

Members Present: Fran Arbaugh; Stephanie Serriere; Orrin Murray; Jerry Trusty; Beverly Vandiver; Pam Wolfe; Simon Hooper; Shirley Woika; JoLynn Carney (serving for proxy for Jim Herbert)

Guests: Our deans--Jackie Edmondson; David Monk; Greg Kelly

1. Approval of the minutes from October 20, 2011

No comments or corrections. It was motioned and seconded that the minutes be approved. All approved the minutes from Oct. 20th.

2. Announcements by the Chair: None

3. Communications to the Council: None

4. Comments by the Dean of the College

- a. Dean Monk shared his appreciation for us changing the meeting time so he could attend.
- b. Dean Monk pointed to the changes here in just 10 days; and that the good news is how the university responded. He expressed his confidence in new university leadership. He confirmed that they have taken Erikson's 'interim' status away. He is now president. It was asked if a search would happen. Dean Monk only speculated that maybe later to give us a chance to "catch our breath" as a university. Pangborn is acting executive vice provost. Dean Monk pointed to grassroots projects about addressing sexual abuse issues in the college—bookmarks and Bern Badiali's letter to students that was published in *EdWeek* online. The online comments to Bern's letter are mixed, reflecting the complex issues at hand, but understandable. This letter will also be featured in the upcoming edition of *Connections*. Departments have provided opportunities to share at their meetings. At the College level, a statement was made to students. At University level, Rod Erikson's statements have been profound. Graham Spanier is still a member of the faculty here. From a university perspective, they are keeping an eye on enrollments. At the college level, the dean and Michelle Houser, our director of development and alumni relations, have been reaching out to our donors who are grateful for the contact and who are almost without exception reaffirming their support for the College and University.
- c. Dean Monk then indicated that he has been contacted by reporters who are reacting to allegations about a former College of Education professor, who was accused of sexual abuse in 2002. When the dean became aware of the situation, the case was already in the courts and the dean made sure that the professor's Penn State duties did not involve contact with youth. The professor retired shortly thereafter and the case was subsequently dismissed. The dean summarized these past events to inform Council that new stories were emerging about these allegations as the victim is contending that the dean and President Spanier were contacted by him but did not do anything. The dean emphasized that he has never been contacted by the individual making the allegations and that this person was never a student at PSU.

- d. In the last week, Dean Monk worked with PSU Crisis Management Team to respond thoughtfully and sensitively to inquiries made by various news outlets about these new allegations.
- e. It was asked if the dean has plans to share the reemergence of this sex abuse case with the rest of faculty. The Council believed that faculty would appreciate having information about the background. The dean agreed to send a note about the case to the College listserv. Dean Monk noted that Penn State has agreed to make counseling resources available to the individual making these claims to assist in his healing. Dean Monk shared his hopes that the current scenario at Penn State would not negatively impact our searches. He mentioned that the candidates making visits are aware of the circumstances and have been asking good questions and continue to be seriously interested in joining the Penn State faculty. It is more difficult to reach the candidates who may decide not to apply because of the negative publicity.
- f. The dean announced that the ribbon cutting ceremony for the Kraus Innovation Studio went as planned. The Krauses were present, as was former President Spanier. Photos of the ribbon cutting ceremony will be featured in the College's annual report, which will be distributed before the end of the calendar year.
- g. The dean shared that the theme of the College's special issue publication coming up is on early childhood studies and that its release will be delayed until the early spring.
- h. Dean Monk shared that the dinner for Dean's Graduate Assistantship awardees (13 this year) with advisors went well and was refreshing reminder of what Penn State is really all about as the students engaged in a serious discussion about their research and their career hopes and dreams.
- i. Dean Monk reminded us that the website is now frozen, but that it is not impossible to make a change. Yet, unless it's time sensitive, it's better to wait on making changes until the new calendar year.
- j. Dean Monk worked with Associate Dean Edmondson to draft the goals and duties of the new positions—director of undergraduate and graduate studies. This draft will be shared with departments and discussed. Dean Monk has gone to some departments to talk about these ideas. He recognizes that departments vary and thus the chart he gave us may get tweaked a little.
- k. One C&I FC member raised an issue based on an email sent from another C&I faculty member to share at FC. There is concern about the lack of continuity, delays, and confusion in communications from individuals outside of Penn State to the respective programs within a department and vice versa. Furthermore, there is concern that the learning curve for someone to know specific program needs for not only one, but multiple programs, within three months is too steep, particularly when the learning must occur across several programs. The email also pointed out that assuming there are separate directors of graduate and undergraduate studies, dividing the program coordinator work into two areas creates additional confusion. That faculty member's email that was being shared also pointed out the observation that C&I PICs for years never had summer support but continued to do the work. In response, Dean Monk clarified his vision that the director is not the only person who would be active during the summer, and that the director would reach out, as appropriate, to the coordinators in the summer. It will be the director's responsibility to get an answer, for instance, in a timely way.

- l. A faculty member asked what happens if a program coordinator says he or she is unable to cover for the summer, given that without a summer supplement, all non-administrative faculty members are on a 9-month contract. Dean Monk said that the director would have the official responsibility. Dean Monk said that he would add a box to the chart to define summer duties; others agreed. He will do so before it is circulated to faculty
- m. Another member expressed the way in which counselor education works in that the title program coordinator is used for those over strands (elementary counseling, secondary counseling, etc.) within the program might conflict with the proposed change in titles for professor-in-charge. The dean said he would think about how to address the potential confusion of titles.
- n. Dean Monk was asked what the second duty in the list (student retention) is meant to be. He explained that the things on the program level are more or less going on already. The departmental level, however, is what we are trying to work on anew. These directors are going to sit with Associate Dean Edmondson. To answer the original question, Associate Dean Edmondson gave examples of sitting with students to get opportunities (grants, fellowships) to students. She explained that the Graduate School is tightening up admissions in ways. Another member asked what another bit of money would be used for. The response was to “organize department research discussions” and coming together more across departments on research, such as the Faculty Research in Progress (FRIP) sessions, which is sponsored by C&I, although it was not designed for cross-departmental collaboration.
- o. A member asks how departments, especially C&I, responded when he brought the information of the new leadership formations to them. Dean Monk pointed out that he visited C&I earlier in the semester (before the position changes were announced) and may want to revisit it with them. Dean Monk reported that it is not the most popular thing he has ever proposed, as resources are being removed. Yet, he added, that staff members for a longer period of time have felt like they have been hit the hardest so this feels like more of a balance in that way.
- p. Another member asked about the cost analysis, specifically with the course release of the PICs, and how he calculated course releases in dollars or otherwise. Dean Monk reported that he did it in two parts: stipends, and translated course releases into faculty line equivalents (the number of courses being taught that could be taught). Associate Dean Edmondson pointed out that they did benchmarking with other colleges. Higher enrollment equals more support and so this brings us to a more equitable model across the departments. The logic was that it reduces the number of low-enrolled courses, and money will be saved.
- q. Dean Monk answered also that this change of leadership duties will happen in the spring. One member expressed strong concerns with this, especially as the EPCSP department is undergoing so many changes already. This faculty member suggested a staggered start, a period of training, and other ways of alleviated stress on the identified leaders so that they can hit the ground running by next fall. Dean Monk clarified that we are going to start putting it into place in the spring. Other members expressed support needed. After some discussion, it was decided that Faculty Council will solicit feedback on the position duties chart, after Dean Monk adds the summer duties component. Another member asked the dean, “What happens if there is no program coordinator?” Dean Monk said that if a program wants to

“torpedo itself,” it may but he doesn’t think they would want to do that. He noted that there have been cases in the past when it has been difficult to identify a suitable department head but that we have handled these situations and have always succeeded at making the needed appointment. Another member reminded him of an alternative model their department presented. Dean Monk acknowledged that this possibility may work with that particular, smaller department. Associate Dean Edmondson pointed out a difficulty in that particular alternative proposal in the curricular piece.

5. Reports of Standing Committees

- 5.1 Committee on Graduate Studies & Research Policy (Jerry Trusty, Chair): No new information has occurred since our last meeting.
- 5.2 Committee on Curricular Affairs (Stephanie Serriere, Chair)—We met on Oct. 21st and will meet again tomorrow.
- 5.3 Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Student Concerns (Bernard Badiali)—Bern is not here but we will follow up.
- 5.4 Technology Committee (Simon Hooper, Chair)—The committee has not met since the last faculty council meeting.

6. Reports of special and ad hoc committees

6.1 Departmental representative to Faculty Council (Fran Arbaugh). This committee was charged to consider the make-up of the council to reflect the changes in decreased number of departments. They examined by-laws. Current by-laws suggest that we need 17 in faculty council, including non voting graduate and undergraduate reps. Two people per department now change the total to 15 members, so the by-laws would need be changed if we wanted to go with this option. They confirmed that the four standing sub-committees could indeed be staffed. One concern raised was how we can make a quorum, which is usually 2/3rds. It was pointed out that this actually may be simpler if the group is smaller. Another concern was raised that we may look small, representing so many people. Dean Monk suggested 3 per department as an option. Yet, it was pointed out by a member that, if we increase the number of faculty members, then in some departments, we have difficulty getting people to serve. From another suggestion, a response was made, if we go by percentage of department (like a house of representatives model), what happens when the department grows? It was offered that Faculty Senate has a model that we could consider, an algebraic sort of formula, so that it doesn’t get too big but the size is maintained. This same person added that we wouldn’t want something so mathematical that it’d make us crazy. Then, it was pointed out that we are not following our by-laws by not having student representatives. No change on this was suggested.

In sum, the ad hoc recommendation is to change the by-laws to have 15 members, not 17. It was decided that we bring this to our departments and put it to a vote via the listserv (via Karen Mogel, for instance). However the by-laws will be checked to see that this procedure is feasible as per the by-laws. If the by-laws allow, the Ad Hoc committee’s recommendation will be with the motion (a paragraph they put together), responded to by a yes/no on the ballot. First, reps will take this back to

their departments and then discuss the matter again in the December faculty meetings to see if there are any differences about it. The vote might be in January.

It was pointed out that some people feel like that we don't influence the dean anyway. A future discussion was suggested that we have a stronger faculty council, in that the dean works with us more closely in decisions that need to be made.

7. **News from Faculty Senate** (Beverly Vandiver)—It was reported that there was a lot of conversation on Senate Council regarding where faculty had voice regarding the recent investigation of PSU leadership. A group within Senate Council requested a special meeting of faculty senate, but no movement was made to schedule it. So, five faculty senators, including Beverly sponsored a petition for a special faculty senate to address concerns about the current events at Penn State and present a resolution to the floor; 50 petitioners signed and there will be a special faculty senate meeting tomorrow. The petitioners represented five colleges and are meeting in a special senate council meeting now. Bill Carlson is at the council meeting representing the College right now. This group of faculty senators feels that they have been silenced as faculty and are concerned that it could look like we as faculty don't care or that all we care about is our research. Their argument is also that some of PSU's best PR is their faculty. They are pressing for transparency and trust built. Many of the faculty senators are concerned that the investigation is not independent enough (led by PSU people) and this may not engender trust and transparency. They are suggesting that Faculty Senate push to have an independent investigation with the composition of the committee not be related to Penn State. Dean Monk responded by reminding us that President Erikson believes in transparency, and the co-chair of the committee is the PA Secretary of Education who has no connection to PSU. Beverly said that Senate is in full support of Erikson and want to show their support by being organized and visible.

8. **Unfinished business**

- 8.1 Representation of departments (see above under #7)

- 8.2 Changes in RIF Guidelines

It was decided to use the remaining time to talk about RIF. The draft that Dean Monk originally gave us has been revised and clarified, and Dean Monk wants to make sure the committee is working with that version. It was decided that we will hold off a vote today, in the interest of time. Associate Dean Kelly passed around an explanation of current use of RIGs. He explained that idea is how we can invest in research, getting grants and supporting faculty research. Associate Dean Kelly talked us through this sheet of categories in which the monies would go for RIFs: research design and methods, develop web-based research tools; travel for PIs; post-award grant management; and pre-award support for grant prep. Associate Dean Kelly shared charts and discussed an example of a post doc that might focus on statistical methods. Then faculty would support staff such as the post-doc. The college is taking the risk in making the investment who we may/may not use. The idea is to support faculty research in stronger ways. These people hired would be excellent at what they do.

Appreciation was expressed as well as concern. One member asked, what happens when the RIF drops—what anticipation do they have to support an infrastructure? What back-up plan will be in place when funding is flat? Dean Monk says there is some stability. Dean Kelly says it's not worth hiring someone who doesn't do the job well and that's why they'll hire the best.

Another faculty member expressed the concern that without evidence of how it would support their research, why would they continue (getting grants)? The faculty member pointed out that these people have been successful in getting grants and budgeted tightly. They are worried about losing funding in an already tight climate. This faculty member recommended that the deans have a conversation with leading granters in the College. Other faculty members agreed that this would be a good idea. Two faculty expressed concerns that these people would not be motivated or incentivized. Dean Monk pointed out two things: 1. He will honor commitments that grantees have already made; 2. Dean Monk said that the money doesn't disappear—and that “we will find ways to support productive researchers.” He added that, faculty can go to your department head and to the associate dean to “shop” for funds (travel and things).

Faculty were also concerned with course buy-out. Faculty said there is a need to talk about when something is a concern of the Dean's office and when there is one with the department.

8.3 Update on current and future building renovations—delayed until next meeting

8.4 Equitable workspaces for faculty throughout the College—delayed until next meeting

8.5 Academic integrity—delayed until next meeting

8.6 Academic freedom/scholarship and Development—delayed until next meeting.

9. New business

Faculty requested that new business for next meeting would be to have a discussion how to strengthen faculty council to have a stronger voice in the college's governance.

10. Forensic business: none

11. Comments and recommendations for the good of the College: none

It was motioned and seconded that the faculty council meeting be adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Submitted by Stephanie Serriere