

**Faculty Senate Minutes
September 21, 2010**

The meeting was called to order at 4:08 p.m. All departments were in attendance except Business Administration, History, and Special Education.

I. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the September 7, 2010 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

II. Proposed Courses and Programs

Discussion was held regarding proposed Educator of the Year Award forms. There was concern that a 500-word limit is insufficient to communicate a nominee's merit. It was noted that such awards often require the nominee themselves to submit a more substantive portfolio, although this creates some burden for the nominee. Development of guidelines for the types of materials to be submitted by a candidate was recommended. The overall evaluation and prestige to be associated with this award seemed unclear. A question was raised about why staff members would be eligible, but the guidelines clearly stress the recognition of educational initiatives. It was noted that the Student Senate selects a Person of the Year on campus.

III. Report of the Faculty Senate Chairperson

Faculty Senate Chair Börger-Greco noted that assistance is needed after each meeting to return tables to the classroom configuration.

IV. Report of the Student Senate President

Student Senate President Darling reported on new senators, administrative guests at their meetings, including Dr. McNairy, and upcoming elections for campus-wide committees. A question was raised about the website outlining student organizations. Ms Darling noted it will be updated soon.

V. Report of the Graduate Student Association

GSA President Tomao noted efforts at increasing campus awareness of GSA through a website, Facebook page, and table at Open House events.

VI. Report of the Administrative Officers

President

President McNairy welcomed faculty back to a new school year.

Associate Provost for Academic Administration

Associate Provost Burns highlighted the need for faculty review and feedback on the first three proposed agreements posted to PA TRAC for psychology, math, and elementary education areas. He indicated that these proposals are likely to shape development of agreements for other fields. Senator Luek commented that the proposal for psychology extends beyond the scope of a transfer articulation to the overall shape of programs/degrees that could impact curriculum beyond the associate level. Dr. Burns noted that the math proposal is more in line with expectations and that elementary education may also have some issues to address.

Assistant Vice President for Academic Services

Assistant Vice President Redmond noted that the Early Intervention system is active. He urged faculty to provide feedback on freshmen, sophomores on academic warning, and freshmen and sophomore athletes by October 4. When asked about expanding this feedback to all students, Mr. Redmond indicated it might be possible in the future. Mr. Grant stated that Athletics would continue to use their current approach until the two processes can be combined. But he reiterated that faculty who use the Early Intervention system can forego responding directly to Athletics.

VII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

ASC

Senator Sikora reported on academic dismissal hearings from June 2010. [see Attachment #1]

UCPRC

A UCPRC motion to extend the expedited review process for adding the D label to existing courses through August 2012 was approved without dissent. It was noted this would allow for more courses to be designated D since it can be difficult to make time for completing the application. A comment was made about the hurdle that including a significant writing component might present.

Senator Smith introduced proposed updates to documents for the course approval process: Course Proposal Form, Curriculum Application, D Label Application, P Label Application, W Label Application, Record of Approvals, and Instructions for Forms. She highlighted a separate signature sheet and integration of Gen Ed objectives for alignment.

Concern was expressed about an unattached signature page and the purpose for integrating alignment to Gen Ed was questioned. Senator Caldwell commented that GERC hopes to gain a better understanding of how Gen Ed outcomes are met across the curriculum. Dr. Burns also noted the need to demonstrate how learning outcomes are being met for reviews such as Middle States. Concern about further reducing the overall Gen Ed program based on overlap with general coursework was noted. A question was raised about how these alignments would be reviewed or evaluated beyond the proposer's perceptions. It was suggested that course mapping for programs is a more appropriate way to track how overall learning outcomes are achieved across campus. It was noted that it is important to recognize how courses meet learning outcomes even if not labeled specifically for Gen Ed.

First Readings

(1) CHANGE TO UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

CHEM 302: Chemistry in Nanotechnology, 3 credits. Proposal to renumber course to CHEM 312, update catalog description, and change prerequisites to NFMT 313 and CHEM 104 or CHEM 111; or CHEM 232; or CHEM 235; or permission of instructor.

(2) CHANGE TO UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

CHEM 327: Biochemistry II, 4 credits. Proposal to change prerequisite to C- or better in CHEM 326 and update course description.

(3) CHANGE TO UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

BS Chemistry, Nanotechnology option. Proposal to add course options to program electives and change one credit of CHEM 498 (research) to CHEM 487 and CHEM 488 (senior seminar).

(4) CHANGE TO UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

AS Chemistry, Pre-Pharmacy option. Proposal to add MATH 130: Elements of Statistics, change biology electives to match current courses offered, and increase program credits from 19-21 to 23-25.

VIII. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

None

IX. Faculty Emeritus

None

X. Grade submission deadlines

Senator Rosenthal expressed concerns from English about the shortened deadline for grade submissions this fall: exams and projects extend to Saturday but grades are due Tuesday. She highlighted the difficulty of grading large numbers of term papers or essay exams especially with larger class sizes. Dr. Burns indicated that the scheduling issue is related to the need to notify students of academic warnings by mail in time to allow them to submit appeals. A comment was made about whether the common calendar could be challenged to address such issues. Dr. Burns noted that there may be some extension of winter break in the future. A more rapid notification method was suggested, but students are already notified both by e-mail and postal service. It was suggested that the 4-day exam schedule might be implemented in the fall semester to complete exams by Friday. It was noted that there isn't a way to notify faculty about students at risk who would need more rapid grading. Faculty who face significant difficulty in meeting the deadline may contact their dean to request an extension.

XI. Other/New Business

None

Meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimee L. Miller
Secretary of the Senate

Action Summary:

The minutes of the September 7, 2010 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

A UCPRC motion to extend the expedited review process for adding the D label to existing courses through August 2012 was approved without dissent.

21 September 2010

From: Todd D. Sikora, Chairperson, Academic Standards Committee
 To: Ana Borger-Greco, Chairperson, Faculty Senate

Re: Report of Academic Standards Committee Dismissal Appeal Hearings for June 2010

1. The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) held all-day dismissal appeal hearings on 9-10 June 2010. Results from the hearings are summarized in Table 1. The results from the January 2010 dismissal appeal hearings are summarized within Table 2 for comparison.

Table 1. June 2010 Dismissal Appeal Hearing Statistics

	Dismissed	Appealed	Approved	% of Dismissals Appealed	% of Appeals Approved
1st Dismissal	118	52(11)	24(1)	44	46(9)
2nd Dismissal	28	10(2)	4(1)	36	40(50)
3rd Dismissal	12	4(0)	2(N/A)	33	50(N/A)
Total	158	66(13)	30(2)	42	45(15)

Table 2. January 2010 Dismissal Appeal Hearing Statistics

	Dismissed	Appealed	Approved	% of Dismissals Appealed	% of Appeals Approved
1st Dismissal	92	41(3)	25(1)	44	61(33)
2nd Dismissal	31	14(0)	7(N/A)	45	50(N/A)
3rd Dismissal	8	5(1)	2(0)	62	40(0)
Total	131	60(4)	34(1)	46	57(25)

Non-parenthetic data represent the total number of cases. Parenthetic data represent the portion of total cases that were resolved via letter-only as opposed to via a letter and an in-person hearing. Three first dismissal letter-only appeals were received after the June hearings but before the 30 June deadline for late appeals. They were handled by a special subcommittee of the ASC.

2. ASC subcommittees considered three eligible petitions for academic amnesty during the June 2010 hearings, all of which were approved.

3. During the Spring 2010 semester, an ASC subcommittee recommended the readmission of a person who served a three-year dismissal period and also approved one academic amnesty petition.