

College of Education  
Faculty Council  
Minutes from Thursday, February 16, 2012  
221 Chambers Building  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

**Members in attendance:** Stephanie Serriere, Pam Wolfe, Jim Herbert, Orrin Murray, Edgar I. Farmer (for Simon Hooper), Leticia Oseguera, Fran Arbaugh, Ed Fuller, Beverly Vandiver, Shirley Woika

**Guest:** Greg Kelly (for Dean Monk)

**1. Approval of the minutes from January 19, 2012**

Jim Herbert motioned for the minutes to be approved and Fran Arbaugh seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**2. Announcements by the Chair:**

- a. Congratulations to Esther Prins in being elected to represent the College at Faculty Senate.
- b. There are three positions at the full professor level that need to be filled in the College P&T committee.
- c. Faculty Council representatives will also be solicited. These are for a two-year term.

**3. Communications to the Council:** None

**4. Comments by the Dean of the College:**

Dean Monk could not be here today, so Dean Kelly filled in for him:

- a. Dean Kelly reported that the University intends to reduce the budget by \$20 million, which would be 2% (\$350,000) of the permanent budget that the College will have to return to the University. This reduction goes into effect July 1.
- b. Dean Kelly reports that Penn State is watching enrollments for the coming year.
- c. Dean Kelly reports that faculty searches are going well. The science education search is underway. The social studies education search committee will meet and start choosing candidates soon.
- d. Krauss Innovation Studio will open some time after spring break.
- e. Dean Kelly reports that that re-launching of the College's website is pending, due to technical snafus.
  - i. Concerns about the website have been and were expressed in the meeting, especially with its look and feel. The current system or the new system does not seem to project the image that the faculty want to present, in terms of following links/navigation and technological image. It was summed up by one question: In 2012, *why does our website look and operate like this?* Students are coming to the College/departments/programs based on web-presence. Thus, the programs are losing certain kind of students (the ones who are just looking via the Web).
  - ii. Dean Kelly asked the question, "How do we include faculty's voice in about the College's web-presence that's not burdensome for faculty?" There are several issues that complicate the decision making process.

College of Education  
Faculty Council  
Minutes from Thursday, February 16, 2012  
221 Chambers Building  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

One, who is the point person for the departmental websites? It varies; some are staff members and others are faculty. Two, there is a concern that a similar look and branding limits the diversity of the departments and program, recognizing some restrictions are necessary (ADA compliance). Three, there is the issue of the cost; the College's website is large, with at least a couple thousand web pages. Faculty Council suggested that the College consult with graduate, undergraduate, and faculty and ask how they navigate it and where there are problems. This process is called a *user study* and should be done by someone who designs these studies. It was then suggested that Bill Welsh, director of the Office of Disability Services, should be consulted as well.

- f. Faculty computers:
  - i. Dean Kelly reports that a policy is in place on faculty access to administrative rights on their computer, if there are certain needs that meet the policy's criteria. There are two problems about faculty request. One, who gets administrative rights? The concern is that increased administrative rights may result in the public's access to the computer, leading to risk in more viruses, access to passwords, and other vulnerabilities to the Penn State computer system. Two, there is a concern about workflow in processing these requests for admin rights. In the old system, Greg read the requests and sent the requests forward as quickly as possible. However, there was at times a 3-week delay in the next step of permission/activation.
  - ii. Work flow to address admin rights has changed in the following process:
    - 1. Client requests administrative privileges at <http://www.ed.psu.edu/educ/for-current-faculty-and-staff/outreach-office/technology/technology-guidelines>
    - 2. The Associate Dean decides to approve or not to approve the request.
    - 3. If the AD approves, then a confirming email is sent to the client and CETC.
    - 4. CETC then pushes "Admin app" to client over network and informs client via email. Client locates and runs "Managed Software Update application" found in the client's "Utilities folder".
    - 5. The update will ask the client/user to logout, once App is installed.
    - 6. When the client logs back in they will have full admin rights under their "Education" account for a short duration to update and install relevant programs.
    - 7. Thus, a note is sent to ETC and an admin app will come in the client folder. The computer will reboot, and will come back on as a client with rights.

College of Education  
Faculty Council  
Minutes from Thursday, February 16, 2012  
221 Chambers Building  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

- iii. Each user will be able to do this. This workflow plan eliminates walking over to ETC with your computer and eliminates the other option at login.
- iv. The option of still signing on as an administrator was also discussed in terms of designing apps. Concern from a faculty member was expressed that when someone made that switch, this person lost files. The process was very slow and disappointing for the faculty member. A key question was posed: *what issues exist in migrating users?* Dean Kelly will consult with ETC the matter and let faculty know.
- g. Friday classes: Dean Kelly reports that the College received a note from the Provost about examining the drop in Friday classes for undergraduate. The College has some of the lowest number of classes offered on Friday (9% in 2010), and it has decreased more recently to 7% in 2011.
- h. Director and Coordinator positions:
  - i. The latest drafts were distributed. It is still a work in progress. Comments are still welcome. The Chair indicated that feedback from faculty, by and large, continue to be against the proposed changes and despite the Dean's solicitation for feedback about the duties of the director's position and the revised coordinator positions, the faculty members do not believe that their fundamental concerns about the positions have been addressed.
  - ii. Faculty member in Special Education asked that the following concerns about the positions be shared in FC:
    - 1. The one size fits all approach doesn't work.
    - 2. Supervision advising responsibilities vary across departments.
    - 3. The amount of time devoted to these positions should be indicated in the most recent draft and then pay could be better addressed. This model appears to be the one existing in C&I, and Special Education wanted to know how it has worked for C&I. At issue is whether the model actually is efficient and effective.
    - 4. There are concerns for loss of student centeredness and broader quality in terms of meeting students' needs.
  - iii. Greg noted that the primary goal for the new positions was curriculum coordination within and across departments. Approvals were often in queue in faculty hands. Cost-savings was an issue too. Equity across programs was also an issue—PICs have had both very small *and* very large programs. It was asked how this new system will work because it seems like a one-size-fits-all model. Dean Kelly corrected that it wasn't necessarily based on C&I, because C&I never had course releases. It was asked how it was derived. Dean Kelly reminds FC of the process; it was discussed with PICS, Dean's

College of Education  
Faculty Council  
Minutes from Thursday, February 16, 2012  
221 Chambers Building  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Advisory, and Faculty Council. Another faculty member expressed that it seems like since there is a diversity of programs, a better goal might be to negotiate certain metrics. Departments could be given money and they work from there based on their needs. The rationale was if there is a certain amount of cost savings in this model, then why not give that designated funds to the respective departments and allow them to run each department to meet the stated objectives—cost savings and curriculum coordination.

- iv. It was then reported that departmental reps are needed to serve on both departmental and college curricular affairs. Also, how can the proliferation of 597 courses be managed even within a new system? Without clear expectations of outcomes on 597s, how can we know what to do? Faculty Council might want to create an alternative approach via an ad hoc committee.
- i. A faculty member made a request to Faculty Council and asked that Jim Herbert present it for Faculty Council to consider. The request was for Faculty Council to conduct a survey on faculty's views on the positions. The faculty member submitted a set of 5 multiple-choice questions. A discussion ensued, with comments about empowering the faculty to have a point of view and to consider coming up with an alternative approach to meet the objectives of the Dean. However, it is unclear what specific objectives the Dean has in mind. Faculty Council recognized that the Dean may not endorse such survey, but FC is a consultative body and thus the findings could be provided to the Dean in this vein. Jim Herbert made a motion that FC use this draft instrument with some minor additions (department/program being optional and then a 'why' question). The motion carried (8 yeses and 1 no) to conduct the survey, with changes, and to offer the findings to the Dean as part of FC's charge in consulting with the Dean about this matter. The Chair will place the survey in Qualtrics and asked Orrin Murray for assistance in making sure the survey is set up properly. Then the survey will be sent out to FC to vet; after it is vetted it will be sent out to the faculty, with faculty defined as all tenure track and full-time fixed term faculty.
- ii. Finally, the Chair will send an email to the Dean requesting an articulation of goals that may provide a better idea to faculty of what is expected to be achieved in implementing the new model.
- i. RIF was tabled for next time.
- i. College Curricular Affairs: Dean Kelly presented a draft of faculty initiated contact hours for distance education courses. Comments are welcome.

**5. Reports of Standing Committees:**

5.1 Committee on Graduate Studies & Research Policy (Jerry Trusty, Chair): Fran

College of Education  
Faculty Council  
Minutes from Thursday, February 16, 2012  
221 Chambers Building  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Arbaugh reported that two ranked list were made for candidates for Grad fellowships, Dean fellowships, and RIGs.

5.2 Committee on Curricular Affairs (Stephanie Serriere, Chair): See on-line course contact hours point above.

5.3 Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Student Concerns (Barbara Schaefer): The staff award criteria were changed to include nominations of staff who had been in the College less than five years. Call for nominations is out and the deadline is February 24.

5.4 Technology Committee (Simon Hooper, Chair): No new report.

**6. Reports of special and ad hoc committees:**

6.1 Departmental representatives to Faculty Council (Fran Arbaugh): It was presented that this committee recommend that they amend the bi-laws in terms of faculty composition of the following:

- (1) Each department will elect two voting representatives, at least one of whom must be tenured.
- (2) Faculty Council Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past-Chair (all elected by the College of Education faculty) will serve as voting members.
- (3) The College of Education faculty external to University Park will elect one (1) representative.
- (4) The Dean shall appoint one (1) voting member. The Dean shall be a non-voting member.
- (5) The College of Education Undergraduate Student Association shall elect one (1) non-voting representative. The College of Education Graduate Student Association shall elect one (1) non-voting representative.

Then, the by-laws can be amended by two-thirds of those present at Faculty Council. We will vote on this at March meeting. This change in the by-laws may still require faculty vote as well.

- 7. News from Faculty Senate:** (Beverly Vandiver): Faculty Senate visited the College and it was appreciated that the faculty and students came out to the meetings. Faculty Senate visits academic units every so often. Issues noted were the College's wireless connections, facilities (i.e. temperature in rooms), etc. Other College issues included education majors and 597s. At the February meeting, two votes were held. One was a vote of no confidence in the Board of Trustees in how they handled the scandal in November and the other vote was on forming an independent committee to examine the Penn State's governance, specifically the Board of Trustees. Neither motion passed. Instead it was recommended that a special committee be formed to look at the University governance policies in terms of communication.

**8. Unfinished business:**

- 8.1 Changes in RIF Guidelines (see Dean's Comments)
- 8.2 New departmental position (see Dean's Comments)
- 8.3 Representation of departments (see #7 above)
- 8.4 Update on current and future building renovations
- 8.5 Equitable workspaces for faculty throughout the College

College of Education  
Faculty Council  
Minutes from Thursday, February 16, 2012  
221 Chambers Building  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

8.6 Academic integrity

9. **New business:**

9.1 Strengthening Faculty Council's involvement in the College's governance.

9.2 Forensic session (see below)

9.3 Least user privilege on faculty computers in the College (see 4.f above)

9.4 College web presence (see 4.e above)

9.5 Faculty survey (see 4.h.i above)

10. **Forensic business:**

A town hall meeting on the Director/PC roles was suggested from two departments. It was decided that the bigger issue is *faculty governance* (role of FC, Dean's Advisory, ad hoc committees, etc.). The purpose/goal of the town hall was questioned, at it will drive what we look at. Is there to be an outcome? Or is this session intended for faculty to vent? FC would need specific prompts, or even consider small group discussions. FC wants to have a civil, thoughtful and informative conversation. It was proposed that a continuum of examples of different levels of faculty governance be highlighted. What are the benefits and challenges of having little/a lot of faculty governance? Having the deans involved in that conversation would be helpful. FC reps were asked to confer with faculty the best time/date to have the town hall meeting. Ed Fuller was asked to inquire about a potential moderator for the town hall meeting.

11. **Comments and recommendations for the good of the College:**

There were none.

The meeting was adjourned around 4:30 p.m.

Submitted by Beverly J. Vandiver and Stephanie Serriere