

**Members Present:** Fran Arbaugh; Bernard Badiali; Stephanie Serriere; Orrin Murray; Dana Mitra; Jerry Trusty; Jim Herbert; Beverly Vandiver; Leticia Oseguera; Pam Wolfe; Simon Hooper; Bob Hale (sitting in for Shirley Woika)

**Guests Present:** David Monk; Richard Hazler; Humphrey Fellows

**1. Approval of the minutes from September meeting:**

- a. A discussion ensued about the minutes as the content was believed to be too detailed and potentially inflammatory about the proposed changes the Dean has announced about the change in departmental structure. On the other hand, other representatives believed that the minutes needed to be more detailed to reflect the sentiment of the faculty. A vote was called about approving the original minutes sent out (moved and seconded); the vote failed. In return, a motion (moved and seconded) was made to append to the original minutes a summary provided by a faculty council representative depicting the discussion about the proposed departmental changes. The motion carried and the September minutes were approved. The original minutes will be appended with a summary about the discussion at the September meeting.
- b. It was proposed that Faculty Council sessions be taped and provided to the College. There were mixed views on the usefulness of doing so. For now this discussion was tabled, but could re-emerge in the future.
- c. Related to the minutes, the Chair asked that Faculty Council representatives provide timely feedback when a draft of the minutes is submitted in order to improve the efficiency of our meetings.

**2. Announcements by the chair**

There were no announcements by the chair.

**3. Communications to the Council**

The chair, Beverly Vandiver, acknowledged receiving the Dean's response (Oct. 7) to the Faculty Council memo sent to him on September 30 and his plans to schedule meetings with all departments.

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

- a. The Dean talked about visiting the College's departments to discuss the proposed departmental changes and acknowledged that the job description for the new position, director of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies is needed. He welcomes input and hopes that his visits to the departments will result in specific descriptions. Some representatives expressed concern about the consistency of the tasks and responsibilities from one department to another. Other concerns were who would accept this position and how the person would be selected (by the Dean or the Department). A question was raised whether the person in this position would take over the tasks of programs who did not (a) select a program coordinator and (b) would be responsible for all program-related work during the summer as program coordinators are on a 9-month contract, whereas the director will provided a summer supplemental salary. Thus, the next step in the process will be to engage Faculty Council creating a job description for the position.

- b. The Dean reported that the College website was undergoing changes and that a web freeze was pending, meaning no changes will be able to be made for a period of time. Thus, any changes to the College website (programs and departments) should be made before November 4.
- c. The Dean announced that the ribbon cutting for the Krause Innovation Studio, which is under construction, will be on October 28 and asked that everyone come out to support the momentous occasion. He also provided a draft of document about the Krause Innovation Studio Learn Lab, which described its purpose, the design for innovative pedagogy, and the potential for research. The draft document is attached.
  - i. The Dean also announced new College guidelines he is proposing for distribution of research incentive funds (RIF). Under the current revenue sharing model, the College receives 12% from the University, which is split with 9% going to the PI and 3% to the Associate Dean for Research. Based on a benchmark of other research-oriented colleges at University Park, the Dean would like to change the revenue sharing model where the funding would shift from an automatic 9% going to the PI to a model where more support goes to the Associate Deans office for the purpose of providing infrastructure support along with support going to the departments where the project is based. According to the new model, PI's could seek support to meet their needs from the Associate Dean and/or their Department Head. What would change is the automatic nature of the allocation to the PI's. If the project is based in the department, teaching buyouts would remain in the department. If the project is based in the Associate Dean's office, the teaching buyout would go to the Associate Dean's office with an internal compensation to the department at \$5,000 per course.
  - ii. Many representatives expressed concern about this new model. One, what is the incentive for PI to pursue grants? Two, many PIs depend on the funding to support other aspects of their research—graduate students' travel to conferences related to the grant work, etc. Three, how would the funds be used in the College? Faculty will need to see how this shift will benefit the support of their research and grant work. Otherwise, such a shift may be perceived as a benefit to the College only. The Dean noted that the additional funds would allow for provision of infrastructure support for meeting pre-award and post-award needs of PI's and prospective PI's. At this time Faculty Council is hesitant to support this proposed plan, but requested that more information be provided at the next meeting. Specifically, how would the funds be spent and the benefit of the change to the faculty who pursue grants. Finally, the Council expressed concern that such a change would have further impact on faculty morale, which is believed to be quite low, given the change in the incentive for teaching in World Campus, the changes in summer class incentive, and the PICs' incentive.
  - iii. The Dean said a more detailed plan would be provided at the next meeting, although he expressed concern that he could not attend the next Faculty Council due to a travel conflict. He reported that Greg Kelly, Associate Dean for Research, would attend the next meeting and provide the subsequent details about the RIF proposal.

## **5. Reports of Standing Committees**

### **5.1 Committee on Graduate Studies and Research Policy (Jerry Trusty, Chair): Six**

applications for graduate faculty status were received and approved.

5.2 Committee on Curricular Affairs (Stephanie Serriere, Chair): A meeting was scheduled for September. However, there was not a quorum. The next meeting is scheduled for October 21, 2011.

5.3 Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Student Concerns (TBA): The committee has not been composed and a call for volunteers to serve on this committee was made. Bernard Badiali has agreed to chair the committee. Dana Mitra volunteered to find staff and students to serve on the committee.

5.4 Technology Committee (Simon Hooper, Chair): The committee met and discussed the proposed Technology Replacement Guidelines. After a lengthy discussion the guidelines were approved..

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

6.1 Composition of special committee to examine number of departmental representatives needed for Faculty Council: Beverly Vandiver asked for volunteers to compose this committee. Fran Arbaugh agreed to chair the committee; Orrin Murray agreed to serve on the committee and Beverly will ask Jim Herbert to serve as well (Jim had to leave the meeting prior to this discussion).

#### **7. News from Faculty Senate (Beverly Vandiver)**

The focus of the last meeting of Senate Council on September 27, 2011 was on the reorganization of the College of Agricultural Sciences. Senate Council approved the reorganization. A number of administrative searches are under way: Senior Vice President for Finance and Business; Dean for the Smeal College of Business; and Chancellor for the Schuylkill campus. Core council is wrapping up the evaluation of the University and should be completed by the end of the fall semester. The Provost reported that the total applications for admissions for last year were up, exceeding 6% over the previous year, but applications were down for campus enrollments and associate degree students. Of concern to the Council is that the budget for the state program supporting selected high school students for non-degree enrollment in selected PSU courses has been eliminated; thus, enrollment among these students is also down. The primary concern that emerged in Faculty Senate, which met on October 11, 2011, was the realignment of the travel component courses. Legislation was introduced that would lead to a policy to move what would be official start dates for semesters and how credit for these course would be distributed in a semester. Currently, Penn State is out of compliance with guidelines for students who have federal loans. However, the senators were concerned that the proposed policy had little detail about how to make the changes work without affecting course enrollment in the travel courses and confusion on the transcript. Thus, the proposed policy was voted down and sent by to committee for revision.

#### **8. Unfinished Business**

8.1 Representation of departments

This matter is under review: See point 6

8.2 Technology Replacement Guideline

This guideline was reviewed last time and considered okay by Faculty Council.

**8.3 Guidelines for Travel-Related Faculty Absences**

This guideline was reviewed last time and considered okay by Faculty Council.

**9. New business**

9.1 Update on current and future building renovations was deferred until next meeting.

9.2 Equitable work spaces for faculty throughout the College was deferred until next meeting.

9.3 Academic integrity was deferred until next meeting.

9.4 Change on tax sheltered annuities (403B)

Beverly Vandiver talked to Gerald Henry, Coordinator of Human Resource and Administrative Services about the changes on tax sheltered annuities. He recommended that faculty look at a webinar provided by TIAA-CREF. He has provided a link to Beverly that she will post the link to the College's listserv.

9.5 Academic freedom/scholarship and Development was deferred until the next meeting.

9.6 Scrutiny of faculty purchasing

A concern was expressed that faculty making requests for books or other supplies for research were being asked to provide detailed information to justify these purchases, beyond a note stating for "research," in order for the requests to be approved by the financial officer in the College. The Dean noted that the request for specific information about faculty purchases have long been in effect and is Penn State's policy. The Dean said he would double check and let the Council know about this matter.

**10. Forensic Business**

There is no forensic business at this time.

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

There were none.

**12. The meeting was adjourned.**

Submitted by Beverly Vandiver, chair.

11-11-11