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M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 26, 2016, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Mohamad Ansari, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Ansari: The December 8, 2015, Senate Record, providing a full transcription of the proceedings, was sent to the University Archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

May I hear a motion to accept?

Senators: So moved.

Chair Ansari: Second?

Senators: Second.

Chair Ansari: All in favor of accepting the minutes, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed, say nay. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The minutes of the December 8 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Ansari: The Senate Curriculum Report of January 12, 2016, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETING OF NOVEMBER 17, 2015

Chair Ansari: Minutes from the January 12, 2016 Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Ansari: Recently I became aware of the death of a former Senate Chair. Dr. Peter Bennett, Professor Emeritus of Marketing and Associate Dean Emeritus in the Smeal College of Business, passed away on January 4 at the age of 82. Dr. Bennett joined the faculty of Penn State in 1964 and served as Senate Chair from 1983 to 1984. During his year as Senate Chair, there were eight regularly scheduled meetings of the Senate, the standard at that time.

Major accomplishments of that year included the passage of legislative reports to support gender equity in faculty salaries, to change the Pass/Fail grading system to Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory grading, and to provide for Faculty Athletic Representatives at non-University Park locations in addition to a Faculty Athletic Representative for University Park.
I now call for a moment of silence to recognize the passing of Dr. Peter Bennett.

Thank you.

I have appointed a Special Committee on Engaged Scholarship. Senators Careen Yarnal and Ann Taylor are co-chairing the Special Committee. The charge letter and membership list have been posted on the Senate website under Special Committees.

At this time, I would like to invite the University Park Undergraduate Association’s Speaker of the Assembly Emily Miller and Vice President Terry Ford, to give a brief overview of the student organization at University Park.

**Emily Miller, Student Senator, University Park Undergraduate Association:** Thank you very much. For those of you that don't know me, my name is Emily Miller. I am the Speaker of the Assembly of the University Park Undergraduate Association as well as our senator.

**Terry Ford, University Park Undergraduate Association:** Good morning, everybody. My name is Terry Ford. I am the current Vice President of the UPUA.

**Emily Miller:** We are just going to take a couple minutes to give you an overview of what the undergraduate student government does. Again, just a brief overview. And we really encourage anyone that has any questions or any interest in partnering with us on anything to please reach out to either one of us or any of the UPUA people in the audience. Raise your hand if you're one of our senators. Any of them would also like to answer any questions.

In UPUA, we have four standing committees, the Committees on Academic Affairs, Facilities, Governmental Affairs, and Student Life. What we're going to do is just give you a couple examples of some things we're working on in each one. But overall, we like to think of ourselves-- obviously, we're the representative body of the undergraduate students at University Park-- but also, we sort of bridge the gap between students and faculty, staff, and administration. So we have a really wonderful partnership with each different entity and really have been fostering those relationships over the last few years.

**Terry Ford:** As Emily mentioned, we're going to take a few minutes today to talk about a few of the initiatives that we're working on. And one of our major initiatives that actually transcends our committee structure is a project to reevaluate how student fees are administered and allocated here at University Park and across the Commonwealth System.

This initiative began last year with a student fee commission of both the UPUA and the CCSG, as well as the GPSA, the Graduate Student Government. And we've taken the time to evaluate how the three existing fees-- student activity fee, facilities fee, and information technology fee-- are allocated and overall administered here on campus. And we've concluded that the best system for all students and really for everybody would be to have a one-fee model, instead of three, that students would have greater control over.

Moving on to our Facilities Committee, which is one of our standing committees, we're working on expanding one of our projects called the Blue and White Brigade which is where we sponsor buses to
away football games. And it's been very popular in the past. Last semester, we took a bus to the Ohio State game in Columbus, Ohio. And we're looking to expand this program in the future to other sports, including volleyball and men's ice hockey.

In our Student Life Committee, we're actually working on a report for the three student diversity and multicultural caucuses to give to the Board of Trustees. Currently, there are the three major multicultural caucuses, the Black Student Caucus, the Latino Student Caucus, and the Asian Pacific American Student Caucus. And we're helping them create an informal, relatively quick presentation for the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Affairs and Student Life. And hopefully, one day, they'll be able to give that same report to all of you. Emily will now talk about some of our other initiatives in different areas.

**Emily Miller:** In terms of governmental affairs, this year we've really been stressing legislative outreach. We have meetings set up with various legislators from Harrisburg. Though many have canceled while they diligently try to put a budget together. Maybe not diligently, but they're trying, I guess. So that's something that we're doing, reaching out to people in Harrisburg, reaching out to people in Washington. We've put together a legislative commission, a legislative government, as well as the Commonwealth Student Government to really come together and work on issues that pertain to all of us. But then also we have recreated the group for the state-related schools. So actually, on Saturday, we'll have Lincoln, Pitt, and Temple with us to go over what we, as state-related schools, can do to work together and advocate for in Harrisburg.

And then as far as academics, which you usually see that side of it-- and I would like to say that we have really had a much better relationship with the Senate in the last few years, especially undergraduate education in terms of bringing our various resolutions to the UE meetings. Different committees, but really we work a lot with UE and actually have them bring those to the floor. You've seen some of those before. Last year we did the interviews as excused absences. And we'll have the opportunity to have a few more. But I really appreciate the relationship we've had and the willingness to kind of bring the academic needs of the students to the Senate. For us, we advocate. We pass resolutions on opinions. But then it really is up to our work in the Senate to be able to bring those to fruition.

So again, this was just a very brief overview. If you have any questions, we'd be happy to answer them. But we're always looking to partner and to further our relationships with all of you as well as the rest of the entities we work with. So thank you for the opportunity.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Emily and Terry. I would like to invite the Chief of Staff for the Student Government Association of Commonwealth Campuses, Brant Portner, to give a brief overview of the student organization. Brant?

**Brant Portner, Council of Commonwealth Student Government:** Thank you, Dr. Ansari. I am the Chief of Staff for CCSG, the Counsel of Commonwealth Student Governments. And everyone's always like, what the heck is that? Well, we're the student government that helps all 19 Penn State campuses. And once every two months, all the SGA presidents and their staff members come up here to University Park, and we talk about issues that we're all facing and legislation as well.

We had a very successful semester last semester. And I thought I would give an overview, like UPUA did, for our upcoming semester, particularly our Council Weekend which will be coming up this weekend.
to discuss some of these issues. In our Student Affairs Committee, we talked about the student fee structure which Terry talked about. We're also trying to formulate a day of service on April 9. On April 9, we're hoping that all SGAs across the Commonwealth are participating in their community on a certain project.

We're also going to be discussing the Stanford State Program which is advocating for bystander intervention. And that launches tomorrow here in the HUB and across the Commonwealth. Materials have made it to all the campuses.

In our Governmental Affairs Committee, we're looking at more legislative outreach, as UPUA is doing as well. Although we're trying to get legislators to come to the campuses within their districts, we will be going to the capital for Capital Day like we do every year with all the student governments to discuss the budget. Although when I went last year for the first time, I didn't think that we'd still be discussing the same budget this year at this time.

Alan Janesh, who is in charge of the Penn State's Grassroots Network, will also be speaking at our Council Weekend. Our Academic Affairs Committee is looking at some interesting things, some Penn State initiatives such as a plan for Invent Penn State. And we're also looking to see if we can increase connections between the Commonwealth Campuses as far as students at different campuses getting involved in internship opportunities, research opportunities, and those things.

We also have two interesting ad hoc committees I'd like to talk about. First is our Mental Health Committee which Alex, our senator, is going to be running. They're looking at the strength and efficiencies of mental health across the campuses and looking at how fee money can help improve those deficiencies. And lastly we're having a diversity and equality ad hoc committee and they're going to be looking at diversity issues across the campuses and trying to improve those. That is all I have, and thank you all for listening.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Brant.

Moving on with my announcements, all senators using Mediasite, please use the Ask A Question box to send a message if you have successfully connected to the live feed so that we may add your name to the list. As a reminder, senators joining today's meeting by Mediasite, we're using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Just a reminder that visitors are not permitted to speak during the meetings unless prior permission from the chair has been granted. We ask that visitors sit in the visitor's section.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY
Chair Ansari: Due to a prior commitment, President Barron is unable to join us today.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Executive Vice President and Provost Nick Jones described the university’s difficult budget situation resulting from the lack of a state appropriation to date. He pointed out that President Barron was in Harrisburg meeting with state government officials about the budget need. The Provost gave an update on next steps for the strategic planning process and the fund-raising campaign. He mentioned that
Matthew Decker is serving as Interim Vice Provost for Information Technology. Canvas, the new learning management system, is coming online. He discussed the recent run of the CollegeNet optimizer and some of the issues that arose, but emphasized the overall success of the optimizer run. Provost Jones also commented on the continuing roll-out of LionPATH functions, and the work being done to resolve issues that have arisen during that roll-out. Implementation of WorkLion has begun. That system will impact all Penn State employees at all locations.

Provost Jones responded to questions on information security breaches and fixed term contracts.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Ansari: As we move into the forensic business portion of today's agenda, I would like to remind our presenters to adhere to the time that Senate Council has allocated for their presentation. I will inform each presenter when there are five minutes left.

We have the forensics report from the Special Senate Committee on the implementation of the General Education Reform, which appears as Appendix B in your agenda. Committee Chair John Moore and committee members Carey Eckhardt, Maggie Slattery, and Matthew Wilson will make brief remarks. And I will then open the floor for discussion. 30 minutes is allocated for presentation and discussion. John? Carey?

John Moore, Retired Faculty Senator: Thank you. General Education reforms flow from changing educational needs. Twenty years ago, reformers felt that students and faculty wanted smaller classes and closer contact. Out of that awareness, there emerged our first-year seminar program.

Last year's task force sensed a widespread desire to better understand the connections among course and requirements within our extensive General Education program. To create a more intense awareness of how the various General Education courses speak to one another and work together, there emerged the concept of integrative studies, the topic we will be discussing today.

The Implementation Committee expresses that task force thought at the top of page 2 of today's forensic report handout. The text reads as follows. "Integrative studies courses will have a distinctive intellectual dimension. Because they ask the student to consider a topic from the perspective of two different General Education knowledge domains, they will advance the student's ability to comprehend things from multiple perspectives, to see connections, and to grasp the concept that one must employ different modes of thinking, different epistemologies to understand fully the nature of things. One domain is not fully equal to the task of understanding the world around us."

And now, we want to hear from you about this new academic requirement and its implementation. Let us turn to the first question to be discussed. It's on the board. What factors would encourage you to offer an interdomain course or a linked course? Or if you, yourself, do not teach, what factors do you think might encourage other colleagues to teach such courses?

Chair Ansari: Thank you, John. The floor is open for discussion. But please limit your comments and questions to the forensic and to the two questions. I would like to recognize Ira.
Ira Saltz, Shenango: One of the concerns that I think we have at the campuses is that there is a limited number of General Ed courses we're capable of teaching. I can think of an example. I teach History 155, US Business History. I could easily make the case that that is an interdomain case because we discuss quite a bit of stuff through history and economics, business. But we don't have ownership of the course.

What I'm concerned about is that if a faculty member brings forth a proposal to make a certain course interdomain and can demonstrate that it's done, if that's not supported at the department that owns the course or they're not interested in making that course an interdomain case, that this may very well limit what the campuses can offer and whatnot.

Maggie Slattery, Engineering: That's a very important point. There's a couple things I'd like to address in that comment. One is the clarity of ownership of courses. The University owns courses. No unit owns a course.

If there was an intention by a faculty member who wants to teach or change a course so that it met this requirement, it would go through a normal curricular process. If there was disagreement and some people want the course as is, you could create a new course. So there is no reason that couldn't happen.

Another important point here is that there are many existing courses that probably would qualify as they are taught now, as long-- they would need to go through the approval process.

Carey Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: Mohamad. Could I add something to that? The plan is that it would also be possible to request one-time approval so that some sections of a course at some locations might be part of an interdomain or linked arrangement for integrative studies while others would not. So there's flexibility and range even within a particular course in the planning for that.

Ira Saltz: Can you have that renewed each year? Is that a one-time shot, if that could be renewed on an annual basis.

Maggie Slattery: Those are details that will be in our next report.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: Maybe something could be done addressing Ira's question there like first-year seminar did. I used to teach a first-year seminar back when they were required at the small campuses, which they're not anymore. I used to teach STS 151, which is also HIST 151, which got an “S” designation. But it could be taught as an “S” or without an “S.”

The “S” was permanent for sections that were deemed first-year seminar. There were still versions that were not first-year seminar. Maybe there could be two versions of the same course number with a suffix.

Maggie Slattery: That is-- yes, in theory. We have to work within some of the constraints of LionPATH in that suffixes don't really exist anymore. But the concept there would be something similar, yes.

Keith Nelson, Liberal Arts: I'm sure you're working on other recommendations. I'm just thinking that the idea that part of the reform will be new assessments of learning goals, including creativity, that even at this point in thinking about factors and resources, it might be interesting to think about ways in which the University can help people who are developing new courses, new links, to build right into their course kind of a test model, a beta model for how some of that could be done best.
Carey Eckhardt: We expect there will be various forms of assistance to faculty who are designing courses or submitting existing courses for integrative studies. That will include, I expect, working with assessment specialists who will be available. We don't have those details at present, and that's not exactly the immediate purview of this special committee. But assessment is very much on everybody's mind.

Maggie Slattery: I'd like to add that the resources that we've been discussing that will be necessary for successful implementation of General Education also include the General Education structure. We know there's support for that. We're waiting basically for us to outline what we really need.

Matthew Wilson, Harrisburg: I think that's one of the things we're hoping to get from you today is as you contemplate doing one of these integrative courses, what support is it that the university can provide for you to do that.

Nicholas Rowland, Altoona: So far all these classes that we've been talking about-- and this just, in part, for clarification. We're talking about 200-level classes and lower only in this. We've been using those discussions, but I just wanted to clarify if that's explicitly what we're talking about.

And then secondly-- and this is, I guess, in reverse. One factor that would discourage me from wanting to participate in this kind of thing is that if these activities get loaded on incoming tenure-track faculty, that we're hiring faculty explicitly for this, the more senior faculty, because this is not part of their cache of prepared courses, might resist it. They'd be in a perfect position to do that vis a vis fixed-term faculty or incoming tenure track and so on. So some clarification, please.

Carey Eckhardt: As far as the level of the courses, these are General Education courses because integrative studies is part of the General Education package. So as far as I know, they will be primarily courses with lower course numbers, but Maggie would be more of an expert on that.

Maggie Slattery: There's no prescription at this point. We have no prescription of level of course. There was, in the previous report from the General Education Task Force, some prescription of level. I don't foresee that being carried through. But to focus more on the question at hand and this being loaded onto fixed-term faculty or it not being within the cache of tenured faculty, we're hoping that it will be adopted by people who are interested in talking about working with students in topics that they already cover in their research and their academic pursuits. I think that the types of courses that lend themselves to integrative studies courses follow along those lines.

A lot of this is things that we do as faculty because we integrate knowledge and thinking. That's our academic research or pursuit. Hopefully it will not just be handed to fixed-term faculty. That's not something I can promise. That's an administrative decision.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Before I recognize you, Jamie-- I apologize-- there's a question from Mediasite.

Anna Butler, Senate Staff: There is a Mediasite comment from Krishna Jayakar, Communications. A concern has been raised that some General Education courses are being offered that are entirely online and potentially taught by non-resident adjunct faculty. The intent of General Education Reform is to ensure that the quality of General Education is improved across the board. Is the Implementation
Committee reviewing criteria or parameters that General Education courses, online or resident instruction, need to fulfill before new courses are approved or for existing courses?

Maggie Slattery: This question isn't within the scope of this.

Chair Ansari: Right. Yes. It is my fault. At the meeting today at CCR, Krishna was there, and I said you can ask your question. Krishna. I apologize. We are supposed to adhere to the Forensic Report. I will have John respond to you by email. Thank you. I recognize Jamie.

Jamie Myers, Education: A few ideas that I think would be encouraging, while interdomain courses, which are the single courses that cover multiple domains, can be taught by a single faculty member, fixed-term or tenure-line, I believe the spirit of integrative studies is to engage conversation across disciplines. I would think that having two faculty from different disciplines represent the different domains and having both of those faculty able to teach together on load would be a very encouraging type of thing to offer.

The other things might be with the linked courses, you have two separate courses. Again here you have from two different domains linking their courses. So it's a six-credit linkage. I would think that it would be encouraging to those two faculty if there were some resources for some joint activities that they might do. If there was the ability to actually override the scheduler and have their courses be back to back, maybe concurrent sections so that the students are in both sections together.

Because actually, you see, what makes interdisciplinary work are the students' minds. If you have two different courses with different groups of students' minds, different things are going to happen. It's not going to gel as much. Thank you.

Maggie Slattery: Thank you, Jamie. I think those are both fabulous suggestions.

Peter Dendle, Mont Alto: I think something that would encourage certainly me and maybe a lot of other people, especially at the launch of this, is the understanding in the Records Office and in the DAA's Office at the Commonwealth Campuses, that this is a time for experimentation for three steps forward, two steps back, that it's OK if a course doesn't work out, maybe to encourage what may at first seem unnatural, linked courses, things whose connections aren't immediately obvious.

In other words, perhaps for Dr. Hanes to communicate and other administrators to communicate-- and this doesn't cost anything-- to help foster this environment of experimentation and creativity are encouraged certainly preliminarily, until things start to settle down. I think that would encourage people to get out of their comfort zone a little bit more. Perhaps also, during the first few years, to find a way that perhaps DAAs could communicate with each other. What's working well on my campus? I'll communicate that with the others so that ideas could be shared in that way.

At my campus, we're very fortunate. Our Records Office and the DAA's Office are very supportive. They're very nurturing of faculty who come up with crazy ideas like some of us do. And I hope that that would be encouraged on other campuses as well as much as possible. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: I would like to say, Carey, that we're at about 15 minutes when we discussed the first question. Maybe after you answer this question, we can go to the second question.
Carey Eckhardt: I'll be very fast then and say thank you. I agree.

John Moore: Yeah, the second question is the big one. Everyone wants to know the answer to this one. What resources will you or your unit need to offer a high quality General Education Curriculum that includes integrative studies in the form of interdomain and linked courses? A frequently asked question.

Dawn Blasko, Behrend: My comment actually goes to both questions. I think the resource issue is a big one. When we started this process, we talked a lot about what we would need to do a really excellent General Education Curriculum, and that involves assessment, of course.

So just to add to the ideas you've already heard, first, we want to incentivize faculty, and that just might take a little time and money. Right? Money for extra activities. Money for some course releases, and potentially money for students to get together and go to new places or try new things. I think there needs to be a budget, which I know you're talking about.

Secondly, I think there needs to be rewards for creativity. One of those things that we could do that you said was free and think you were hinting at is be very, very understanding about the SRTEs as we try these new things. Especially for new faculty or even for faculty who might be up for promotion or just annual review, if you try out a new course and you get 3's because students don't like it so much, you're going to be punished for that. And we certainly don't want excellent faculty to be punished.

The third thing is we really need to get together disciplinary communities and start talking across disciplines. To avoid the problem of the perception of course ownership, we really need to get everybody teaching Psych who's interested in talking to someone in Biology together and have some brainstorming sessions. That might require some resources because face-to-face meetings are always stronger than Polycom. Thank you.

Matthew Wilson: Your second point is great, and one of my concerns. I think one of our concerns in the committee is as we get new tenure-line faculty coming in, we want them to buy into this. We're not going to get them to buy into it if they feel they're going to be dinged on their SRTEs if the course doesn't work out the first time.

Nicholas Rowland: When it comes to resources that we need, in light of some of these comments already about major concerns over SRTEs and how they're interpreted, maybe some resources should be put forward so that there's a point person or a liaison for people who are developing these courses that can pass along best practices. Because making these will be new for us, but making them at all is not a brand new thing. So there's that.

Secondly-- and this has to do with how resources are thought through. One thing I'd really like to avoid-- and I'd like to underscore what Jamie said earlier about team teaching. I've done it. It's extremely good. One way we have to think about it is if we're adding this on-- you're teaching your regular load, and then you add on a team-taught course, I think this should be avoided. I think resources shouldn't be set aside to pay people over the top of their regular job. If it's integrated, it should be integrated into their workload.

Matthew Wilson: I think the suggestion of a liaison person is absolutely wonderful, because there are going to be people throughout the University coming up with these innovative courses. I'm not going to
know what my colleague in Behrend is doing, and that might be a course that I want to adopt. So we've got to find a way to have cross-University information flowing about these courses. Thank you.

**Keith Nelson, Liberal Arts:** Just a couple things. One is, I think that the University under-invests in good teaching assistants. I think it would be a marvelous opportunity for probably a modest number of courses to offer an incentive that if a course is approved and offered, that there would be exceptional levels of teaching assistance support. I mean, if it's really going to be an integrative, unusual course, then a teaching assistant would probably be much more important. So that's one thing.

The second thing is going back to the question of 200-level, 400, and so forth. I think it would be good of the committee and the Senate to encourage people to develop 400-level courses because it's at that level that students have enough foundations that the kind of true integration and creativity and cross-disciplinary thinking that we would like to happen is most likely to occur in my opinion and many folks that I know in Education, Media Technology and Psychology who think about the learning sciences.

**Matthew Wilson:** If I could just quickly comment on the issue of TAs, TAs work at University Park. They won't be available at any of the Commonwealth Colleges or the freestanding colleges. So there we have to think about other ways to incentivize.

**Sharon Holt, Abington:** Yeah, thank you. I wanted to bring up a slightly different perspective. That is, has the committee thought about involving students with faculty in the development of these courses? That is cross-discipline or whatever, that rather than having simply faculty, from our position of authority, telling students how to integrate their learning, can we develop this in a way that empowers students to advise us, assist us, drive us, and put us in the responsible rather than the initiative position. I wonder if you've given that any thought.

**Carey Eckhardt:** Maybe one way of glancing towards that is to comment that our committee includes student members and that the thinking of the committee all along the way has been that the creation of courses would be a collaborative enterprise, not simply among those who might immediately teach them, but among all stakeholders; actual implementation in terms of creating new courses or submitting existing courses. That will take place presumably at unit levels, at disciplinary levels.

But certainly I think part of the overall concept is that student involvement and resources will be important and including student feedback afterwards, as we were just talking about, encouraging risk. If things don't work out perfectly once, try something else again. That acknowledges that the student response is going to be a key aspect, too.

**Chair Ansari:** I concur with Carey. I see one student that is in this committee, and she is extremely active and very influential. That is Emily Miller. Emily, I would like to give you an opportunity to make a few remarks, if you would, please.

**Emily Miller:** Thank you for your kind words. I love that idea. If anyone would like to give me money to not graduate in May, I would love to be involved in that.

But I think that as far as myself and Andrew Ahr, the other student on the committee, I think that we have had a lot to do with what's going on. I also think that that's a really great way. You know, this whole
point is to be innovative and flexible and look towards the future of education. I would love to do that. I think we can have some further conversations in our committee. Thanks for bringing that up.

Ira Saltz, Shenango: I guess a few other people have hinted at this. I guess I just need to make sure everyone understands explicitly what I think some people are hinting at. With the concept of team-taught courses, one of the obstacles has always been that the DAA or the dean or whatever will say, “Oh, OK, so there's two of you teaching one course, so that's half a course in your teaching load.” And someone with a three-course teaching load would have to do two courses plus two shared courses.

I think if we really want to encourage this kind of team teaching that maybe among the resources that are made available is the concept of saying, OK, well, we're going to redefine the course load in such a way that if you're team teaching a course, that's a full course for you and maybe put some limits on it. I think that's a very important issue if we really want to encourage team teaching.

Matthew Wilson: This is going to sound like a punt, but that's beyond the scope of what this committee is doing. That's an administrative matter. We have no input into that.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. We have a question from Mediasite. Jose, I will recognize you later. Go ahead, Anna. Please.

Anna Butler, Senate Staff: There is a Mediasite comment from Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture. On January 27, 2015, one year ago tomorrow, the Senate passed an Advisory Consultative Report entitled "Institutional Support and Resources for General Education" which recommended, "the University should establish a signature Intra-University faculty-led structure for General Education collaboration and support, assessment, and research which will be available to serve all Penn State locations and instructors who teach General Education courses. The University Administration should work with the Gen Ed Task Force and the appropriate Faculty Senate committees in the creation of this structure with a standing budget that will meet the needs of the instructors teaching General Education to best support, maintain, and promote excellence, innovation, and scholarship in General Education.” My question is, do you have an insight regarding the status of those recommendations?

Chair Ansari: I do, but I would like to give the opportunity to Provost Jones. Would you like to answer the question, Provost Jones, or should I?

I've had opportunities to discuss this specific question with Provost Jones and also with President Barron. I meet with the president on a monthly basis. His response is there is support absolutely from Provost Jones and President Barron, but they need to see the legislation. So as soon as-- this wonderful group has been meeting since June 2, they bring a Legislative Report in March, and I hope that this body will embrace and approve. Then the support will be there. I promise you, on behalf of President Barron and Provost Jones.

Carey Eckhardt: We will quote you on that, Mohamad.

Jose Guerrero, Liberal Arts: What size classes are these? I mean, we began talk of seminars from the historical perspective, but what size classes is being envisioned for these courses?
Carey Eckhardt: One of the guiding principles has been flexibility, and so the committee is not stating, mandating anything about class sizes.

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: Question is in reviewing recently the knowledge domain definitions that had been circulated for feedback from faculty members. Some of the domains' definitions or the overall criteria, what we want to achieve seem to have changed significantly. I'm wondering if those changes that were in the process of being discussed and may, I'm assuming, be brought to us for discussion here were also taken into account in regard to interdomain quality or characteristics. Does that make sense?

Maggie Slattery: This group, the Implementation Committee, did solicit lots of feedback on revisions of the domain criteria. The results of the survey, all of those are on the Senate website. That will be part of our report in March. It is expected that that new criteria will be used in the review of integrative studies courses, interdomain courses because that will have been legislated by the Senate at the same time. I don't think I answered your question.

Bonj Szczygiel: Was there intentional consideration of both aspects at the same time as they would work together or not?

Maggie Slattery: Yes, and it was also intentional in thinking about the review of General Education courses for alignment with the new learning objectives that were passed by the Senate in April.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. We have time for one more question.

Keith Nelson, Liberal Arts: A brief question. I think as regards purview of the committee, I think that it would be perfectly appropriate for the committee, when they bring a report for a vote by the Senate, to have a package of incentives that you believe, after discussion with everybody else, that would be highly productive and appropriate incentives which then, of course, would be passed on to the Provost and so forth. But why hold back if you-- why not make the incentives, like changing the teaching load if you do team teaching, part of what you bring to the Senate?

Carey Eckhardt: Thank you. We appreciate that. There will, indeed, be some conversation in the report that looks at questions of forms of support. A lot of what that is, of course, is not directly in our hands. But definitely the viewpoint you're expressing is one that we've heard, we're aware of. And thank you for stating it again now.

Chair Ansari: I want to shake your hand, John. You've been great. Carey, Maggie, Matthew. Please give them a big round of applause. Please.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. We have the forensic report from Faculty Benefits which appears as Appendix C. Before I introduce the presenters, I'm pleased to report that the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, and the Health Care Advisory Committee have joined forces to work together on health care issues. Senator Jamie Myers, Chair of JCIB, and Senator Renee Borromeo, Chair of Faculty Benefits, have joined the Health Care Advisory Committee as liaisons.
In December, I charged the Committee on Faculty Benefits to prepare an Advisory and Consultative report on how to improve the current Health Care plans with consideration for privacy, employee medical condition, and cost effectiveness. That report is expected to be presented to the Senate on March 15, 2016. Senior Vice President for Finance and Business, David Gray, and Vice President for Human Resources, Susan Basso, will make a few remarks, and I will then open the floor for discussion.

David Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business: Thank you very much, Chair Ansari. I appreciate the opportunity and invitation to appear before the Senate this afternoon to take a forward look at Penn State University's medical benefits program, a topic which I know we're all intensely interested in. We in the administration are aided and abetted to a tremendous degree by the presence of our Health Care Advisory Committee or HCAS for short, which is comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators who have expertise in the health care field or who have direct responsibility for health care-related work for the University.

Members include health care practitioners, academic experts in the disciplines of health care and insurance, and administrative representatives in the disciplines of human resources, budget, and finance. The committee also importantly includes the chair of the Faculty Senate and the chairpersons of the Senate's Faculty Benefits Committee and the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits. The committee meets monthly and serves in an advisory capacity for administrative decisions regarding Health Care for University employees.

Last summer, the HCAC embarked on a survey to inform its members about how Penn State employees and families make decisions on their medical benefits coverage. Although our meeting time today doesn't permit Susan Basso, our VP for HR, to summarize the results of the survey, I'd like to share with you just a few of the high level takeaways.

First, employees stress the importance of robust, clear, and abundant communications. Secondly, employees want specific examples of claims scenarios to illustrate their out-of-pocket exposure. Risk aversion influences their decision making. Another key point: employees are literally hungry for more information. They lack a general understanding of how medical insurance works. And last, our employees are very concerned about their total medical costs through both premiums and out-of-pocket expenses.

You can find a copy of the slide deck that includes more details about the results of the survey on the Faculty Senate website. I would also encourage you to review all of the enhanced resources on the Benefits section of the HR website.

So what do we know about the status of our current medical plans? We've seen consistently about an 80/20 split in the enrollment between the PPO Blue and the PPO Savings Plan since 2014. Traditionally, Penn State has asked employees to contribute between 17% and 18% of the medical premium and share 25% of the total cost of the plan, including premiums, deductibles, copays, and coinsurance.

Penn State introduced deductibles under the PPO Blue plan in 2012, and they have not increased since then. This strategy has benefited employees and families by keeping our out-of-pocket costs manageable, but medical inflation continues, which increases the University's costs.
Across Towers Watson’s book of business, which includes over 3,000 PPO plans, only 9% have an individual deductible underneath $300. Penn State’s is currently $250. The PPO Savings Plans has a higher risk of out-of-pocket costs, but that comes with lower medical premiums. A question that has been asked by our employees is whether the premium structure is fair and equitable between the plans, and is what employees contribute as a percent of their pay across all salary levels reasonable?

You may have heard that Congress recently passed legislation to delay the implementation of the so-called "Cadillac tax," the 40% excise tax on high cost medical plans that was to take effect in 2018, now postponed until 2020. Despite changes like this, Penn State cannot stand still, and we need to continue to monitor our medical plans to ensure their viability into the future.

The common theme on this slide is that there is shared accountability between employees and the University to ensure that our medical plans remain competitive and affordable. Availing ourselves of health management resources, following the direction of our physicians, and utilizing the most cost effective types and sites of care are all ways in which we can keep costs manageable.

Penn State self-insures its medical plans, and that is a key point. What this means is that all medical claims are paid as they are incurred. Highmark, our third-party administrator for the medical plans, negotiates discounts and pricing arrangements with providers to establish allowed charges. The allowed charges are paid by Penn State's general funds and by employees. Some of the costs of the plans are fixed, such as employee premiums and HSA contributions. Others, such as deductibles, copays, and coinsurance, are variable.

Penn State's average medical trend over the last five years is 4.1%, which is favorable as compared to the market trend. However, medical inflation continues to exceed consumer inflation as measured by the CPI. And the cost of providing medical coverage for Penn State employees is now over $11,300 per employee per year and in total $30 million more than in 2011. For each 1% change in the medical trend, there is almost a $2 million impact on the university.

To put this into perspective, $2 million is about 7% of the general salary increase pool. Despite the delay in implementing the “Cadillac tax,” we as an employer, along with all other employers, need to be mindful about cost increases. It is anticipated that medical trends will continue to exceed consumer inflation in the next few years. In fact, for this calendar year, we're anticipating 5% as general inflation in medical costs. It may even tick up due to increases in pharmacy spend, which I'll discuss in just a few minutes.

As we think about ways in which Penn State can manage the cost of providing medical benefits, there are a number of levers that we can pull to share the costs between employees and the University. Under traditional PPO plans, copays, deductibles, and coinsurance levels are all ways in which those who utilize the services are asked to pay more out of pocket. Considering modest, more periodic increases in out-of-pocket expenses enables the university to avoid significant plan design changes that could easily create too much financial tension for employees and their families.

The suggestions on this slide are pertinent to aspects of the PPO Blue plan that have remained unchanged since 2012. Likewise, under the PPO Savings Plan, modest changes in out-of-pocket expenses on a regular basis keep plan costs manageable, and they avoid unexpected spikes in plan design changes. This approach also asks those who utilize services to pay more out of pocket.
Controlling pharmacy drug costs is challenging for Penn State as it is for all employers. There are some very effective drugs that are enabling our employees and their families to enjoy better, more productive lives. You may be aware that some drugs cost literally tens of thousands of dollars, some for just a few months of treatment. Although these drugs are effective, the inflationary trend is unsustainable for employers like Penn State.

Cost sharing for prescription drugs is a very sensitive issue because we want individuals to be healthy and productive and not to be burdened by expense that could inhibit their ability to adhere to their medication regimen. There are some opportunities for changes across both the PPO Blue and the PPO Savings Plans that will result in some additional cost sharing and behavior change. None of the suggestions on this slide will impact the additional costs that Penn State will bear as the price of prescription drugs continues to escalate.

So why is it then that medical benefits cost so much? The key driver is utilization. It's really simple supply and demand. There are opportunities to more effectively manage utilization that we've noted on this slide. The Clinically Integrated Network, or CIN, which you will hear more about in this quarter, enables our employees and families to benefit from health management support from your clinical experts who will ensure that you're receiving the care you need to manage any chronic conditions.

Patients of physicians from Hershey Medical Group and Mount Nittany Medical Group in the University Park area will have an opportunity to engage with Penn State Health Care partners as part of this local pilot. Participation is optional, although strongly encouraged since you, the patient, are the beneficiary of this high touch service. I think this is a tremendous example of how you and your doctor can become more engaged in your care and the management of any health conditions you may be experiencing. The interactions you may have with Penn State Health Care partners and your physician remain private, and Penn State will have no knowledge of your participation in any recommended programs nor any information about the care you may receive.

Another way to control costs is by incentivizing the use of lower cost services and facilities. One example is lab services. Another is high-end radiology services. Through steering patients to lower cost sites of service, you benefit through lower out-of-pocket costs, and the University benefits through lower claims.

A data warehouse is a means by which a third party can analyze claims data to determine opportunities for more effective utilization. As an example, are emergency visits higher than the market? If so, why? As a self-funded employer, Penn State needs to do a better job in educating its employees about the benefits of shifting care for non-emergency needs to an urgent care facility or a physician's office.

Penn State currently has a contract with Highmark through December 31 of 2017. Early next year, we'll prepare an RFP for a third party administrative service contract. During the negotiation process, Penn State will be looking for opportunities to work with a carrier who is able to cost effectively and accurately process our claims, receive deep network discounts which we discussed earlier, how they are incentivizing providers to more effectively manage the health of their patients, quality versus quantity, and one who can help address spiraling pharmacy costs.

We may find that some services, such as pharmacy benefits management, is better to carve out of the third party administrative relationship, and we're open to that idea. Penn State is committed to keeping
the provider network strong for all of our employees and their families across the Commonwealth, and we will not compromise that for lower cost services.

We know from this slide that Penn State collects between $35 and $40 million in employee premiums every year, and this amount is necessary in order to sustain affordable medical coverage. Premiums make up only a portion of the total cost of the plan, with Penn State sharing less than 18% of this cost with employees. When combined with all of our out-of-pocket expenses which include copays, deductibles, and coinsurance, Penn State shares approximately 25% of this cost, which is slightly more favorable than the market.

Now, it's your turn. You've heard a lot of information today, some of which may be familiar, some of which may be new. There are two questions on the next slide, along with some ideas to get the conversation started. As senators, your input is valuable to the Health Care Advisory Committee on informing our medical plan strategy into the future.

Let's first focus our attention on an important issue that employees responded to in our Health Care Advisory Committee Survey. The total cost of the plan. There are two approaches that can be used to share costs, through premiums that impact everyone's paychecks, or through out-of-pocket expenses that impact those who utilize medical services.

How do you feel about those approaches? Do you prefer one over the other, or do you prefer some balance between the two? Perhaps we can stop there at this point, Dr. Ansari.

Chair Ansari: If you like, yes. Thank you. We have 30 minutes for discussion. Are there any questions or comments?

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: First of all, thank you, Vice President Gray, for taking the time to come to the Senate. This is a very valuable opportunity to open up communications. I'm concerned about the balancing cost containment against employee morale. I have a general comment. I'm grateful to your comments that it seems that there's a commitment to maintaining choice to having the two programs.

But as we discussed in the March Advisory Consultative report of last year, there's evidence that some of the employees are being priced out of the market in traditional insurance because the employee contributions are so steep. So when we maintain choice, there's an element of choice being taken away because the prices are so high. I'm wondering if perhaps we should look to other colleges to provide us some guidance on how to control these two factors.

To give just one example, Elizabethtown College provides a very simple model where they deduct a certain amount from the paycheck of the employees. It's simple. It's transparent, and it's eminently fair. So is it possible for the University to break out of the model that we've described here and to look at something a little more simple, a little more streamlined that might bring about more equity, but at the same time balance cost containment against employee moral?

David Gray: Very good question, Matthew. In fact, the Health Care Advisory Committee is looking at gathering in additional benchmarking information from peer universities. You're really referring to the notion which we refer to as salary indexing in the plans. And we are going to be taking a look at that.
We realize that at least for some folks, we have heard that that's a point of concern and consternation over the steepness or perceived steepness of the indexation. So we do plan to take a look at that vis a vis our peers and see how we line up. We are open to the consideration of change in that we don't have any specific plans at the moment to change that level of indexation, but yes, I believe we always should be informed by data from peer institutions and think about the potential for adjustments.

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** You asked whether one method is preferred over the other, out-of-pocket costs versus premiums. There's a moral issue here and an ethical issue here. It's health insurance. The concept of insurance is that a person pays a premium based on certain risk factors for loss, things that are controllable. In auto insurance, somebody speeds, they get hit with higher insurance rates.

The idea is that insurance is set up because people may at random or through factors beyond their control, may get forced into big expenses, and if you start making it where it's more and more out-of-pocket, people who have, through no fault of their own or through no control of their own, higher expenses are taking pay cuts, essentially. I mean, I'm sure there are people in this room who, for example, have diabetes and would love not to be diabetic anymore or people with high blood pressure and taking expensive medicines for medical conditions who would love not to have those problems.

But having a plan based on increasing out-of-pocket expenses for those who use medical services is immoral and unethical and nefarious. I would hope that in the future this body will consider a motion to eliminate the PPO Savings Plan which sends all sorts of perverse incentives. It encourages people to forego medications and primary health services that may avoid long-term diseases.

I can tell you this. I've said this before. The existence of that plan will cost this University's Health Care costs to explode down the line because it will be people who will forego the primary care that could've prevented major illnesses. We're all going to end up paying a lot more down the road because of the existence of that PPO Savings Plan.

I hope that there is consideration to do away with that and certainly no plans to unduly burden people who are just getting older or who, through no fault of their own, have serious conditions. Thank you.

**David Gray:** Appreciate your perspective. Thank you.

**Larry Backer, University Park Law:** Thank you very much for a very interesting technical report. I appreciate the efforts that you've made to explain to us your numbers. I do regret the choice you made in looking at benefits from the perspective of an insurance company within the ambit of a University. But it's a choice you've made, and let's work with it for a while.

I want to focus on one of the things that is implicit in your presentation but that you don't discuss very much. You tell us that cost is really the driver of the system now. As an insurance company, which is what we are, cost is met both by the premiums you charge, which I'm assuming that's used to meet our operating expenses with Highmark, but that the costs are then estimated.

I want to focus on the cost thing, which you've taken as a given. I want to focus it in two ways. I'm not clear on how you're pricing cost, and I'm not sure how you're netting cost. Since cost is a driver, the way you do that, of course, will determine just how nervous we should be about spiraling costs.
With respect to pricing costs, I'm wondering whether, for example, with respect to the services that are provided by our own internal service providers, Hershey for example, we're pricing these at cost or market. If we price them at market, of course, we're making profit on our own plans, increasing, inflating the cost and then coming back to us and telling us that indeed we have all these horrible costs for which we're making a profit. I'd be curious to know what your pricing model is, cost or market.

Then the second one is I'm wondering how you net costs. When I see the numbers up there, of course, these are the raw costs, but I didn't see anything up there that captures the value added by the expenditures for things like productivity which also has a dollar value against which the perhaps the cost should be netted, which then reduced the "overall costs" with respect to which we worry about the provision of services. I was wondering if you could talk a little bit to these "cost drivers" in terms of pricing cost and netting cost.

David Gray: I don't know-- I think we're going to turn to Greg Stoner. Greg is our Senior Director for Compensation and Benefits, Larry, if you don't mind. I think he'll have some good insight into how we price our plans and the nature of our cost drivers and how we net against those costs. Greg.

Greg Stoner, Senior Director for Compensation and Benefits: Thanks, David, and thanks, Larry, for some excellent questions and insight. I asked Susan to flip back to this slide. Arguably, in my opinion, this may be the most important slide in the entire deck. The reason I say that, this really breaks down how health insurance works for a self-funded employer like Penn State. What do I mean by that?

Bill charges are what all the providers charge and submit to the insurance carrier for payment. Now if you've ever looked at your Explanation of Benefits, I'm sure it's eye-popping in terms of what some of those charges are that are submitted. Through Highmark or any third-party administrator, Aetna, Cigna, any of the others out there, they, as part of the fees we pay to those third-party administrators, negotiate discounts with those providers. By using those in-network discounts, we have 99% of our claims being paid in-network, stressing the point that we're not going to compromise network to save a few dollars.

Highmark and the other carriers discount or negotiate discounted rates with those providers. So again, you look on your Explanation of Benefits, you see what was submitted, you see the discounts, and you see the remaining amount which is the allowed charges. That's what the insurance carrier pays and bills back to the employer who's self-insured, like Penn State.

Then we have two other components. This may get to your question. There's out-of-pocket costs. These are the variable costs, things that we pay out of pocket, our copays, our co-insurance, our deductibles. Those vary based on utilization. And then we also have, under the Savings Plan, the HSA seeding amount, which is $400 or $800 if you're single or a family.

On the right side, and this is where the budget comes into play, this is what the cost that Penn State pays and asks employees to share in through their premium contributions out of their paycheck. So that plan cost is the figure against which the premiums are established, the budget figures are calculated. That $35 to $40 million premium figure that David noted earlier, that's the amount necessary in order to sustain our medical plans at a level that are competitive, that are affordable. That's how those costs break down.

I guess, let me know if I'm not answering the question. A lot of the stuff at the top is out of our control, meaning under the contract we have with Highmark that lasts through the end of next year, we don't have
influence on a lot of that work that they do. But when we do an RFP next year, we'll be able to ask those very difficult questions to say, what are your in-network discount rates? What other types of impacts can you have to help manage our overall costs for the out-of-pocket costs as well as the plan costs?

David mentioned pharmacy benefits management. You may have seen on the slide our specialty direct trend rate is over 16%. Again, we want all of you and your families and all of us to have access to medications that are going to improve our quality of life, but the costs are spiraling out of control. So how do we work with that third-party administrator to help us manage that?

Then we work with the Budget Office in terms of what that plan cost should be. We have a third-party actuary that helps us with budgeting, creating those budget rates against which we create the premiums.

**Larry Backer:** That was very helpful. Thank you. But if I heard you correctly, then what you're telling me is that Highmark is pricing Hershey's services to us.

**Greg Stoner:** Right, they negotiate with the provider.

**Larry Backer:** But that sounds absurd. If we are selling our own services to our own administrator, our outside administrator, they're pricing it at market and then charging us. Then we come back and we say, well, these are University-provided services that now we're going to charge you full cost as if we were charging the Mayo Clinic and that that's what's driving up costs. That sounds a little odd.

**Becky Bascom, Hershey:** Three quick comments. First, when you were talking about the siren song of outside lab providers and imaging services and how that would be a great cost savings, it makes my blood run cold because I'm one of the clinicians that has to try to track down those lab results, link them to the medical record. It's a huge time sink, and it's a huge source of lost information.

I think I brought that up a couple sessions ago. I didn't hear the asterisk that spoke to the importance of the electronic medical record and having part of the cost of doing business getting those results incorporated in the longitudinal EMR so an individual can have a continuous record. Number 1.

Number 2, one of my patients a few weeks ago was on brand name Effexor as one of her psychiatric meds and came to me saying that she had paid $0.10 a pill when she was at Hershey Medical Center and that was her employer, and she was now paying $8 a pill when she was switched over to the College of Medicine which is a Penn State formulary. It seems totally nuts for someone who's in her mid-20s to be faced with that kind of cost differential. I didn't know if there was a plan for information sharing between the medical center and Penn State to try to learn where cost savings could be. That's point number 2.

Point number 3, when I had my children, I was 50 pounds lighter than I am today. I've had wonderful food. I have also changed my health risk profile. I have not smoked cigarettes. I am delighted that I don't have to face the specter of $3,000. But I think this group would be well to think about and educate themselves as to the health behaviors that lead to altered health risk before we get too moral about the business of health.

Many things that we do affect our health risk. And gosh, it's a tough thing facing these costs, but I don't think we should be ignoring the role of personal choice in behaviors that affect our health.
David Gray: Amen to that.

Kim Nelson, Science: I just wanted to comment and basically follow up on that. I'm one of those minority 18% to 20% in the Savings Plan. While I don't mind being altruistic, there is a limit to how altruistic I wish to be for other people's health choices. I would like to definitely not swing all the way to the premium side, relative to the out-of-pocket side because it does take considerable effort and energy on an individual's part to try to maintain one's health and reduce one's health cost, and I think that should be, in some ways, rewarded.

David Gray: This is part of the reason why we offer these two very distinctly different plan choices. I think that as we've looked at the numbers, something along the lines of 95% of our employees would actually benefit financially from the Health Savings Program. Obviously, we don't have nearly that many that are members of that. They're making their own set of choices about risk aversion and so forth which, again, having these two plan choices, is their perfect right to do.

But we think it's a responsible thing to have these two very distinctly different plans, provide employees with every bit of information we possibly can about what those choices are about and what risk they're assuming by one plan versus the next and then let them make the choice for themselves about which plan they opt for.

Galen Grimes, Greater Allegheny: I think everybody in here can appreciate your diligence and your concern with keeping health care cost. We want to see that happen, but there are a lot of us in the western part of the state that are considered that in the future about whether or not we're even going to be able to obtain Health Care in the future. I'm sure you're aware of the brush wars that have been going on between Highmark and UPMC.

From all indications, it appears that UPMC seems to be winning that battle. They have bought up most of the hospitals in the area. They have bought up a large percentage of the medical practices in the area. And there are a lot of situations where we go to doctors and the first question we ask is what insurance are they going to take. Do they take UPMC and Highmark or whatever? Can the doctor even see us if they are owned by UPMC?

So my question is as our contract with UPMC is approaching the expiration date, are you-- pardon me. Highmark. Are you going to be talking to or entertaining conversations with UPMC and possibly have a UPMC option for us to choose from in addition to or in place of the Highmark option?

David Gray: Let me just say that, first, we are extremely concerned about that continuing battle between Highmark and UPMC in Western Pennsylvania. And we are extremely concerned about the ability of all of our employees and dependents that reside in Western Pennsylvania to continue to have access to high quality affordable care.

Certainly, as we go into this next RFP with the expiration of the Highmark contract at the end of 2017, we will have to continue to be exceptionally concerned about choice of provider and the ability of our employees and dependents to get unfettered access to the highest quality affordable care in all sections of Pennsylvania. We will be leaving no stone unturned in that quest, and certainly open to the consideration of a relationship with UPMC if that is what the path is that takes us to that goal.
Rogerio Neves, Medicine: It's just to make a point, when I moved to Penn State nine years ago, I really couldn't understand when I was obtaining and seeing a patient from Penn State and why we had to charge that much to our own people, and still I don't understand.

What they do now, they charge as much as they can for a service because they know they're going to have a discount and going to have a fraction of that. I give service, I do a procedure. They charge let's say $10,000 because they know they're going to receive $1,000. They'll be happy with this, with $1,000. But they charge $10,000.

Then for many patients, what they show, say, “Oh, doctor, you charge that much?” I say, “I'm sorry. I didn't charge anything.” I'm outraged because the service I provided, it's not this cost, but they get that number. Then I get embarrassed again when I receive my return. I say, oh, they're paying only this for what I have done because it's just a little, tiny amount that comes.

In this game, but what happened when it comes to our account, shows that the cost was $10,000. Your insurance was very nice, negotiated discount, paid $1,000. And you have a lot of out-of-pocket to match that difference, but everything was virtual. It's not real cost.

We are still playing this game. The hospital charges as much as they can because they know they're going to receive as minimal as possible. We are paying again to ourselves, you know, out of pocket for this. So this game needs to finish because we'll come to a point that nobody is going to be able to have health insurance and mostly for a service that we provide for ourselves.

David Gray: Let me comment on that from the perspective of a Board member of Penn State Health under the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, which I also happen to be. Penn State Health and the Hershey Medical Center have, I think, a very difficult road in front of them to maintain competitiveness in a turbulent health care delivery marketplace. By some of the financial measures that we typically look at to gauge the financial health of a health delivery system such as Hershey, we look at perhaps one of the most frequently quoted measures is the number of days of cash on hand. Hershey, by that measure, is still well underneath the industry norm.

Now they have been running very effectively in terms of creating a positive operating margin over the last seven or eight years. But even with that very positive operational status recently, they still are 80, 90 days of cash on hand underneath that measure which Moody's and Standard and Poor's and other outside evaluators look to as a basis for financial health and well-being.

So I don't think there is evidence in my mind to indicate that Hershey is some way systematically overcharging for the services that it provides to those of us that avail ourselves of Hershey Medical providers. I don't think so at all. In fact, I think-- Susan, if I'm speaking out of turn, please call me up short. But by the data that we see from the Highmark's claims database, I think there are providers that currently are more costly, on average, than the Hershey Medical Center is for the very same medical service.

So I think in fairness, a normative look at the cost structure doesn't suggest that Hershey is radically out of line. They are an academic medical center. And it is a well-known fact that academic medical centers are among the more expensive providers of different health care services, but there's nothing that I've seen to indicate at all that the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center is out of line with respect to cost. I
believe Highmark negotiates those discounts with Hershey the same as they would with Geisinger or other provider networks.

Rogerio Neves: I'm not saying that specific notion, but they try to charge as much as they can because they know that it is possible. That's what I'm saying. Everybody plays the same game. But the problem is that we are paying, you know, although we are serving our own population. You are paying like you're going to any other hospital. You know, we could. We could. But we're still treating our own people there. Thank you.

David Gray: One of the things we intend to do as we think about putting online the data warehouse that we're talking about, not only will that data warehouse, that we spoke to earlier, address the need for the administration and the Health Care Advisory Committee to have better insight into our claims utilization and our Health Care cost, we also intend to deploy those very same tools to help provide better transparency to all of you and to our employee colleagues so that they can cross-compare costs of services from different providers, different physicians, different provider groups, and Health Care delivery systems and make informed choices based both upon perceived and real measured quality of care as well as the cost of that care. That's something we look very much forward to providing to all of you in future years so that you can make better, more informed choices.

By so doing, and when we think about this trend taking place across the country, I think it will help, as employers and as informed consumers of Health Care, to help put a lid on that health care cost inflation trend. That's my hope.

Johanna Wagner, Liberal Arts: I was wondering if you could clarify. On the first slide, when you talk about the current state of things, that preserving choice may not be sustainable. I was wondering if you could just clarify what is exactly meant by that.

David Gray: Yes. I think what we're saying there is as we go into the future, we're going to have to be looking very carefully and methodically at the cost of services and the inflationary trends that we're experiencing and be very thoughtful about how we engage different provider networks that can help us and are willing to go shoulder to shoulder with us to keep a lid on Health Care cost inflation.

If provider networks are unwilling to engage with us and our plan administrator in that quest, then we may have to make some difficult choices. I hope that's not the case. I hope we don't have to limit choice at all. But it's simply something that I would be disingenuous if I didn't put it out there as something that we could be pushed into doing if we're unsuccessful in all these management tactics that we will be deploying now and into the future.

Asad Azemi, Brandywine: I was looking at your numbers. It seems that your question is how we can raise your basic premium this way or that way. You provided that it says the cost is $200 million. But you do not provide any specific categories where these costs are. So if you all want to answer that we're going to do a cut here or a cut there, I have no idea. We are pretty much in the dark. I'm sure people are willing to make sacrifices here and there, but we are not given information to know how to do that. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Please make your questions brief because I want to recognize two or three more. Thank you.
**David Gray**: If I might just quickly responding to that. That's a great observation. What we threw up there with the figures is kind of a black box. Let us do some work to try and provide more of a break out on what some of those major buckets of costs are that we're experiencing that make up that $200 million. We'd be happy to do that.

**Deirdre Folkers, York**: I am one of those people who's trying to avoid the American Health Care system, and so far, I think the University's made money on me through luck, perhaps. You've begun to address this, but it's critical I think that we have some access to understanding costs in order to save costs.

A very quick anecdote, I recently had to purchase a small medical device because I have all of the arm and shoulder issues that come from using a computer for 30 years. I'd already priced it, and I knew that it sold for about $50. So when they told me that my insurance covered it, that seemed like a nice thing. I was surprised then to discover that they had billed Highmark $600 for the same item I could buy on Amazon for $50. I called both the supplier, and I called Highmark to complain about the huge cost involved in this. I was told by Highmark that I really should worry about it because they'd negotiated, and they were only going to pay $400 of that.

Had I known in advance, I would never had done it. I'd have frankly paid the $50 out of pocket. I really do try to be a good steward of my health care dollars. I think it's really critical that we have some way to make some kind of meaningful comparison when we go to make those decisions. Without it, there's really no way we can participate in cost containment.

**Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley**: One number that you just said really jumped out at me, that you said 95% of the employees would do better on the savings plan. That seems to tell me that the Savings Plan is underpriced and the traditional plan is overpriced. I would think that if it was equally priced, everyone should have a 50/50 chance of one being cheaper or of the other one being cheaper, depending on their health costs in a given year. The fact that it's 95/5 tells me that there's an underpricing of the one and an overpricing of the other.

**Chair Ansari**: Thank you. I have one minute left. The last question goes to Esther here.

**Esther Prins, Education**: Thank you. I just wanted to urge the committee to consider the unintended consequences of switching or moving people to a high deductible plan. For example, there was a recent study that was a natural experiment of people in a firm who got switched to a high deductible plan, and they found that both healthy and sick patients use less Health Care.

The problem is that included not just the wasteful things like imaging but also necessary preventive visits. And the people most likely to reduce health care were the people who were the sickest and actually needed that care. I think that's where the issue that the previous Senator brought up of some of the long-term negative consequences come in.

**Chair Ansari**: Thank you, Esther. Our time has expired. I want to thank David. Let me come and shake your hand, Sir.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS – NONE**
LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Ansari: Please be reminded that parliamentary procedures require all motions to be submitted to the chair in writing. If needed, the Senate staff can provide you with paper and pencil. We will use clickers for voting today. Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Please raise your hand if you need a clicker.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revision to the Bylaws, Article II, Section 1 (Senate Council)

Chair Ansari: We have one legislative report from Committees and Rules which appears as Appendix D. Because this report is a revision to the Bylaws, the report is placed on today's agenda for your review only. This report will be discussed and voted on at the March 15 Senate meeting.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
Revisions to Senate Policy 67-00, Athletic Competition, Section 5 Athletic Schedules
Committee Chair Jeff Laman

We have one legislative report from Intercollegiate Athletics which appears as Appendix E. This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second. Committee Chair Jeff Laman will respond to questions.

Jeff Laman, Engineering: Good afternoon. I just had a couple of brief comments. For those of you who have looked at the legislation, you know that there are fairly extensive changes. I won't take the time to go through all of those in detail. That would take a very long time.

The legislation before you consists of fairly extensive revisions to Faculty Senate Policy 67-00, otherwise titled Athletic Competition. Intercollegiate Athletics is not really the province of most of us. I'm not sure how interested all of you will necessarily be. I think it's important to point out that the Senate and us as faculty have a specific and solemn responsibility to provide oversight of our Intercollegiate Athletics, and I think we do a very good job at that, not just as Senators but also the other offices at the University that pay attention to these things. We want to maintain that at Penn State, so we work very hard to stay up to date with our policies.

At Penn State that is not news to anybody. We have a fairly new Provost, a fairly new President. We have a new Athletic Director. We have new coaches. We have new Associate Athletic Directors. We have new people coming and going through our Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

We felt that it was important to stay current, can't be a static situation because we also recognize that NCAA changes all the time. If you read the paper, the sports page, you realize that. Maybe less so in the news, but certainly impacting Penn State are all the changes that happen through the Big Ten.

Of course, many of you are aware that television plays a big role in the kinds of things that we do. So we have impacts just based on television, and I could go on. The IAC undertook an effort to revise a small chunk really of the 67-00 Policy to bring it in line with Penn State policies, with NCAA policies, and the Big Ten. What you see is the result of that effort. We have ongoing efforts for other sections which will come to the Senate at some other time.
What you see is in part house cleaning. Some of it is just practical matters. Some of it is defining process and codifying what's being done in a better way for future members of the Senate who come after me. I've been a member of that committee now for nearly five years. Chaired it for three. Somebody else is going to have to do this sometime, so think about that, all of you.

But with that bit of an introduction, without going into all of the details of the changes, I'm happy to answer any questions that you have or comment. And also our wonderful and dedicated Faculty Athletic Representative, Linda Caldwell, is here to help me if I stumble or can't answer.

**Annie Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences:** Just a comment. I want to reinforce something you alluded to which is that I was impressed that this report does such a great job of just cleaning up policies. I think we need to do this more and more. It seemed from my read-- I don't pretend to know anything about how things work in Intercollegiate Athletics, but the takeaway I had was that you streamlined processes and took out unnecessary bureaucracy. I really applaud the committee for doing that.

**Jeff Laman:** You're warming Linda's heart here. She's after that as a goal just to streamline.

**Chair Ansari:** Other questions or comments? Seeing none, are we ready to vote? To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 125 accept, and 3 reject.

Motion carries. Thank you, Jeff.

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

**Change to Senate Policy 05-81**

*(Minimum Entrance Requirements for Admission to Baccalaureate Degree Programs)*

Committee Chair Keefe Manning

**Chair Ansari:** We have one legislative report from Undergraduate Education which appears as Appendix F. This report is brought to the floor from the committee and needs no second. Committee Chair Keefe Manning will respond to questions.

**Keefe Manning, Engineering:** Thank you very much for this opportunity to update one of our policies in terms of minimum entrance requirements for admission for degree programs. It's focusing more on the requirement of the world language. Currently in policy, we state that the student can be admitted even if they have not met the requirement at the secondary level. But the policy states that by the time he or she earns 60 credits or graduates from Penn State, whichever comes first.

We looked at this and decided that it would be best practice, because some degrees are very compact with the requirements in the first 60 credits, that we would relax that, just have it so that they meet the requirement by the time they graduate from Penn State.

**Chair Ansari:** Are there any questions for Keefe? Hearing none, are we ready to vote? To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 129 accept, and 5 reject.

Motion carries. Thank you, Keefe.
Chair Ansari: We have one advisory and consultative report from Educational Equity and Campus Environment which appears as Appendix G. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Committee Vice Chair Rob Loeb will respond to questions. Rob?

Rob Loeb, Dubois: I just would make a comment that the committee went dutifully looking at the statistics involved and had some difficulties in interpretation and overall thought there could be some improvement in regard to administrative diversity. That's the general basis of the recommendations that come within the report. Are there any questions?

Sharron Holt, Abington: What kinds of diversity did you investigate? Could you just give us a quick run-down?

Rob Loeb: We had hoped to deal with all of the diversity represented in the various commissions, presidential commissions, that is, at the University. However, we were only really able to gather data concerning the diversity of women and the EO group, African American, and so on. Those were the only data we were able to look at.

Sharron Holt: Specifically, were you looking at LGBTQ diversity?

Rob Loeb: We desired to. There was none to look at, and that is part of the recommendation.

Sharron Holt: I'm sorry. What is part of the recommendation?

Rob Loeb: If you take a look at the report and you take a look at the penultimate paragraph, you'll see a rather extensive discussion of this matter.

Chair Ansari: Are there any questions? Hearing none, are we ready to vote? To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 120 accept, and 15 reject.

Motion carries. Thank you, Rob.

Chair Ansari: We have one advisory and consultative report from Faculty Affairs which appears as Appendix H. Before I introduce our committee chair, I would like to report that Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations are in the process of preparing advisory consultative reports to revise HR21 which would provide two levels of promotion for fixed-term faculty, provide a mechanism for long-standing faculty on FT1 appointments to be eligible for FTM appointments and establish promotion review
committees for fixed-term faculty. We anticipate receiving those reports for consideration by the Senate in March and April.

This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second. Committee Chair Michael Bérubé will respond to questions.

**Michael Bérubé, Liberal Arts:** Thank you, Chair Ansari. I believe that if you propose to take votes away from anybody for any reason, you'd better have a damn good rationale for it. Faculty Affairs feels the same way. We debated this for some time. It could've come to the floor a little earlier, but the debate was--vigorouos.

The argument in favor of keeping the system we have now in which FT faculty on some campuses can vote for the members of P&T committees was that it allowed them to participate in the P&T process. The argument against that position is that it's not really participation in the P&T process. It's the participation in the selection of the people who engage in the P&T process, which explicitly excludes FT faculty. That seems to me a serious structural problem in governance.

The other question was that it does not seem clear why FT faculty on some campuses would have that right to vote for the members of P&T committees and FT faculty on other campuses would not. That also seemed to be a structural problem. We thought of this in Faculty Affairs, together with Intra-University Relations, as Chair Ansari has suggested as part of a larger plan to eliminate voting for P&T committees among the FT faculty but then to create a new system of promotion and rank and reward for FT faculty administered by FT faculty.

Very briefly, that would create--and you'll see it in March when we bring it to the floor. It is all set to go. We'll meet the February 5 deadline. That would create fixed-term review committees, one for the University College campuses, one for each of the stand-alone campuses, and one for every college at UP. FT faculty would not have to have the approval of division head to go forward for promotion after five years. They would put themselves up for promotion, and it would be five years across the board. It would not be eight years at the University College Campuses. Their promotion applications would then be reviewed by a fixed-term review committee made up of fixed-term faculty elected by fixed-term faculty. That is really the proposal here. This is the first part of it. It basically involves making sure the tenure-line faculty vote for the tenure-line P&T system and we create a new system that makes more sense for FT faculty to adjudicate FT faculty matters.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. I would like to add that, as Michael said, there is no uniformity in this process. Colleges at University Park, only the tenure-line faculty will vote to select the members of the P&T review committees. Many of the campuses, including the five external colleges, they have tenure-line. One college from within the five colleges uses tenure-line only for the college P&T committee and everyone else for the divisions.

There are few campuses within the University College that are open for everyone, including the fixed-term faculty colleagues, to participate. As you know, the Senate will also elect members of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. As you also know, all Senators will vote in that process which also includes our colleagues from fixed-term ranks. I just wanted to bring this charge for Faculty Affairs for them to deliberate on it and decide whether they would like to bring a uniformity to the process. It was totally at the discretion of the committee.
I am pleased to report that they have done a great job. We have faculty members of fixed-term rank that are in both committees, IRC and also Faculty Affairs. They have been involved in the process. So with that, I would like to open the floor for discussion.

**Rosemarie Petrilla, Hazelton:** At the last Senate meeting, I stood before you as an FT1 faculty saying that I've been very supported, and I have been. I am from one of the campuses that as an FT faculty for the last 20-some years, I have been allowed to vote for who serves on the P&T committee at Hazelton.

Also as an FT1 faculty, I am allowed to vote at this body right here who serves. The language in this report is going to, if it is passed today, will stop my ability-- and if you are an FT faculty-- to vote for who serves on the P&T committees if you vote for that today as an FT1 faculty here. So think about that.

I am very excited about what's coming forward with the FT1 policy. I'm very excited about that. What it does say, before the changes were made-- can we put up what the changes are?

**Chair Ansari:** You mean this policy? HR23?

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** HR23?

**Chair Ansari:** Yes, go ahead. Sure.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** Can we put that up so they can see what the changes of the language are?

**Michael Bérubé:** It basically is that tenure-line and tenured faculty are eligible to vote for P&T committees, which takes the vote away from FT faculty in the Senate and on campuses, but only for the campuses that now permit them to vote.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** Right.

**Michael Bérubé:** And every place else it would just be business as usual.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** Members-- in "see under procedures for establishing review committees," it says, "Members of the review committee shall be"--

**Chair Ansari:** No, no, no. I'm sorry. You're reading from another report.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** Oh.

**Chair Ansari:** This report is HR23. It has nothing to do with the promotion of your committee. This is talking about the eligibility to vote. Nickie, can you bring up the recommendation please?

OK, right there in the bold area. Michael, could you read that part please?

**Michael Bérubé:** "Only tenured and tenure-line faculty are eligible to vote for members of all peer tenure and promotion committees."

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** OK. So you propose to amend HR23?
Chair Ansari: That's correct.

Michael Bérubé: Exactly.

Rosemarie Petrilla: OK, but what HR23 does as it stands now, it says it is up to the unit to decide. I guess what my concern is, does your unit that you represent today, do they even know that they had the right as FT1s-- it may not stand like that right now. Do they even know that they had the right to even question that? That's my concern. When was the last time it was even discussed at your unit?

What I would like to see is that we are-- I think of us as one faculty governance. We're governing together. We're one faculty. I would like to see that FT1s get to vote for who serves on P&T, and I would like my tenured colleagues also to get to vote for who serves on the-- if we get that far, I hope we do-- who gets to serve on the FT promotion committee as well.

So as you go forward, I want you to consider it's really not your vote. Have you discussed this in your unit? Do you really know how your colleagues feel? Think about that before you decide. Because right now, they have the right. Maybe they don't know about it. But before you take that right away, consider that before you change and remove it. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: I just wanted to tell you, Rosemarie, that I can speak for my campus. There is already a policy. The Senate in the Berks campus has developed that policy, the guidelines in accordance to HR23. I have a lot of colleagues under fixed-term, which I love them all, and they have been involved with the development of that policy. I can also say that perhaps-- I don't know for sure, but I can say that perhaps other units have had the same opportunity.

Rosemarie Petrilla: Well, we recently just had a forensic, and we also had the vote.

Chair Ansari: You mean at your campus?

Rosemarie Petrilla: Yes, at Hazelton. I can say we even-- after the vote, they did a survey to take a look at-- and they divided-- they wanted to see-- on the survey, they separated out FT to tenure-line and tenured. The majority of the tenured, tenure-line vote-- because the concern is that FT1 faculty are outnumbering the tenured, tenure-line. The tenured, tenure-line majority voted in favor to keep FT faculty voting for P&T.

Chair Ansari: OK, you want to answer that, Michael? Or should I recognize somebody else?

Michael Bérubé: That came up this morning as well. That's a legitimate concern because this proposal here would in fact override the autonomy of various campuses to make that decision for themselves. Absolutely true. I think that loss of autonomy for those units is more than offset by the increase, really unprecedented and salutary increase, in the autonomy of FT faculty to create their own committees and review procedures.

I also think that in this case, the autonomy of units actually contributes to the incoherence of a system. That in fact a person on one campus who's in FT status has rights that a person on another campus with FT status does not have.
Last but not least, to go forward-- one of the reasons I want to keep these two tracks separate and parallel. And I want to create a system for FT faculty parallel that to the tenure system without tenure and a review procedure. To borrow from Ghostbusters, it's a real danger when you cross the streams.

Your suggestion that tenure-line faculty would actually be able to vote for the fixed-term committees I think would be open to all kinds of abuse. The fixed-term faculty I've been speaking to think what we need is greater autonomy from the procedures that the tenure-line faculty enjoy.

Also they have the protection of tenure. Their participation in shared governance carries next to no consequences. Whereas fixed-term faculty participation in governance sometimes put them in jeopardy if it happens to be at loggerheads with their tenured colleagues or with their division head.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: I oppose this. Full disclosure, I have tenure. I think this is a very, very bad idea for the simple reason that many of our faculty who are employed on fixed-term contracts already feel and are treated as though they are second-class citizens, depending on the unit and location. I see that this is a very bad idea to double down on this system. I find an argument for a separate but equal promotion structure to be unconvincing in the extreme. We've seen what happened to separate but equal in the past.

So establishing this sort of thing here is, I think, not a good step. For those units, such as our colleagues at Hershey, where those employed on fixed-term contracts are in the vast majority, this then gives those units less say in the composition of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The vast majority of those Senators are, in fact, on fixed-term contracts. They will be unable to vote for those committee members. I think this would be a bad idea for the University to adopt this legislation. I understand the good intentions. Unfortunately, I think we're treading down a road to Hell.

Ann Taylor Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thank you. This has actually been very educational for me. I so respect my colleagues, but I have a different opinion. I'm in a college where we already have separate committees. I've been there since 2002. It's the only college I've been in. I was in a central unit before that, so it just seems normal to me.

Until becoming an administrator, I was a fixed-term faculty member. I've never gone for tenure. I really don't ever want to go for tenure. I don't understand the process. I don't know what to look for in looking for someone who would be good to serve on that committee.

Likewise, our college has a fixed-term and research promotion committee. I'm not comfortable with my tenured colleagues who don't understand our weird workloads to be able to suggest likewise. It has worked very well. We have an incredibly collegial environment. I feel extremely respected, as do my colleagues, I hope, fixed-term colleagues in my college. We all are part of the faculty. We all advise our Dean equally, but we do have this bit of a differentiation, and it's worked very well, I believe, in our college.

I haven't been in the situations at other campuses, as my colleagues here have discussed. I can't speak to that. I did want to say that we do it in our college, and it's worked and worked very well, I think, and been very collegial and has not left me feeling like a second-class citizen.
Ira Saltz, Shenango: Yeah, I would like to echo what she just said. It's a question-- and being a former DAA, I understand very different types of expectations there are of tenure-line faculty and fixed-term faculty. I'm not sure that everyone does understand those differences.

I think it's appropriate that when we're talking about forming a committee to review somebody for promotion or tenure on a tenure-line that only those who have been through the process or hope to go through that process have the expertise there. The same with the fixed-term faculty, that there's a lot of tenure-line faculty who probably would not understand what is expected of the fixed-term faculty. I do support this legislation.

We have had this discussion at Shenango. This issue was brought by our campus Senate chair. There was discussion of it. The fixed-term faculty expressed that they were completely fine.

Stephen Synder, Berks: I'm a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee. I supported the report when it came forward. I accepted the rationale. What I would ask of the chair is to simply repeat those opening remarks.

Michael Bérubé: Sure. Let me repeat those opening remarks by articulating myself to the critique that this is analogous to Jim Crow, an analogy I think fails on two levels, the racial being the first. I don't think there's any plausible way to see the overall proposal of creating fixed-term review committees in all these units elected by fixed-term faculty, served on exclusively by fixed-term faculty, independent of division heads and unit heads as disenfranchisement. It is exactly the opposite. It is an unprecedented enfranchisement of fixed-term faculty to oversee fixed-term review and promotion procedures.

Now that said, we thought one of the ways to clean this up is because we have situations where tenure-line can vote on fixed-term, fixed term can vote on tenure-line, but only in some situations. Furthermore, despite the fact that some fixed-term faculty and some tenured faculty feel that this is a one faculty issue, I still point out it's a one faculty issue only with regard to the voting. No fixed-term faculty can serve on these committees. They don't adjudicate fixed-term faculty issues.

So it's a one faculty issue with the vote. Then there's this notion about whether any fixed-term faculty can ever serve on the committees. Better I think to create fixed-term committees that can oversee fixed-term reviews, promotions, multi-year contracts independent of administration and independent of the tenure-line faculty.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Michael. Steve?

Stephen Synder: My concern was with the very beginning opening remarks.

Michael Bérubé: Oh, don't take votes away from people without a good rationale. I think in the end, if it were just this issue, if it were just this proposal, I would oppose it, but because for me and for Faculty Affairs and for Intra-University Relations, it's a much larger and more ambitious package that would create a system at Penn State that has never existed.

The fixed-term faculty situation, that was not one where-- again, to go back to the Jim Crow analogy-- there's a separate but equal pathway. There's no pathway. There is caprice and randomness. And things are just up for grabs, campus by campus.
And that is one of the equity problems we face, even with the very fact that University College FT faculty have to wait eight years for promotion while everyone else can go up for five. That's something I really think in the interest of fairness and equity are in the end the rationale for this proposal and for all the ones that follow it.

**Chair Ansari:** I would like to say before Stephen speaks I know Michael is a champion. I am, too, for all of our colleagues, especially for our fixed-term colleagues. And those people that know me and they know Michael, they attest to that fact. If there's anyone here who can speak against it, I would love to hear that.

That said, there was no uniformity. Rosemarie said-- and I don't want to-- I'm not entering the debate because I'm not supposed to. I know the parliamentary procedures.

I am not entering the debate. But I just want to make one observation that--

I heard you. I would like to make one observation that Rosemarie made excellent remarks. And I've known Rosemarie for a long time. But all of these units, they already have put a policy in place. In fact, as Steve knows, at Berks Campus, the assistant professors also cannot vote to select members of the P&T committee. Thank you, Steve. Go ahead.

**Stephen Synder:** I just had one final comment. I am on the committee. I supported the report. I do not feel it is appropriate for me to speak against the report. What I want to do though is encourage you, if you feel that it needs to be challenged, stand up and you challenge it and not be told not to.

That said, if you want me to change my vote, which is now in support of the report, if you want me to change it, show me that there are grounds. The report rationale says there are no grounds. What you have to do to convince me and my vote is show me that there are grounds.

**Michael Bérubé:** OK, I think--

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. Michael, let's recognize other people.

**James Jaap, Greater Allegheny:** We're one of the campuses that allows fixed-term 1 Senior Instructors to vote on the makeup of the P&T committee. Of course, we are not able to serve on that P&T committee. That committee is a subcommittee of our Faculty Senate.

And we as senators vote on various committees, Academic Affairs, Curricular, and the P&T Committee. By removing this, then in some ways are we not removing faculty voice and faculty governance for fixed-term faculty? We lose our voice in this. So in a way, we're kind of stepping back from faculty governance.

**Michael Bérubé:** That's what I'm worried about. I want to second Steve's remarks as well. If you're against this, vote against it. There was no unanimity in the subcommittee. No unanimity in the committee. I expected no unanimity today.

That said, my rationale remains, nothing that a P&T committee does affects FT faculty. They are barred under Penn State procedures right out from participating in that. It's the one place where that voice I think
is a sort of shadow voice. I want that voice to be a real voice that affects FT faculty members more directly with direct representation. That's the rationale.

Now there are other affective rationales for one faculty as a voting thing even if you're not one faculty as a serving thing. That I hear. I am not personally convinced, but I totally understand other people being. And I think it's an argument advanced in totally good faith.

**Kim Nelson, Science:** I think my issue with this, if I understand it correctly, is I have no issue as a fixed-term faculty member not voting for my departmental P&T committee members. I trust them. By doing this my understanding is you remove my capability as a senator to vote on a Senate policy concerning P&T which is a different role than being a fixed-term faculty member. I happen to be a senator who is a fixed-term faculty member. So you remove one of my responsibilities as I was elected to serve my unit as a senator, and there's where my issue is with this policy.

**Michael Bérubé:** I agree with that. Actually the first draft of this exempted senators by virtue of the fact that they've been elected representatives of their units. That that would make an exception so that you could vote for the university P&T committee precisely because you'd been elected to represent your units.

**Peter Dendle, Mont Alto:** Thank you. I was a little bit bewildered at first to find this being pitched as a sort of equity issue for some of the reasons that you said about things that happen in Canada do impact me indirectly. But that doesn't mean I get to vote in Canada. They have internal vote for things that immediately and directly affect Canada.

When I was inducted into the tenure-line and then eventually serving on P&T committees what I've found was that I had a whole lot of learning to do. It was a whole lot of very specific checklists, a whole lot of very specific expectations, exceptions, historical build up across different disciplines. I'm still learning and developing in that.

Having served on those committees, I also know who works well together, what people's presuppositions are, what sort of coalesces into a successful committee within my campus. I just don't understand on what basis someone outside of that entire process would be voting for someone other than hearsay or general perceptions of their effectiveness, et cetera, et cetera. I hope this isn't sounding elitist. I'm just trying to sort of give my-- OK, well that's good to know. Then I will do some soul searching also. I promise.

**Michael Bérubé:** I think it goes both ways, if I may. It also is a case that long time tenured and tenure-line faculty don't understand the different job descriptions of FT faculty. Having them on those committees I think is also a potential injustice.

**Peter Dendle:** Thank you. So finally a case could be made that the P&T versus full time that it is a dual class thing and that it's perhaps dated or that it's not visionary, and that is perhaps an important discussion. Given that it is kind of these structures are in place, then I think working through rationally with them is still a desideratum. I appreciate what I'm hearing today and what I'm learning today, and I will do more soul searching.

**Dawn Blasko, Behrend:** Behrend is one of the places where indeed everyone has the vote. It was discussed in terms of being one faculty, having a right to be able to talk about the people that they are
interested in, basically promoting the people who are going to be important to the college. It's more of a general collegial type of thing.

Now our Promotion and Tenure Committee also did the reviews for our senior lecturers. And that was also discussed. And recently we changed our constitution, which was just approved by Senate Council a few weeks ago-- changed it to include a fixed-term faculty member who would provide the judgment of the fixed-term faculty.

We at that point talked about whether we should have two completely separate streams. Generally people were not very positive about that because they thought it would divide us into two classes as opposed to one faculty.

I just want to add one more thing. So basically this would invalidate our constitution and probably many others. Also I would say one more thing. We had an administrator not very long ago argue the faculty should not be allowed to vote on any policy that had to do with annual review, personnel policies, P&T generally because that was an administrative role, and we should have no say.

One of the things he used to argue about this was, well, you don't have a fixed-term faculty on a Promotion and Tenure Committee, which of course is true. So I guess-- I hate to make a slippery slope argument because we don't want to do that, but there have been some people who have put those types of arguments forward. I think that's why our faculty have been pretty careful to include everyone in as many of these votes as possible.

I have a real concern about senators because we've talked over the years about trying to encourage representation of the faculty here at the University. That includes fixed-term faculty. I think we've done pretty well in recent years having more fixed-term faculty, but if units decide those fixed-term faculty are not fully representing them, then perhaps they will also elect fewer fixed-term faculty.

**Michael Bérubé:** Of course I'm in favor of increased FT faculty participating in shared governance. As to the argument that because fixed-term faculty don't serve on Tenure and Promotion Committees, therefore shared governance is invalid. I collect lousy administration arguments. Thank you for that one.

**Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development:** I thought I was clear about this, but I have a question for clarification. It's to Kim who made this comment. In this document, all that is changed is the statement only tenured and tenure-line faculty are eligible to vote for members of all peer Tenure and Promotion Committees.

But then, Kim, you added that as a senator this document would not allow you to vote on other policies that might come up at the Senate. Did I misunderstand that?

**Michael Bérubé:** University P&T committee. Right.

**Kim Nelson:** As senators, we vote on the University P&T committee. I would be excluded at my role as a senator of being able to vote for those members.
Patricia Koch: So that was the exact thing you were talking about not other policies. I was just wondering does that mean any time that promotion and tenure comes up on this floor-- so that does not impact that at all.

Michael Bérubé: Just the University P&T committee.

Patricia Koch: Thank you. I wanted to clarify.

Michael Bérubé: And that's open to amendment.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. The question has been called. There's no debate. Those in favor of calling the question please say aye.

Speakers: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed, nay.

Speakers: Nay.

Chair Ansari: Motion carries. That was 2/3 majority. Please start the clock. We're voting on the advisory consultative report. Please press A if you approve. Please press B if you reject. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 73 accept, and 48 reject. Motion carries.

Michael Bérubé: Thanks to everyone on both sides of this. Wait till March. Man, it's going to have a good slate of stuff for FT faculty. It'll change this place forever. Thanks.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Michael.
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COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Ansari: Are there any additional comments for the good of the University?

Jamie Myers, Education: I wasn't quick enough on that end of debate on the election of members to the Promotion and Tenure committees. I do believe that HR23 does now contradict with at least two areas of our Standing Rules in our Constitution. I do think that's a constitutional issue that Committees and Rules needs to take up.

The Constitution specifies membership in this body to include all kinds of names for fixed-term faculty. So they are members of this body. The Standing Rules, Article III, section 4, number 2 states that those members of this body will vote for the election of the university Promotion and Tenure Committee members.

So the Constitution I don't believe is in line with what we just passed in the revision of HR23. And for me, I'd go with the Constitution and the Standing Rules over HR23 in this matter. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Jamie. Jose?

Jose Guerrero, Liberal Arts: I simply want to applaud President Barron's putting forth PSU’s values of community, responsibility, excellence, integrity, discovery, and respect. And I appreciate those as a lecturer in my field and intend to use those and have shared those the first day of class. And I just am very appreciative to have those. I hope they serve us well. I think they can.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Jose. Are there any more comments?

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari: Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor, please say aye. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until March 15, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.
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