materials still in there?
- Noel Sloboda: that point should be struck, because some people will submit a box of publications and others won't
- Anne Vardo-Zalik: motion to alter language that so that nominees who do not win will only be re-nominated for one more year
 - o Nope – let's just strike that sentence altogether
 - o Motion seconded by Mark Casteel
 - o Motion accepted
- Mark Casteel: move to delete the entire final bullet beginning with "Any additional supporting documentation..."
 - o Motion seconded by Jennifer Nesbitt
 - o Motion carried
- Robert Farrell: Why is there no letter of support?
 - o Joy Giguere: This streamlines the process, especially for those who are members of small departments/department of one
 - o Nicole Muscanell: If you can get a letter of support, of course it's going to be positive
- Jennifer Nesbitt: Wants to support Farrell in encouraging some additional material that would confirm what the faculty says about him/herself; the concerns that Farrell is raising here are relevant; the committee does not have the expertise to assess the quality of the work
- Judy Owen: judging a faculty's contribution is very difficult without a letter of support
- Mark Casteel: what we heard at the town hall meeting is that for the people who went through this process, getting the outside letters was a hindrance and made them not want to be a nominee; this process should be as least onerous on the nominees as possible
- Asif Mahmood: we also tried to replace the letter with a letter from a discipline coordinator, but DCs showed no interest in helping in this way
- Anne Vardo-Zalik: should we go down and look at the other edits before we do any further voting?
- Michael Marcus: what was the objection to having the DC submit something in support?
- Maureen Muller: the DC could be nominated for the award, and then what?
- Asif Mahmood: a DC could get a letter from someone higher up, but the DCs showed no interest in writing letters in the first place
- Kip Trout: having a hard time understanding how someone who is nominated for an award cannot get a letter of support from within or outside the university; we write letters for our students
- Joy Giguere: this is a campus award meant to boost faculty morale
- Sukhdeep Gill: when we have any other award like for teaching or advising, we want endorsement from our stakeholders/students, and we get that; having published work is an endorsement of the quality of work itself; the fact of publication is the rigor that should be accepted as the merit of the work
- Michael Marcus: it is difficult for committee members outside the discipline to assess the quality of journals

- Anne Vardo-Zalik: this is the function of the nominee's letter, so that they can explain the significance and impact of their scholarship
- Mark Casteel: we're probably not going to reach unanimity here; calls the question for a vote without any further changes
- 23 for; 6 against (motion carries)

V. Forensic Business

Discussion of One Penn State 2025 Initiative – intention to provide feedback to the University Faculty Senate

- David Christiansen: this was a committee put together by the provost's office; it was part of the last strategic planning process; initial idea was that we should take a look at how PSU should be offering courses in the future in an online environment; at first meeting of the committee, the provost talked with the chairs, and they decided to revise the charge to make this committee look at the University as a whole and where it should be in 5-10 years; the priorities are focusing on student access to services equally across the campuses; to develop a uniform, consistent curriculum across every Penn State campus; to provide a relevant and timely curriculum to the students (need to give BS and BA programs that will help students' job prospects); lifelong learning opportunities that PSU can offer graduates; focusing on the effective use of limited university resources
 - o The report was finished in September 2017, it's been floating around, the university has been socializing it in certain circles, it's now being spread across to the campuses (and now the senate)
 - o The charge was given to the central offices at University Park to make this report, there was very little campus representation
 - o There was only a single faculty member on this committee
 - o There are many unanswered questions and opinions that need to get out there
 - o There's an opportunity for us to have a strong voice in how this is to evolve
- Jennifer Nesbitt: wants to open the floor for comments/questions about these five principles and what it means for us as a campus
- Marcy Nicholas: first question is regarding achieving curricular coherence – the difference between disciplinary communities and departments; what's the difference?
 - o David Christiansen: it was pretty nebulous; it means people who have a vested interest and expertise in an academic discipline
- Marcy Nicholas: second issue is related to Penn State's strategic plan – the guiding principle highest level of efficiency; driving digital innovation – but that hasn't filtered down to the campuses; where's the money to finance all of this "digital innovation" on the campuses?
- Suzanne Shaffer: how is this related to the next cycle of strategic planning? Is this going to be the focus for the next strategic plan? We don't need anymore unfunded mandates
- Deirdre Folkers: I would urge everyone to read this carefully; it is jargon-laden; it speaks to some potentially profound changes that will not necessarily speak to the health and wellness of campuses, though I am assured this will result in increased efficiencies so that faculty can overcome limitations of space and time to be able to teach students across multiple campuses
- Fred Haag: I've read this three times now, and will there be another VRP, because this would be a good way to bring in a lot of new junior faculty who are willing to teach online

- Javed Siddique: We will continue this discussion at the next meeting

VI. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Fred Haag
Seconded: Andy Landis

VII. Next Meetings: Thursday, February 7

Proposals for new business by committees must be distributed to all members at least 72 hours prior to the meeting at which they are to be discussed. Except as otherwise provided, all meeting notices and agenda shall be distributed at least 48 hours in advance. Please get materials to the secretary in time for distribution.