

Senate Minutes, February 1, 1994

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The February 1, 1994 meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chairperson Ender at 3:15 p.m. in Pratt Auditorium.

The following Senators were excused from the meeting: Beener, Bradley, Broad P., Cronk, Curey, Davison, Debiasi, Dugan, Hanrahan, Start, Mill, Mutchnick E., O'Hara, Pettit, Reisenman, Smits, Walz G., Winstead

The following Senators were absent from the meeting: Barry, Begg, Bennett, Brode K., Camp, Halapin, Kaufman, Kolb, Mack, Maracle, Marshall, Santelli, Sapienza, Say, Sellers, Snyder, Thibadeau

The December 7, 1993 minutes were amended as follows:

1. Delete Senators James Gibson, Larry Kroah, Marc Taiani, and Susan Zimny from the list of absentees.
2. Under Rules Committee Item 1, Evelyn Mutchnick's title should read Interim Associate Provost and Leon Vandecreek's title should read Interim Associate Dean for Administration, Graduate School.

The minutes were APPROVED as amended.

Agenda items and order were APPROVED.

President Pettit gave no report.

Interim Provost Staszkiwicz's remarks are attached (**Attachment A**).

Vice Chairperson Jacob's report is attached (**Attachment B**).

Chairperson Ender's report on the Provost Search is attached (**Attachment C**).

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

RULES COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON STINEMAN

1. The Rules Committee submitted the following proposed change to the Senate Constitution as a First Reading:

All curriculum matters shall receive approval of the University Senate before they are implemented. Curriculum matters are forwarded to the full Senate by the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees. These committees have been delegated curriculum responsibility by IUP Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF). The membership of these committees must include a minimum of two thirds faculty. ~~Curricula approved by the full Senate are subject to APSCUF review before they are submitted to the Council of Trustees.~~ Actions by the Senate on curriculum shall be reported to the President and IUP APSCUF.

2. Chairperson Stineman announced Maryanne Brandenburg as the new Senator representing the Office Systems/Business Education Department.
3. The tentative dates for 1995/96 APSCUF/Senate representative elections are March 30 and 31. Senate committee elections may be delayed into April due to the affect that any constitutional change would have on the immediate follow-up of the Senate committee elections.
4. The new list of student senators was distributed (**Attachment D**).
5. The next meeting of the Rule's Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, February 8, 1994 at 3:15 in 2B Uhler.
6. Chairperson Stineman declared the following motion, approved at the December 7, 1993 Senate meeting, inconsistent with the Senate By-Laws and therefore, **NULL AND VOID**:

The Rules committee recommends that we activate our optional "Consultative Committee" (By-Laws, V.K., page 13); populate this committee with the non-committee senators; and make use of their expertise on an "as-need arises" basis.

Rationale: Their energies would be available to the Senate Chair or any of our other standing Senate committees for special assignment or advising roles.

LIBRARY & EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON GOODRICH

Senator Goodrich announced that an additional guard will be hired at the Stapleton Library to help control library activities. However, there is no way to extend library hours as no additional staffing is available at the present time to do so.

NON-CREDIT COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON NOWELL

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 8, 1994.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON GIBBS

The committee is working on a motion concerning the inflow and outflow of Research monies and will have a complete report soon.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON BARKER

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 8, 1994 at 3:15 in the Pratt Lounge.

UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT & FINANCE - CHAIRPERSON RADAKOVIC

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 8, 1994 at 3:15 in the Blue Room in Breezedale.

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON DUNTLEY

Chairperson Duntley presented a report on Attendance Policy (Attachment E).

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON BORMANN

1. Chairperson Bormann read the following items For Senate Information:

WRITING INTENSIVE APPROVALS

- a. Type I (Professor Commitment)
Jack Reed, Safety Science
- b. Type II (Departmental Course)
CH 498 Problems in Chemistry
EX 112 Typical and Atypical Growth and Development

2. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 8, 1994 at 3:15.

NEW BUSINESS

ADMISSIONS RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE - CO-CHAIRPERSON STONEBRAKER

Senator Stonebraker announced that applications for Fall enrollment at IUP are down from last year.

The University-wide Admissions Committee has formed a steering committee to work on increasing faculty participation in admissions. The committee will ask departments to call new admits in their area, encourage attendance in Phase I, create profiles for their new recruits, and develop better literature to send to students from departments.

Other initiations include developing a new image for IUP as a public ivy; automating the recruitment process; and coordinating the activities of the faculty steering committee, the public ivy group, the computer center, and the Admissions Committee and staff.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FEE COMMITTEE - CHAIRPERSON CUNNINGHAM

Chairperson Cunningham announced that copies of the 1992-93 Educational Service Fee Allotment will be available in the library.

In the future, colleges will be given an allocation rather than being asked to request money for specific items that have to then be approved. The 1995 allocations have already been approved. The money will be distributed to Academic Affairs, the library, branch campuses and Student Affairs.

Chairperson Cunningham stated that the Educational Services Fee will not be increased. The Educational Services Fee can only increase if tuition increases. The Facilities Fee and the Educational Services Fee combined cannot exceed 10% of tuition.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "C. Carranza".

Carmy Carranza
University Senate

INTERIM PROVOST STASZKIEWICZ
Senate Remarks

At the December Senate meeting I outlined some of the positive changes that are taking place in such areas as space utilization, registration, admissions, refocus and our efforts to improve the promotion process. Similarly, President Pettit outlined other improvements such as fiber optics, the one-card technology, physical plant planning, deferred maintenance and construction projects such as the College of Business building, McElhaney, and Weyandt. I indicated that it was nice to end the semester on a relatively positive note but that I'd be starting the second semester by addressing some of the difficult decisions facing us. Well, it's time for that reality check.

First, through its initial phase, the Refocus II subcommittees have each reaffirmed the existence of a serious morale problem on campus. There is a growing realization that it is not any one group or individual that is causing it, rather many of IUP's policies and procedures are cumbersome, frustrating, and too bureaucratic. This leads people to become frustrated with the system and helpless to get things done. We need to change these policies and procedures to empower faculty and staff to make decisions. One way in which this can be accomplished is to review our entire budgeting system. This semester we will begin, in earnest, to discuss the possibilities of changing our policies on hiring from a "complement control" system to a full funding budget model. This has been recommended by the deans and through the first Refocus Committee. I will share more on this with appropriate groups on campus.

A second effort this year is to take a little more time in identifying a long-term solution to a problem rather than continuing to apply a band aid. For example, the Educational Services Fee Committee just passed a recommendation from the Council of Deans to establish base equipment budgets within each college. Rather than dealing one year at a time, Colleges will now be able to plan for long-term instructional needs and eliminate the paperwork that used to be required. Again, the goal was to establish a process which allows decisions to be made at the level that needs to make them. We need to review academic and non-academic policies to see how we can do more of this.

Another major issue that must be addressed is the way in which resources are distributed. The distribution of faculty and staff, space, operating budgets, and other resources tends to stay constant even though changes have occurred or that differential needs exist. While there is great hope that Refocus II will provide some long-term strategies, we need to begin by codifying current resources so we can make future decisions from an appropriate database.

Another area of concern focuses on quality. I spoke a little about this last month in terms of our efforts to change admissions procedures to recruit students of the highest quality. Let's not kid ourselves - this is a real problem - but it is one we can and will correct. But no discussion of quality is complete unless we address all areas--teaching, administration, resources and others. We need to make sure that services we provide are of the highest quality possible.

The last area of concern that I'll address today - and this is not to suggest that I am so foolish to think they have all been exhausted - is technology. We have grown from having 250 to over 2500 micro computers.

We have a much more computer literate faculty, staff and student body. We are building an infrastructure with our databases and fiber optics to do some fantastic things - yet, we have difficulty fixing a broken machine or installing software in a lab. We have a need for written documentation at all levels. We have a need to write more efficient and effective administrative programs and to assist faculty in taking advantage of all the technology to improve instruction. We need to explore the relationship between computing services and the library, we need to develop an instructional design center, and we need to take a hard look at how we can meet needs that will continue to escalate and change. I hope that this semester we can create some structure to address these concerns.

My final comment deals with an immediate concern to the University as a whole - accreditation. I need to take every opportunity to remind each of us that the Middle States Association will take a lot of work by a lot of people.

As I am sure most of you already know, having received a December 20, 1993 letter from the Steering Committee, IUP is due for its ten-year reaccreditation review by the Middle States Association. A site visit and evaluation is scheduled to occur during the fall 1995 semester. A Steering Committee, co-chaired by Dr. Patrick Murphy of the English Department and Dr. Evelyn Mutchnick of the Provost's Office, has been named to coordinate the self-study evaluation process. The committee is comprised of seven administrators, five faculty, three staff and two students. Approximately 60 additional persons will be added to various subcommittees to complete the team.

Following discussions with faculty and administration, it was determined that IUP would use the Special Topics Approach to Self-Study. The areas selected as Special Topics include graduate education, Library and Information Technology and Liberal Studies. The IUP community will be invited to "town meetings" to discuss drafts of the report. On March 16, 1994, Dr. John Erickson, IUP's institutional liaison to the Middle States Association, will be on our campus to assist us in preparing for the self-study process. Faculty, students and staff are encouraged to attend the session designated for their constituency to provide Dr. Erickson with your insights into this process. An agenda of his visit with relevant times and locations will be forthcoming.

I know it is possible to hear all this, to add your own concerns, and to think "my God, how will we ever get through this." I hope, however, that everyone's reaction is, "how exciting - we are in the process of changing our entire culture and we are shaping what IUP will be for a long time to come."

Before closing, I do need to follow up on a motion passed by the Senate to review the Administrative Manual and other official documents to insure that policies passed by the Senate are correctly implemented. My office has begun a review of Trustee dockets to extract all Senate policies that have been approved and we will report back to this group as soon as that has been completed.

**VICE CHAIRPERSON JACOB'S
Report**

Welcome back after the holidays. I hope that you are all well rested and ready for debate! In order to give student senators a chance to work on some different issues this semester, and to increase participation, some of them have moved to different Senate committees. The new lists of students serving on the committees have been sent to Senate committee chairs. In my mind, it is the responsibility of the chair to inform ALL members when committee meetings are held. I sincerely hope that this will not be overlooked so that students and faculty/administration can maintain a good, working relationship.

Once again, many students have been caused a great deal of grief by the IUP Accounts Receivable Office. Time and time again, I have heard the comments "insensitive," "rude," "disorganized," and "uninformed" from many students across campus. I personally saw the pain that the office caused to at least two students at IUP when they told the students that money was owed to IUP, and if the money was not paid by the following morning, the students records for the semester would be completely deleted. After spending over 45 minutes trying to get the personnel in that office to check the students' records on the computer, I was told that Accounts Receivable had in fact been wrong. It seems that this office that receives millions in payments each year, runs two computer programs - including one that does not show cash payments made to a student's account! It is time that such blatant disregard for correct information be corrected, and I would ask that the University's Finance division take a long, close, look at the functioning of the Accounts Receivable Office so that the University does not lose students in the future because of such occurrences.

The IUP community is caused a great deal of inconvenience when offices on campus are completely shut down between 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 p.m. Is it not possible to stagger the hours of employees, or schedule responsible, authorized and educated student workers to be there during those times? At most other campuses in the USA, it is the norm for a campus office to remain open throughout the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. to serve its users. If this issue can be resolved, it would be a great service to this campus.

The IUP Telephone Directories - it is really hard to figure out why this publication takes almost two and a half months to be delivered to the IUP community. Since this has been a problem at least for the last 3 years that I have been here, it's time OHRL takes a look at it and remedies this next year. Actually, if one asks around, one finds that no one is really sure what the problem is, neither are they sure who exactly is responsible, and very readily say "It's out of my hands." Well, let's take it out of these unknown hands, and give the responsibility of the directory's publication to University Publications completely. At least then we know who to hold responsible next year if there is a delay.

I want to also talk about a simply extraordinary professor at IUP. I will not mention her name, because I am currently in her class, but will be sure to do so in May, before I graduate. It has been a while since I have met a professor who gets her full enthusiasm and energy simply by being with students. Not only does she instruct the class practically in the subject matter, preparing the class for the real world, but also make sit clear that she is aware of, sensitive to and willing to help in the many issues that college students face in their college years. She strongly encourages the involvement of students in campus activities, and makes no secret of the value that she believes that such involvement has. She goes way beyond the call of duty, taking information from students that she passes on to prospective employers, matching the skills of particular students in her class to

the employer's needs. I consider myself fortunate to get a chance to see my idea of the true college professor in action.

The last weekend of the Fall semester remains etched in my mind. Finally, an Honors College for IUP, a prestigious national honor society installed with full tradition and ceremony, and a wonderful and personable graduate ceremony - all I can say after that is: I AM IUP PROUD.

PROVOST SEARCH

Operating Procedures & Selection Process

I. OPERATING PROCEDURES

- A. Committee must have quorum (simple majority) to conduct business.
- B. Committee members agree not to lobby members outside of the committee process -- advocacy for a candidate inside the committee meetings is appropriate.
- C. All business discussed in committee meetings is considered confidential and is not to be shared outside of the meeting.
- D. When the committee must vote on a candidate, the voting will take place by secret ballot.
- E. After the fourth review, a committee member can advocate to include a candidate from the 25% pool in the next review stage. A two thirds positive vote is needed to include the candidate in the next stage.

II. SELECTION PROCESS

First Review: A subcommittee of the search committee, which will consist of the co-chairs and four other members appointed by the co-chairs, will review all applications using the published criteria of required qualifications. On the basis of these criteria, the subcommittee will divide the pool of candidates into three categories: acceptable, unacceptable, and questionable.

Second Review: The entire search committee will conduct a review of the candidates who fall into the questionable category. The purpose of this review is to make a final determination of whether candidates in the questionable pool should be continued by placing them in the acceptable pool. A final decision will be determined by a secret ballot requiring a positive majority vote to continue a candidate. All candidates who have not made the acceptable pool will be notified of their status in writing.

Third Review: The entire committee will individually review the candidates in the acceptable pool using a rating scale with a maximum of 20 points each for the required criteria and 15 points each for the preferred criteria. Each committee member will submit to the co-chairs his/her list of candidates ranked from highest point value to lowest point value. The co-chairs will calculate a final pool of candidates which will represent 25% of the acceptable pool.

Fourth Review: Any committee member may choose to advocate any candidate from the acceptable pool who did not make the final pool. After advocacy, the committee will vote by secret ballot. A positive majority vote is required to continue a candidate in the final pool. All candidates who do not make this final pool will be notified of their status in writing.

Fifth Review: Following an open committee discussion of the candidates in the top 25% pool, each member of the committee will re-rank the candidates and submit their ranking to the co-chairs. The chairs will then re-calculate the ranking and present the top twelve (12) candidates, who will then be contacted regarding their permission to interview their references. The remaining candidates will be contacted to alert them to their status in the search and determine if they want to stay in the pool.

Sixth Review: The sixth review has two steps. (1) In step one the candidate's references will be contacted, through a conference call, by a team of two committee members. Each reference will be asked a set of questions predetermined by the committee. These questions shall be designed to find out if the candidate is, in fact, the person they portray themselves to be on paper.

(2) During the second step of this review the committee will decide, by a positive vote of at least two thirds of the committee membership (that is, eleven members of the committee as it is currently constituted), if there is any reason why we should not call all twelve candidates for a phone interview. Any candidate receiving a 2/3 or greater negative vote will be dropped from the phone interview stage.

SEVENTH REVIEW: This review will be a telephone interview with all candidates who remain in the pool after the 6th review. Prior to this interview, each candidate will be contacted by phone to make the necessary arrangements for the phone interview and to seek the candidate's permission to tape record the interview.

During the interview, each candidate will be asked a series of standardized questions. Interviews will be attended by as many committee members as are available and will be tape recorded for the benefit of those who cannot attend. All interviews will have a time limit which will be determined at a later date.

The committee will reconvene ten days after the final candidate interview and each committee member will have his/her personal ranked candidates for discussion and re-ranking. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the candidates. Committee members will have forth-eight hours after this meeting to submit their re-ranked list of candidates to the co-chairs. The co-chairs will calculate the ranking of all candidates to determine the final list of candidates to invite to an on campus interview.

The co-chairs will submit the 12 ranked candidates to the committee for advocacy. After advocacy, each committee member will prepare a final ranking of the candidates. The co-chairs will calculate this ranking and the top five candidates on this list will be invited to campus for an interview.

SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
Student Senators

I. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

1. Julie Willis	235 Esch Hall Box 6	357-4156
2. Steve Whitby	946 Church St.	
3. Joe Elias	37 1/2 College Lodge Rd.	349-5640
4. Deb Brunner	235 Esch Hall Box 1	357-4156
5. Joe Bradley	1036 Water St.	463-8665
6. Shareen Barry	722 Klondike Ave.	463-0213
7. Tracy Mack	1215 Maple St.	
8. Jullian Palka	115 S. 6th St.	349-8507
9. Dirk Sellers	RR 4, Indiana	479-0617
10. Dennis Lytle	116 Stewart Hall	357-4616
11. Mike Dubrovsky	118 Stewart Hall	357-4618
12. Ryan Weaver	110 Scranton Hall	357-5110
13. Kim Weaver	507 Esch Hall	357-5033
14. Jamie Santelli	746 South St.	465-4030

II. UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

1. Doug Baker	320 Carriage House	349-9318
2. Mary Evans	34 S. 9th St.	349-8842
3. Steve Aquilani	927 Fleming Ave. #22	

III. LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

1. Chris O'Hara	RD #2 Box 218 Clymer	254-9581
2. Marc Taiani	122 Stewart Hall	357-4622
3. Robert Beener	1036 Water St.	463-8665
4. Sean Hanley	334 Turnbull Hall	357-3076

IV. UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

1. Jennifer Tersigni	124 Mack Hall Box 169	357-3523
2. Becky Templeton	716 Wayne Ave.	357-8530
3. Cheryl Bennett	1039 Rear School St.	465-8370
4. Lisa Ragantesi	742 Locust St.	357-8234

V. ACADEMIC PROCEDURES COMMITTEE

1. Dana Pountious	800 Wayne Ave.	349-5296
2. Sarah Zablotzky	309 Esch Hall	357-4167
3. John Grundy	2550 Evergreen Dr.	463-6359
4. Zane Davison	1160 Oakland Ave.	349-9403

VI. RULES COMMITTEE

1. Sharon Debiasi	671 Washington St.	463-2639
2. Jim Lidonnice	338 Esch Hall	357-4193
3. Susan Sterner	824 Shafer Hall C-239	357-6189
4.		

VII. RESEARCH COMMITTEE

1. Brian Oglesby	007 Essex Apts.	357-9031
2.		

VIII. AWARDS COMMITTEE

1. Josh Sapienza	246 S. 7th St.	465-2362
2. Larry Snyder	209 Clymer Ave.	465-0732
3. Tonya Wack	620 Lawrence Hall	357-5465
4.		

Senate Minutes - February 1994
Academic Committee -- Chairperson Duntley

Senator Duntley reviewed the work of the Academic Committee in considering the university undergraduate course attendance policy. The policy is under consideration because of renewed interests in the policy; this policy has been in place since the 1970's when it was designed for a different student body and a different academic climate. With indifferent administration of the policy, as well as circumvention of both the spirit and letter of the current policy, review is needed.

Three general proposals for change are under consideration: (1) a course - appropriate attendance policy, in which the instructor would develop a policy appropriate to an individual course, subject to approval by the department. (2) an individual faculty attendance policy, in which faculty would establish a policy, within some parameters, and present it in the syllabus for each course. (3) A university-wide attendance policy, in which senate would set an undergraduate attendance policy with provisions for exceptions.

The committee is seeking additional response from all constituencies. Departmental senators, in particular, were asked to engage their departments in serious consideration of this issue and to forward response to the committee through any of the members or through the chair.