West Chester University of PA
Faculty Senate
2006/2007
April 20, 2007, Full Assembly Minutes

Members Present: *designated by an X*

Alessandria, Tina	X	Kara, Orhan	
Andrews, Thomas		Smith, Paul	Proxy D. Bill
Bean, Nadine	X	Thames Taylor, LaTonya	X
Chilcote, Kathryn	X	Williams, Diane	
Ervin, Margaret	X	Zimmer, Peter	X
Haggard, Cynthia	X	Azorlosa, Jay	
Morgan, Tanya	X	Bedford, Robert	Proxy K Chilcote
Polsky, Yury		Bill, Debra	X
Ray, Judith		Brown, Eleanor	X
Ray, Timothy		Cressler, Walter	X
DeHope, ELI	X	Dannessa, Karen	X
Cai, Wei Wei		Friedman, Jonathon	X
Hutton, Jane	X	Hashimoto-Sinclair, Yoko	X
Hyers, Lauri Lyn	X	Li, Hulmin (Amy)	
Marvin, Stephen		McVey, Randy	
Nolan, Karen	X	Means, Jennifer	X
Onderdonk, Julian		Sandhu, Bim	
Sally Winterton	Proxy T Allessandria	Thompson, Brent	X

Minutes:
- Cliff Johnson provided an APSCUF update. The faculty will have an opportunity to vote for a possible strike this summer. No new negotiations have been scheduled. There will also be an all faculty meeting at 3:30 next Thursday to provide faculty more information. If faculty have any concerns or questions, please submit them either to the APSCUF members only website or to Cliff who can submit them on your behalf.
- The Minutes from the March 8th, 2007 were approved
- Cynthia Haggard provided the "President's Report." She met with President Adler this week.
  - The budget for the University will not be known by July, therefore tuition will also not be known.
  - The graduate commencement will be now separate than the larger one. It will take place May 14th at 7pm
  - Issues of campus safety and communications are being addressed with lessons learned from Virginia Tech.
- A moment of silence was observed to respect those involved in the Virginia Tech incident
- Tina Alessandria reported that administration was trying to create a forum to have faculty air their safety concerns. LaTonya Thames Taylor suggested coordinating with CCIT. Senators felt the need to raise awareness regarding policies, referrals for counseling, etc…
- Senators discussed uncoupling the Ethics and Faculty Welfare Committees as new ethical situations have recently been identified. This was approved and will take place next fall.
  - The Senators recommended that the Faculty Welfare Committee target safety on campus as their focus.

- ▪ Motion by Nadine Bean to have Cynthia Haggard and Nadine Bean meet with President Adler regarding a request to allow Faculty Senate to take the lead to explore safety for students and faculty on campus. Motion approved.
- ▪ Motion by Tina Alessandria to have a faculty processing forum held regarding safety on campus. Motion approved.

New Issues:
- ▪ The election for Faculty Senate Executive Committee was held. The new officers are:

- **President: Cynthia Haggard**
  Secondary Education, Recitation 203C
  610-436-2764, chaggard@wcupa.edu
- **Vice-President: Eli DeHope**
  Social Work, 114 Rosedale 201
  610-738-0501, edehope@wcupa.edu
- **Recording Secretary: Julian Onderdonk**
  Music, Swope 408
  610-436-3234, jonderdonk@wcupa.edu
- **Corresponding Secretary (& back-up Recording Secretary):
  Jane Hutton**
  Library, FHG 210
  610-436-3453, jhutton@wcupa.edu
- **At-Large Member: Dee Bill**
  Health Sciences, SHSC 303
  610-436-6941, dbill@wcupa.edu
- **At-Large Member: Tanya Morgan**
  Health Sciences, SHSC 3112
  610-436-2113, tmorgan@wcupa.edu

- ▪ Motion to destroy the ballots was approved

Report from Committees:
- Faculty Welfare – *no verbal report – see written report*
- Student Welfare – Timely notice of campus crime is now the goal on campus. Also a survey of faculty regarding attendance at commencement showed that the best ideas to entice faculty were for departments to have receptions to honor graduates. Another idea was to have a rotating schedule of faculty who will attend graduation. The chairs of the departments should also encourage greater attendance.
- Communication – Jane Hutton reported that the Web Site template has been approved. The Blackboard site for Faculty Senate is being worked on and will include committee reports and minutes from meetings.
- Membership and Elections – Julian Onderdonk reported that elections went smooth and are completed for year.
- Curriculum and Research – *no verbal report – see written report*

Meeting was adjourned by President Haggard.

Respectfully submitted by:

Eli DeHope
Recording Secretary
AY 2006/2007

2006-2007 Year-End Committee Reports
Attachment A: Communications Committee
Attachment B: Curriculum & Research Committee
Teacher-Scholar Models
Information Literacy

A.

Senate Communications Committee
Karen Dannessa
Jane Hutton (chair)
Amy (Hiumin) Li
Randy McVey

2006-2007 Report

Faculty Senate Blackboard site:
- Access to the Senate BB site has been enabled for all 2006-07 Senators.
- Folders have been created for all Senate committees.
- Senate Meeting Minutes are added to the BB site by the Communications Committee chair/webmaster.
- Site has been migrated from "Courses" to "Organizations".

Faculty Senate web site:
- New template for Senate web site developed & approved. The updated template incorporates the new University web template and top navigation bar. Complete site to be migrated by August 2007.
  Preview available at
  http://sapphire.wcupa.net/_facstaff/facultysenate/test1b.asp

B.

Senate Curriculum & Research Committee

Curriculum and Research Committee
Teacher/Scholar Models

In November 2006, WCU Provost Dr. Linda Lamwers spoke before the Faculty Senate about the evolution and purpose of the department Teacher-Scholar models. These guidelines, based on the theories of SUNY Chancellor Ernest Boyer (1928-1995), assist faculty in developing a complementary approach to the varied aspects of academic life—teaching, scholarship, and service. Boyer proposed integrating all three elements into a coherent theory and methodology, emphasized the more applied-side of research, and sought to strengthen academia's commitment to community building. The result has been a shift away from segmented circles of pedagogy, discovery, and service to circles that overlap. For WCU faculty navigating their way through the tenure and promotion process, the many instruments which assess their performance may be a source of confusion. The Curriculum and Research Committee of the Faculty Senate has undertaken this report to help faculty members make sense of this complexity.

I. CBA

The first set of guidelines which faculty should consult, and which serve as the foundation of all other guidelines, is the Agreement between the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF) and the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (State System), commonly referred to either as the CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement) or the "contract." This document breaks up faculty responsibilities into three categories—teaching, scholarship, and service, and explains generally what is indicated by the three.

Article 12
Subsection B 1 a
"Effective teaching and fulfillment of professional responsibilities: This will be indicated, when applicable, by such items as: student evaluations, peer evaluations, classroom visitations, quality of syllabi, quality of student advisement, willingness to accept departmental work assignments, timely execution of work assignments, and any other data deemed appropriate and agreed to by the faculty and administration at local meet and discuss."

Subsection B 2
"Continuing scholarly growth: This will be indicated, when applicable, by such items as: development of experimental programs (including distance education), papers delivered at national and regional meetings of professional societies; regional and national awards; offices held in professional organizations; invitational lectures given;

participation in panels at regions and national meetings of professional organizations; grant acquisitions; editorships of professional journals; participation in juried shows; program-related projects; quality of musical or theatrical performances; participation in one-person or invitational shows; consultantships; research projects and publication record; additional graduate work; contribution to the scholarly growth of one's peers; and any other data agreed to by the faculty and administration at local meet and discuss."

Subsection B 3
"Service: contribution to the University and/or community: This will be indicated, when applicable, by such items as: quality of participation in program, department, college, and University committees; APSCUF activity contributing to the governance of the University; development of new courses or programs; training or assisting other faculty members in the use of distance education technology; participation in University-wide colloquia; voluntary membership in professionally oriented, community based organizations reasonably related to the faculty member's discipline; lectures and consultations; consulting with local and area agencies and organizations; and any other data agreed to by the faculty and administration at local meet and discuss."

II. Statement of Expectations

Each faculty member has a statement of expectations detailing the specific activities he or she is obliged to fulfill over the course of a probationary or post-tenure evaluation period. These statements generally correspond to the contract in that they are divided into three sub-sections (teaching, scholarly growth, and service), but they are more specific and individually-tailored.

III. University tenure and promotions policies

These guidelines, found on the wcupa.edu website under the office of the Provost or Vice President for Academic Affairs, assist faculty in preparing their documents and narratives in the tenure and promotion process. Instead of repeating the various items of teaching, scholarship, and service, however, the tenure and promotions policies set up a qualitative rubric that distinguishes faculty performance across three levels—assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. The language reads as follows:

Assistant Professor—*Assistant Professors must demonstrate that they have the potential for a successful career in academia. Teaching effectiveness or competence in the primary assignment must be established, not merely asserted. The Assistant Professor teaches assigned courses or performs assigned duties, shows sound professional judgment, performs advising duties (if assigned), and performs professional responsibilities in a competent manner. Assistant Professors must demonstrate that they are beginning to build the foundation for a continuously productive record of scholarship, research, or other creative activities. For example, this foundation might consist of refereed publications; regional or national conference presentations, exhibits, or performances; and/or successful internal grant awards. Since teaching and*

scholarship constitute the most important criteria, Assistant Professors should be expected to perform service primarily at the department level in a competent and professional manner.

***Associate Professor**—Associate Professors must demonstrate that they have established the foundation for a successful career. The Associate Professor must demonstrate the ability to go beyond simply teaching effectively or performing the primary assignment in a competent fashion by demonstrating significant improvements through the introduction of new materials, techniques, or programs; student mentorship; excellence in advising (if applicable). There should be no evidence of weakness nor areas of concern in the performance of teaching or primary assignment. Associate Professors must show a record of scholarship, research, or other creative activity evidence by continuous growth and productivity in scholarly, peer-reviewed products, and an established presence within his/her discipline. The record must demonstrate enough continuity, or sufficient quality, to suggest increased or at least continued productivity in the future. Associate Professors must demonstrate that they can be relied on for critical service activities at the department, School or College, and University levels.*

***Full Professors**—Full Professors must demonstrate continuous and substantial contributions to the University and their discipline through time. Full Professors must demonstrate a sustained and solid commitment to teaching or the performance of the primary assignment. They should have assumed a leadership role in improving and/or updating the delivery of education to students. They can be relied on to provide mentorship for junior faculty and help to improve the overall quality of teaching at the institution. Full Professors should have a continuously productive record of scholarship or creative activity in peer-reviewed forums and displayed leadership within his/her discipline via such activities as service on committees or professional organizations; providing reviews for scholarly journals, granting agencies, or creative works; and/or invitations for speaking engagements. Full Professors must have assumed a leadership role in some area of service at the University level.*

IV. Plan for Excellence

In 2001, the university published its *Self Study Report and Plan for Excellence.* In it, WCU officials set out a vision for the future which included 5 endeavors or transformations.

1. ***Responsiveness Transformation**: West Chester University will increase its responsiveness to the educational and cultural needs of the region.*
2. ***Student Success Transformation**: West Chester University will make student success its defining characteristic.*
3. ***Diversity Transformation**:   West Chester University will strengthen its commitment to pluralism, access, equity, and a supportive campus climate for a diverse community of students, staff, faculty, and administrators*

4. ***Human Capital Transformation****: West Chester University will increase its investment in the continued development of the skills and knowledge of its faculty, staff, and administrators.*
5. ***Resourcefulness Transformation****: West Chester will diversify the base of its physical and fiscal resources and increase the effectiveness with which they are managed.*

Faculty members are encouraged to mesh these 5 transformations into the 3 existing areas of activity (teaching, scholarship, and service.) Although there is no universal mode for doing this, it has been a practice to see student success and diversity transformation as related to teaching, responsiveness, diversity, and resourcefulness as related to service, and human capital as related to scholarship. But it is clear that all five transformations impact all three academic areas in different ways.

To recap:
1. ***The CBA offers the most basic guidelines for faculty in terms of what constitutes teachings, scholarship, and service***

2. ***The Statement of Expectations is the most individually tailored set of obligations for faculty members***

3. ***The University TEP policies offer a qualitative way of evaluating the performance of teaching, scholarship, and service across the three levels of professorships***

4. ***The Plan for Excellence is a mission statement which sets out goals for the future that should be incorporated into faculty teaching, scholarship, and service.***

V. Teacher-Scholar Models

That leaves the Teacher Scholar Models. In view of the four existing rubrics, it is difficult to assess the place of the models until one understands that they serve as a non-binding introduction to the specific discipline, informing a non-specialist at a broad level about what the discipline does and what it values in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service. In this way, the TS models serve as bridge between the individual statement of expectations and the university tenure and promotions (TEP) process, allowing the TEP committee to evaluate faculty accomplishments in a way that is more discipline-specific and less apt to confusion or arbitrariness.

An environmental scan of TS models across the university reveals much symmetry-- despite variance in language usage and expectations. Most of the models begin with an introduction to their disciplines, and almost all of the models are subdivided into the three categories of teaching, scholarly growth, and service, hewing carefully to the language of the CBA. However, only one of sixteen TS models which I was able to survey incorporates language from the Plan for Excellence, and only two make reference to

Boyer's theory, although seven actually call for bringing scholarship into the classroom. Only one incorporates the three levels of professorships in its evaluation of faculty teaching, scholarly growth, and service.

The consensus is that effective teaching is demonstrated primarily by student and peer review, and that faculty members need to demonstrate service to the university at a variety of levels (department, university, and community work). For promotion, demonstration of service leadership is crucial, particularly for promotion to the rank of full professor. It is in the area of scholarship that there is both the greatest concern and greatest asymmetry across disciplines. Many of the models allow for diverse methods of demonstrating scholarly growth, and some, as I said before, echo Boyer in calling for the integration of research into classrooms. But what appears to be happening as well is the assumption of values normally associated with research universities, whose tenure and promotion processes generally emphasize scholarship as the key area of interest. That has brought an increased attachment to more traditional benchmarks, such as peer-reviewed books and articles, external grants, and leadership roles in the discipline (the assumption of an international reputation).

A comparison of the promotions policies between WCU and three Pennsylvania research universities (the University of Pennsylvania, Penn State University, and the University of Pittsburgh) uncovers some of these newly shared sentiments in the area of scholarship.

University of Pennsylvania promotions policy: *The overriding objective of the faculty appointment and promotion policy and procedures should be the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty. While the means to this end may vary, particularly in some of the professional schools, generally the objective will be met by stressing intellectual leadership as the chief criterion. Accordingly, a high degree of excellence is expected in both research and teaching. The relative weight given to research and teaching varies from case to case and should be determined by the individual faculties, but always with significant achievements in research if they are to be assigned teaching responsibilities. An acceptable standard of competence in research should be required even of outstanding teachers, and at a research institution such as the University of Pennsylvania an acceptable standard in research is very high indeed. The initial determination of competence in research should be made by scholars in the same or closely related disciplines, subject to review at the school and University levels. In identifying good teaching, it is essential to make use both of carefully tested forms for evaluation by current and former students and also of some type of peer evaluation. Teaching evaluation forms may differ from school to school.*

Penn State--The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments: *Competence, usually demonstrated through publication, exhibition, or performance, to carry out research or creative work of high quality and scholarly significance; the ability to garner grants or other external support for research or creative activity; evidence of thorough understanding of the field; maintenance of high levels of academic performance.*

Promotion: *The presumption is that a positive tenure decision for an assistant professor is sufficient to warrant promotion to associate professor. Promotion is based on recognized performance and achievement in each of several areas, as appropriate to the particular responsibilities of the faculty member. Decisions on promotion to the ranks of associate professor and professor, or their equivalents, are made by the President after reviews at all previous levels have been completed. Promotions up to and including the rank of assistant professor, or its equivalent, are made by the academic dean of the relevant unit.*

University of Pittsburgh--Promotion and Tenure Reviews: *A faculty member being evaluated for promotion or the award of tenure shall be accorded a fair and impartial review based on the individual's merit and applicable standards of the discipline, school, or regional campus. The recommendation for promotion to the next higher rank is made by colleagues senior in rank. For promotions with the conferral of tenure, the recommendations are made by the tenured faculty with academic rank equal to, or higher than, that for which the person is being evaluated. Recommendations for the award of tenure to full professors or associate professors on probationary appointments are made by tenured faculty with rank equal to or higher than that for which the person is being evaluated. Schools have their own internal procedures to be followed in tenure decisions.*

The questions begged by this are obvious: 1.) Is WCU changing along the lines of Boyer's model, or is it in fact seeking to become more like a doctoral granting institution, and 2.) To what extent are the TS models as they are currently constituted more a fusion of teaching university workloads with research university expectations than a desire to make scholarship more applicable in classrooms and community settings?

There has been in recent years an additional element to this "paradigm shift" at the university, and that is the emphasis in job announcements and evaluations on "entrepreneurship" and "entrepreneurial spirit," tropes that appear to connote a need for faculty members to engage in revenue-generating activities as part of their duties. While grant-writing has always been a staple of academic life, it is not clear whether this new language reflects a different scale or scope of expectations of faculty development. Faculty Senate might want to participate in a larger philosophical discussion about all of these issues, as they impact the future of faculty success at the university.

Information Literacy

One of the more recent developments in pedagogy is the emergence of "information literacy" as a benchmark skill which students need to acquire as part of their education. Information literacy is defined as "a set of abilities requiring individuals to 'recognize when information is needed and to have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information."[1] While this does not appear to be any different than what educators currently strive to achieve in their classrooms, the theory behind information literacy is conditioned by the changes in technology over the past two decades and the current overabundance of information choices that exist—particularly from the internet. A person who is "information literate" ideally will be able to:

1. Determine the extent of information needed
2. Access the needed information effectively and efficiently
3. Evaluate information and its sources critically
4. Incorporate selected information into one's knowledge base
5. Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose
6. Understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and use information ethically and legally

Again, what makes these skills particularly crucial is their relationship to the technology at hand, and increasingly "information technology skills are interwoven with…information literacy."[2] Therefore, in addition to tangible vetting skills (ie., being able to find accurate information from accepted sources and being able to distinguish credible from non-credible sources), students and teachers are going to need to master hardware and software that are growing in complexity. The effective classroom of the future will be a hybrid that mixes traditional modes of information acquisition (lecture and content emphasis) with individual and group problem solving activities designed to amass and assess primary, secondary, and tertiary sources. This will also involve use of diverse technologies beyond even the standards of today (like PowerPoint and Blackboard).

Tangible exercises for classrooms involve:
1. An orientation into our library, its services, and website.
2. Instructing students about primary, secondary, and tertiary sources.
3. Orientations or trips to local and regional archives, libraries, and museums.
4. Requiring students to develop a project around primary, secondary, and tertiary sources from a variety of repositories. (The major project in my classes involves three groups which are charged with designing a museum on some aspect of Jewish history. This entails traditional research into a number

---

[1] American Library Association, *Presidential Committee on Information Literacy, Final Report* (Chicago: ALA, 1989), and http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/informationliteracycompetency.htm, 1.

[2] http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/informationliteracycompetency.htm, 2.

of sources and repositories, but it also entails an understanding of space and how information is conveyed in museum space.)
5. Evaluating websites that share similar content.
6. Requiring students to synthesize academic literature on a particular question via internet databases such as EBSCO-HOST.
7. Developing a new language skill.

The inclusion of information literacy as a standard has not been without fits and starts.   There is a perception among some academicians that information literacy will displace, or is currently displacing, content knowledge in favor of an abstract skill set. The questions that we should discuss further are whether and how Faculty Senate can assist in the incorporation of information literacy into the culture of our classrooms while respecting the diversity of individual teaching methods.