

**Faculty Senate Minutes, Penn State Worthington Scranton  
December 6, 2011  
Sherbine Lounge**

Meeting called to order at 12:05 pm by Dr. Gail Keating, Faculty Senate Chair

**Approval of Minutes**

The November 2011 minutes were approved.

**Administrative Reports**

**1) Chancellor:**

Chancellor Dr. Mary-Beth Krogh-Jespersen reported the following:

- The Chancellor thanked faculty members for their patience in dealing with the effects of the recent Penn State scandal in the classroom and for being available to discuss the issue in class with students.
- In January, after approval by the Board of Trustees, faculty members will receive a letter detailing the recently announced salary adjustments.
- The Chancellor formally thanked Faculty Senate Chair Dr. Keating and Chair Elect Joseph Fennewald for their service during the past year and their work on the Constitution. Both were presented with small Nittany Lion statues.
- The Chancellor concluded by wishing everyone happy holidays.

**2) Interim Director of Academic Affairs:**

Dr. Molly Wertheimer reported the following:

- Dr. Wertheimer asked faculty members to remind their students to complete the SRTE's.
- Furthermore, she asked advisers to check on eLion if all of their advisees had scheduled courses for the spring semester. Advisers should contact those students who still haven't signed up for classes.

**DAA Search Committee Report:**

Dr. Alan Peslak updated the faculty on the progress of the DAA search. He stated that telephone interviews with candidates had been completed, and the committee was in the process of setting up campus interviews. The first candidate will visit the campus on December 12, 2011. An agenda will be sent out prior to the visit. Dr. Peslak encouraged the faculty to attend both the candidate's presentation and meeting with the faculty.

**NOTE:** DUE TO THE SCHEDULED VOTE ON THE REVISION OF THE WORTHINGTON SCRANTON FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION (draft distributed at last month's meeting), NO OTHER COMMITTEE REPORTS WERE SOLICITED. INSTEAD, THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING WAS DEVOTED TO VOTING ON AND DISCUSSING THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION.

**New Business:**

Vote on the Proposed Changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution:

Voting commenced at 12:15 pm with 21 Faculty Senate Members in attendance. One faculty member had to leave during the process. A second faculty member had to leave late in the voting process. Results of the vote and discussions are detailed below:

ARTICLE	Number of votes on proposed changes:		
	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Article I	19	1	0
Article II, Option One	20	0	0
Article II, Option Two	0	20	0

Discussion re. Article II Options prior to voting : Mr. Fennewald explained that there are two options presented as possible changes to the article regulating membership in the Faculty Senate. While the Executive Board (EB) had suggested Option One in its original revision, Option Two had been sent to the EB with the request to present it as a choice to vote on. Since the sender felt strongly that this option should be considered, it has been added to the document and must be voted on by the members present. If the issue remains unresolved, it can be tabled and revisited at future meetings.

Dr. Peslak asked if an attempt to limit non-faculty participation in meetings would really matter since the Constitution also states that non-faculty members have a right to attend meetings, even though they are not voting members of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Meg Hatch pointed out that faculty members may still hold special sessions limited to faculty only. This option would be available, even if the vote did not change current membership rules.

Mr. Fennewald concurred and explained that the October special meeting that was held to discuss the Constitution was an example of such a restricted meeting.

Dr. Matthew Mutchler asked if there was a difference between a "member" and a "voting member." Mr. Fennewald explained that all Faculty Senate members were also voting members. Furthermore, currently staff members cannot vote in the Faculty Senate anyway.

To offer some clarification, Dr. Mary-Beth Krogh-Jespersen explained that the existence of a campus faculty senate is required by the University Faculty Senate. The choice to include in the University Faculty Senate 10% non-faculty members was made by the President. The University Faculty Senate determines who may be a member of campus faculty senates, and a campus cannot change that. For example, no Chancellor, DAA or ADAA may vote in campus faculty senates. Rules regarding membership are sent to the

Chancellor by the University Faculty Senate each year, and the University Faculty Senate Constitution must be applied. A campus may restrict the number of administrators and staff who may be members of faculty senate.

Dr. Molly Wertheimer cautioned that if the Faculty Senate chose to exclude administrators, this act might drive a wedge between administration and faculty and impede communication.

Director of Continuing Education John Drake shared that his attendance at faculty senate meetings had allowed him to learn a great deal about the needs of the campus faculty and that he welcomed the opportunity to learn about the faculty's point of view.

After voting on Article II, Options I and II, the vote proceeded to the next article.

ARTICLE	Number of votes on proposed changes:		
	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Article III	20	0	0
Article IV	20	0	0
Article V	20	0	0
Article VI	19	1	0
Article VII	20	0	0
Article VIII	19	1	0
Article IX	19	1	0
Article X	20	0	0
Article XI	20	0	0

Vote on Bylaws: the vote on the bylaws proceeded section by section (rather than by article) due to the length and complexity of each section in the bylaws.

ARTICLE	Number of votes on proposed changes:		
	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Article I			
Section 1	16	2	2

Discussion re. Section 1 prior to vote: Dr. Janet Melnick asked about the purpose of the changes. Mr. Fennewald explained that the change will reduce the number of standing committees. He then summarized the main points of Section 1.

Dr. Peslak clarified that committees who no longer were standing committees would then no longer be Faculty Senate Committees. He then stated that according to his interpretation, Article I (what the Faculty Senate deals with) contradicts the content of the suggested change to Section 1.

Mr. Fennewald stated that many of the committees that would be moved from the Faculty Senate have already been reporting to the DAA.

Dr. Dolis stated that all chairs of the affected committees had been contacted and had agreed to the proposed change. Dr. Keating and Mr. Fennewald confirmed that they had contacted all chairs.

When Mr. Fennewald explained that most of the committees affected by the change had not been reporting to the Faculty Senate, Dr. Melnick questioned if the chairs' failure to do so was a strong enough reason to discontinue the committee as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Keating and Mr. Fennewald explained that some committees should never have been Faculty Senate committees. For example, the Strategic Planning Committee reports to the Chancellor and does not report to the Faculty Senate. Plant Planning and Utilization also does not report to the Faculty Senate.

The Chancellor offered a brief history of the committees. At one point, someone had moved all the committees to the Faculty Senate, even those that should not be Faculty Senate Committees. For example, a chancellor is not allowed to chair a faculty senate committee. However, due to the existing Constitution, she has been doing just that by chairing the Strategic Planning Committee. These issues need to be addressed and corrected.

Dr. Melnick asked about the selection of committee members for the committees that would be moved out of the Faculty Senate. For example, will administration decide who serves on these committees? Would the selection process be standardized? Dr. Melnick expressed her concern that some committees might "disappear" since the Faculty Senate Chair would no longer assign members to those committees. Mr. Fennewald stated that the committees should make decisions about how to select members, and their choices would be added to the Constitution. Likewise, the change in the Constitution would give the committees more autonomy and options in their actions.

Dr. Wertheimer explained that committees who report to the DAA would be able to make decisions more quickly and administer their budgets directly.

Note: prior to the vote on the next articles, some faculty members had to leave.

ARTICLE	Number of votes on proposed changes:		
	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Article I			
Section 2	16	1	1
Section 3	15	1	1
Sections 4 and 5—no changes			
Section 6	18	0	0
Article II—no changes			
Article III	18	0	0
Article IV and V—no changes			

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm.

**Next Meeting**

The next Faculty Senate Meeting will take place in the spring semester. The time and place will be announced by the new Chair Elect, Dr. Beatriz Rivera-Barnes.

Respectfully submitted,

Éva Tettenborn  
Faculty Senate Secretary