SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
Minutes for Meeting #2, October 21, 2014

Members Present:

Members Absent:
B. Barr, M. Demirel, J. Schiano, F. Weber

Guests:
Kaitlin Roberts replacing B. Barr

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Vote on the minutes of the September meeting - Approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Update from Officers and Chairs meeting:
1. Board likely to support a faculty and student member to the Board of Trustees; if this goes through, CC&R will move quickly to begin an election process; Faculty member would have a 3-year term, student would have a 2-year term.
2. Curricular Affairs is looking at certificates – putting forth a process for review; also may be looking at badges as well. The discussion at Officers and Chairs recommended that the Senate get ahead of this issue, so CA and UE are likely to be discussing badges in the future.
3. Faculty Affairs going to review HR-25 (Emeritus Faculty); there was a change to HR-25 in 2013 that did not go through Faculty Affairs and there have been some concerns about those changes. (The change made it such that only tenured faculty are eligible – campuses like Hershey have otherwise-qualified faculty who are now not eligible because they don’t have tenure.)

OLD BUSINESS
1. Update on Textbook Report/ LIST
   We will work with LIST on this topic, but their committee is very busy right now. Beth will continue to try to get something moving.
2. Update on joining a report on Mental Health services - Student Life
   Student Life is going to sponsor a report on this in March, so Beth has requested that we be part of that report; wants to make sure the report focuses on all campuses (including World Campus); not just UP.
3. Update on request to change SRTE question order
   Michael Komiski has brought this to the committee. He wants to consider changing the order of the SRTE questions (this has come up before). Historically, Faculty Affairs deals with SRTEs, so Beth has been in touch with Pat Koch (chair). FA agreed to take this up and will keep us informed (they are working on several other issues related to SRTEs). Student senators raised the concern that students would like to be able to see SRTE
scores as part of the decision making process for selecting courses (but only those who complete SRTEs would be able to see this). The hope is that this would actually increase the number of students completing SRTEs, making them more valuable in the end. UE’s discussion today focused on the pros and cons of such a move, as well as some alternative ways other than SRTEs to measure/show teaching effectiveness.

NEW BUSINESS
1. Discuss P6 requests, Program Phase-Outs:
   a. BS Applied Behavioral Science, Harrisburg; Energy, Environment and Mineral Econ Minor, EMS
   BS Applied Behavioral Science, Harrisburg: Rose – Urged the Committee to take all P6 requests seriously, as they can mean faculty lose jobs. She feels the request is incomplete; the objections from HDFS don’t seem to be addressed/resolved. Seymour says there is discussion of proposing a new option in Sociology. Rose wonders how the proposal’s promise not to lose any faculty positions can be upheld if the Sociology program doesn’t exist yet. A huge red flag. Some committee members feel that this request is actually a veiled attempt to have UE adjudicate this. UE has a lot of questions about this P6 that are not being answered by the materials – the proposal needs more clarification. Pollack wonders if Education had been considered as a new home. Seymour’s read of the material seems to indicate that HDFS was not happy with the move to Sociology. Committee concern that this P6 is combining two requests into one – the phase out of the current BS and the creation of the new Sociology program. The new Sociology program will have to go through the formal creation process. Harrisburg Senate approved this, but we don’t have any information on those deliberations. How many faculty are involved in the phaseout? Were they individually consulted? We don’t know enough about the faculty. Moore feels the entire packet is “scattered” – not as well put together as others we have received, including the lack of a cover letter from the chancellor.
   RECOMMENDATION: Take this back to the Chancellor, resolve the issue between HDFS and SOC, then bring it back to UE.

   b. Energy, Environment and Mineral Econ Minor, EMS – Very straightforward, comes with the right credentials…shows they did their homework.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approve.

2. Discuss Proposal for name change of Department of Women’s Studies
   Taylor raised the question of why faculty, both current and future, will be given the option to choose their title. Rose said that is common practice, particularly in Liberal Arts. Faculty may feel they are known in the field with their current title/field and don’t want to change for fear of losing that identity. The committee discussed the grammar behind the new title, but agreed that this is beyond our purview and is most likely based on historical rationale. We know that the department has debated this internally for years!
   RECOMMENDATION: Approve.
3. Discuss Engaged Scholarship Informational Report  
Seymour has already suggested that authorship be clearly shown in the report (Brady suggest this go at the beginning), so it is clear that UE sponsored it but did not author it. UE concerned that the CoES goal is to eventually have this as a degree requirement. Rose concerned that some of the organizations students might work with are religious or political. She says this has raised eyebrows in her own work in the past…might we be concerned about this moving forward?

Brady raised concern about using “Scholarship” instead of “Learning” – feels that what we are describing is Engaged Learning and not always Engaged Scholarship. Worried that without changing this, we might not get the buy-in we need across the University…even it if means using terminology that is different than the rest of the nation.

Rose concerned that this will mean a lot more work for faculty. Even if not “required,” faculty will feel they have to participate if they want P&T. RECOMMENDATION: Approved, provided the authorship is taken care of at the beginning of the document.

4. Discuss LionPATH and possible Legislative Reports  
Revision to Repeating Courses Policy (47-80)  
Revision to Major Declaration Policy (37-30; D-1; D-2)  
Revision to Prerequisites and Concurrent Courses (34-60; C-5)  
Co-Chairs of the LionPATH Faculty Advisory Committee, David Salvia and David Babb, will be talking to us in the future about these and possibly other legislative items that will be impacted by LionPATH.

5. Discuss Gen Ed Informational Report  
GETF may be bringing something to us for legislation, likely about Learning Outcomes. Moore felt the GETF report was well-written – the actual discussion is going to center on the deliberation of the three models. Seymour added that the ultimate issue will be assessment. Smith commented that these changes are certainly founded on national literature, but our own values as a University community support this change as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05AM.

Respectfully submitted by A. Taylor.