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L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 17, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Jonna Kulikowich, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Kulikowich: The January 27, 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?

Seeing none, may I hear a motion to accept?

Senator: So moved.

Chair Kulikowich: Second?

Senator: Second.

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, say nay. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The minutes of the January 27 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Kulikowich: The Senate Curriculum Report of February 24, 2015, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETING OF FEBRUARY 24, 2015

Chair Kulikowich: Minutes from the February 24, 2015 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 at the February 24 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Kulikowich: Out of courtesy to our presenters and your fellow senators, please turn off your cell phones and pagers at this time.

I anticipate that this meeting may be lengthy so I asked that you adjust your schedules in order to accommodate the extended time. Please quietly excuse yourself if needed.

If you are unable to attend a Senate meeting in person, you can join from your computer via Mediasite. Instructions for the use of Mediasite are posted on the Senate website, or call the Senate office for assistance. All senators using Mediasite, please use the “ask a question box” to send a message that you have successfully connected to the live feed so that we may add your name to the attendance list as being present.
As a reminder to senators joining today’s meeting by Mediasite, we are again using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Instructions for using this voting system were emailed to all senators and are posted on the Senate website. For those of you on Mediasite today, please log into polleverywhere.com now so that you are ready to use it when we vote.

The link to the online committee preference form will be sent to 2015-2016 senators this week. Senators are encouraged to consult with their unit caucuses and senators to determine the most appropriate Senate committee assignments. Be sure to indicate if you would be willing to undertake a leadership role.

The Senate officers will complete their spring visits on March 27 with the Graduate School. They will debrief with Provost Jones on April 21.

President Barron supports the Advisory and Consultative report on Institutional Support and Resources for General Education that was passed by the University Faculty Senate on January 27, 2015.

At its February 24 Senate Council meeting, the following Senators were elected to the Committee on Committees and Rules for two-year terms:

Dawn Blasko, Pamela Hufnagel, Christopher Long, Richard Robinett, and Matthew Woessner. Congratulations to all of you.

It is now my pleasure to introduce Neha Gupta, who accepted the 2014 International Children’s Peace Prize Award on November 18 for her exceptional work to raise money for underprivileged children around the world. Neha is a first-year Schreyer Honors College scholar. She was presented the award by King Willem-Alexander of the Netherlands, Desmond Tutu, former archbishop and Nobel Peace Prize winner, and Nobel Peace Prize winner Malala Yousafzai during a ceremony at The Hague, Netherlands.

Gupta founded Empower Orphans, an organization designed to support orphaned and abandoned children in India and the United States. The work she began at age 9 has resulted in a charity that has raised over $1 million and has helped more than 25,000 children.

Neha was unable to attend the December and January meetings of the University Faculty Senate. We are pleased to have her with us today. Neha, would you please stand to be recognized?

At the February 24 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following reports on the Senate Agenda and website only: the Election Commission’s Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2015-2016, the Committee on Faculty Affairs’ Report on Resolution on Faculty Contracts Referred by the Full Senate to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs at the September 9, 2014 Senate Meeting, the Committee on Faculty Benefits’ 2014-2015 Report on Faculty Salaries, the Senate Council’s Report on Fall 2014 Campus Visits, the Committee on Undergraduate Education’s Grade Distribution Report, and the University Planning’s Construction Status Report and Development and Alumni Relations Report. These reports will not be discussed at today’s meeting. If you have questions or comments about these Informational reports, you can email senate@psu.edu. Your questions will be forwarded to the appropriate committee chair for response. The remaining Informational reports on the Senate Agenda will be discussed today.
COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

University President Barron discussed briefly the issue of diversity and demographics, a topic he will address more fully at the Board of Trustees meetings on March 19-20. He considers this to be a moral imperative, a way to provide environmental richness, and a business model imperative. He pointed out that by 2030, it is likely that less than half of high school graduates will be Caucasian, and Pennsylvania birth rates are expected to decline by 4.3% by 2020. Consequently Penn State must become more diverse. The administration is mapping catchment areas for each county in Pennsylvania. University Park is lagging other Penn State campuses in racial diversity of students. He emphasized the need to focus the implementation of the Framework to Foster Diversity on unit. President Barron entertained questions on topics ranging from the timing of annual faculty evaluations to the visit by Bill Ayers.

NEW BUSINESS – NONE

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Kulikowich: On Friday February 17, Senator Mary Miles submitted a Forensic Report on 21st Century Student Life Skills. This report, which appears as Appendix B in the Agenda, is a follow-up to discussion on the topic at the February 24 Senate Council meeting. Twenty minutes has been allocated for this forensic report. At this time, I invite Senator Miles to come forward with Vice Chair of Student Life, Enica Castaneda to introduce the subject.

Mary Miles, Liberal Arts: Thank you. I think we would both like to start by thanking our committee for all the hard work that they have all contributed to this report, and express our interest in mainly focusing on the discussion questions that we have at hand. I wanted to give just a little bit of background, that the report emerged from conversations that we had with Senate leadership and community members regarding the increasing sort of complexities of student life in this, the 21st century. That we have had students dealing with issues in particular ranging from financial concerns, legal concerns, and health care issues. Those are the ones that we focused on explicitly in the report.

We are also responding to some people reaching out, including President Barron, who expressed a concern that we hope that we can all work towards a plan or path forward to promote student well-being and safety, seeking meaningful development, particularly among first-year students, of educational training and topics ranging from finances, diversity, and the business of life. I think our report focuses explicitly on the business of life. The general idea is that students-- we alluded to this at the last meeting as well-- are often looking towards student life services to help them with questions about finances, legal concerns, and health care issues. Those are the ones that we focused on explicitly in the report.

We want to be considering the extent to which we incorporate this into the curriculum, or formalize it, codify it, just what could the Senate do to take some steps towards making these services a greater part of the educational experience of our students. Anything to add?

I thought we could almost combine the first two questions, essentially ask how we would establish and promote a shared understanding of the importance of developing financial, legal, and health care literacies in our students. The second one is almost a follow-up to that. That is, would these skill sets evolve through Student Services, University Libraries, Curricular structures, digital badges, information collating, micro certifications-- I just added that one-- or some combination. What are people thinking right now. I will assume you are thinking good things.
William Lasher, Behrend: I wholly support the basic idea behind this. I think it is good. My son is a junior here. He had to take a second GQ course, and I ran across Math 34, and suggested he take that. He thought it was fantastic.

I cannot imagine today somebody going out into the world not having some idea about interest rates and asset allocation, and trying to make decisions about retirement plans, benefits, all this stuff I think is really important. Math 34 is offered to deal with the financial part. Perhaps making offerings available for some of the other legal and health care literacies would also be valuable. Thank you.

Tramble Turner, Abington: Thanks again for all the listings where you are asking about what else might be emphasized. As one of many former chairs of a presidential commission, in terms of diversity, I would simply suggest that you include some version of inter-and intra-cultural and global awareness. I realize those are already initiatives in other areas of the University, but with the recent SAE event in Oklahoma, I believe, some past ones here at UP, and the reality of job situations, awareness for the 21st century, that might be useful.

Jamie Myers, Education: I think they are very important literacies that you outline in your forensics report. I might suggest the administration try to develop support for students in those areas would be in those actual offices where students have contact with people like Financial Aid. I am not sure. I have not gone over to Financial Aid to see if they offer like, here is a seminar on next Wednesday on how to plan your student loans, or how to deal with your loans after you graduate.

In Health Services, there is a Student Health Office. I do not know if they have certain special topics. Of course, you are not going to get a lot of students to attend them all the time, but I think you need to have a myriad of ways to try to help students gain information.

I think that these offices in administration, when students interact with them, that might be a good place for them to also have some educational initiatives in those offices, as well as try to work these into Gen Ed course experiences, et cetera. Thank you.

Jyotsna Kalavar, New Kensington: One of the suggestions is for covering the topic of conflict resolution and management of conflicts.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I like the comprehensive approach that is suggested here. That would have meant multiple aspects of the University cooperating on this. One that might be highlighted further-- I do not happen to see it in your list-- is the importance of advising, the advising networks.

I am not sure whether that is meant to be included under student services, but it is often thought of as somehow between student services and academic offices, and all of that, because I think students turn to academic advisers not only for academic advice in the narrow sense, but perhaps as a gateway to these many other forms of support the University provides.

I am hearing a lot of interest in doing a diverse approach of bringing together a lot of different groups and getting them all behind the theme of Student Life Services and Student Life Development, rather than perhaps pacing people through everybody having the same thing.

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: Just to make the point, we had discussed this before, but this specifically says health care. We might want to enlarge that just to say health, because care is a
specific issue. Sometimes people do not think about prevention under that rubric. I think maybe we could enlarge that wording to say health.

Then also along those lines, the President had accepted some recommendations from the Presidential Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault, and at least one of those recommendations dealt with educating students for their health and their safety. That may also be something that comes under consideration here, as well as perhaps being considered separately as well.

**Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture:** I would suggest that many of these life skills are something that our alumni could be influential in helping students with, since they have gone out, they know what to expect. It might be a great way to engage students and alumni in learning the things they need to do in order to succeed when they leave school.

**Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley:** All of these suggestions are great suggestions. I am not sure what the proper methodology for getting all this stuff across to the students is, but if it is strictly voluntary offerings of this is a selection of things you can learn about, my fear is that the students who most need it will not get it at all, because they will not bother. The students who are most likely to look at a menu of options and things they can learn about, and go to them, are the same ones that would probably seek out this kind of information in other ways, even if we did not offer. That is not saying we should not offer, and I am not saying that it should necessarily be a required course. I am not leaning in that direction.

Maybe some kind of expanded first-year orientation which lasts during the semester, or something along those lines. I do not have it well worked out in my mind. Unless you require this of all students, the ones that get it are the ones that are not going to need it, and the ones that need it are not going to get it.

**Mary Miles:** Maybe not a one-size-fits-all, but a size needs to be out there for everybody, and given to everyone.

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** Maybe I am a broken record here, but we have heard President Barron talk many times about financial literacy and our students in need of that. Certainly this report highlights that. Following up on what Roger just said, you know, if it is a voluntary workshop and things like that, the large majority of students that probably need or could benefit from it, will not attend, especially, I know, at many of the campuses.

Therefore, I go back to whether or not things like financial literacy should not be in Gen Ed, and required. Especially I see it-- you know, at Shenango, most of our students come from low income, low middle income-- and boy do they need financial literacies’. It is a shame. They do not seek it out.

We tried voluntarily offering a course in personal finance, and got zero students. If we do not somehow make it required, they are not going to get this. Thank you.

**Margaret Meloy, Business:** I actually did my undergraduate here many, many moons ago, and I remember the requirement for a swimming exam.

This feels kind of like the swimming exam, like we need to require that our students, sometime before they graduate, display these competencies. Maybe it is through an exam. We should probably divide up the
competencies that we think are absolutely essential for life, like swimming was.

Maybe we just need to give them an exam, and say, you must pass this exam. If you do not pass it, you are not going to graduate. If you can display that you understand how to balance a checkbook, fill out your taxes, make some wise investment choices, then fine. You do not need to do anything more, but it just feels like we need to break these apart a bit.

Emily Miller, Education: I think this is a great way for the Senate to pair with the student governments. I know UPA specifically has been creating a Student Financial Education Center where students can go and get help with their finances. Sexual Violence Prevention Awareness Week, which has different educational events throughout that week. I think there is a lot going on from the student side trying to put this out for the student body that we could pair together on. I think also a freshman seminar is somewhere that we could look into kind of across the board providing more of these opportunities. I think this is a great way for us to pair with the Senate.

Patricia Koch: I want to support comments that have been being made about in some ways requiring these, and also in working with the student government, student organizations, because just to give one example that again, the Presidential Task Force Report on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault found that over the past three years there were almost 1,000 different programs offered at University Park on those topics. Yet the majority of students had not attended them. There is a lot of time and effort and resources being used to organize such programs. For various reasons, students are not availing themselves of them.

Enica Castaneda: I think a point there is, not just that students are not attending the events, but they do not know about the events. We need to publicize them. How do we do that most effectively to get students there?

Michael Krajsa, Lehigh Valley: Most of the comments you said, so students who stop in and attend these trainings, et cetera. I see it a little differently, because I am from a Commonwealth Campus. Where do my students get access to this? I see it somewhere maybe in LionPATH, where there is a series of little badges that you do. I see many TED talks on each one of these topics, perhaps with students who have been in those situations, explaining it to one another.

If you put it up there that they have to check all these off at some point in time by doing them, with some Q&A throughout the thing, that way everybody would have accessibility to at least the basics and the fundamentals of all the issues we have discussed. I think we should use technology to enable a lot of that.

Mary Miles: I would be excited about getting Student Life joining in with Curricular Affairs, the General Education committees, and LionPATH, and getting those things linked up.

Sydney Aboul-Hosn, Liberal Arts: I hate to be the dissenter here, but-- well, not really. Frankly, I do not think this kind of material belongs in the university curriculum. This should be taught in high school. I mean, what about all those poor, poor kids who do not go to college? How are they going to learn all these? I think it is just ridiculous. I think this needs to be in high school. I think that is what we need to push for instead-- and I certainly cannot imagine requiring this at university level. Thank God the swimming requirement is gone.
Enica Castaneda: Just very quickly. I want to say that I agree with you, as a lowly graduate assistant. I am grading students, and I have to say, there are a lot of things that I think they should have learned in high school, but they have not. What are we going to do once they are here?

Mary Miles: Many of these skills would be at the college level. The financial planning would be retirement plans for when you are in your professionalized careers, that they are not just saying, write a check. Here is how to do it. I would put that out there as well.

Enica Castaneda: Then also when it comes to things like health care, there are a lot of students here, especially because they are usually coming in here on their parents' health plans, they have no idea how to even call and make their own appointments. They do not know what it is like to pay a deductible. They do not even understand what a premium means. They do not know what that word means. I think it is important that we get to the fundamentals for them.

Rebecca Bascom, Medicine: I support the competency-based approach to this, because people who were fortunate in high school to learn this competency can knock it off in the first week. People who do not have that fortune can also learn and have the flexibility to do it sometime in the next few years.

Thomas Beebee, Liberal Arts: I am surprised no one has mentioned this, but I want to point out that in doing this we are fulfilling what our Alma Mater tells us. The two brilliant lines, "Helpless in the hands of fate, though didst mold me, dear Old State."

I always found that a little bit unrealistic. But apparently we are making it a reality. I somewhat agree with Senator Aboul-Hosn. It's funny that they're called life skills, and yet we're saying that life begins at the age of 18. And many of these factors, it's rather too late to start to instill those at that age.

But my question would be, can we find then, a bright line as to life skills that the university will not feel obligated to teach its students?

Mary Miles: I think that is exactly—that is what we have be working towards.

Thomas Beebee: Are you sure? I mean, that is hygiene. That affects health and well-being. I am looking for the bright line here.

Mary Miles: I think President Barron alluded to that last time, that there were concerns that every single discipline wants to have a first-year seminar topic. That would be something that the faculty could helpfully engage with, and be asking what do college level students need to-- the other term we have used is literacies; life skills and literacies. It is not necessarily simply learning to file the nails, things like that.

Kathy Hodgdon, Engineering: You have listed in your presentation that there is a financial literacy on the worldwide web. I think what makes sense in this day and age is to put it online and make it like a training module. And I also think that it doesn't-- I agree with both sides that it's kind of not necessary at the college level, but the point is to educate them, not necessarily make it a requirement for graduation.

So you would require that they complete the module, and have a certificate of completion upon completing it. And maybe have questions at the end of the module, but not have it be a requirement. The point is to give them the information to better themselves. And you've demonstrated that by requiring completion of
it, but not making it a graduation requirement. So there's a difference there in terms of what the requirement affects in terms of their advancing at the university.

**Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts:** I think I have sympathy with what Senator Beebee was saying in terms of drawing a line somewhere. What are we, as an institution, prepared to give up? We are very good at coming up with ideas for expansion, but we are not very good at figuring out the cost at which that expansion is going to come. Sooner or later, you reach a point where the priorities have shifted beyond what it is to think of as reasonable in the delivery of a university level education.

**Tramble Turner, Abington:** Recalling how wonderful the school district here in State College and the borough has been for decades, I recognize the emphasis of some on whether these life skills should be learned in high school.

Having traveled four hours from the Philadelphia County School District, which is in financial crisis, having seen the York School District be entirely privatized, I would suggest that this may be an opportunity, as President Barron was speaking about last night, increasingly using Summer bridge programs to look at some opportunities. Also with the new governor and a new sense of education funding, perhaps the University, maybe through the College of Education, Department of Political Science, form some partnership with school districts in the state to try to share common goals on revised state funding.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Time has expired for this session, but I do want to recognize Senator Jaap.

**James Jaap, Greater Allegheny:** I support the notions of financial literacy in all the other aspects of this. One thing we did not talk about was the access to student legal services that, from my reading, none of the students at the campuses have access to. While all of the University Park students have access to student legal services, and they are bringing in money for the students, as the report says-- or giving money back to the students, my students do not have access to that. I think that is an issue that needs to be addressed.

**Enica Castaneda:** When the report was talking about giving money back to the student, that is when they are going up to litigation. Let us say, up against their landlord, and they won, but they are getting their security deposit back, something like that.

**Mary Miles:** I am really grateful for this lively discussion that we have had. I think my first tendency is wanting to write it all down, and then I realized it is recorded. I thank you all very much.

**Enica Castaneda:** Thank you.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Thank you, Mary and Enica.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS – NONE**
LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Kulikowich: We will use clickers for voting today. This system provides a precise count for each vote taken. It also allows for confidential voting and gives immediate results. Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Raise your hand if you need a clicker.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID
Revisions to Senate Policy 34-20 (Registration)
Committee Chair Richard Robinett and University Bursar Roseann Sieminski

Chair Kulikowich: We have one legislative report today from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. It appears in Appendix C in the Agenda. Committee Chair Rick Robinett and Roseann Sieminski, University Bursar, will respond to questions.

Richard Robinett, Science: Let me do three quick sentences about this, because it seems sort of arcane if you have not been involved with what is called SCHED to REG. LionPATH has provided a nice opportunity to revisit policies-- which is what we do; procedures-- what ACUE does; practices, workflow, business models, and this is an example of that. It is called SCHED to REG for a reason. This two-step process that I have known ever since I have been here-- I would rather call it instead “schedule to registration”. It is like registration and registration purgatory, this sort of nebulous state which confuses students. As it is, it does not allow students to add and drop and makes it a hassle to record grades. That is all designed to be streamlined by a simple change in the one policy that addresses this two-step process, which is: promise to pay your bill, register for courses and you are registered like every other student. Then there will be various procedural things that ACUE and other people will follow up on. It is a way to design a smoother workflow. My understanding is, Roseann, there are not many other places, if any, that have this two-step process across the country.

Roseann Sieminski, University Bursar: There is no other school in the whole country that has the SCHED to REG process up and running right now. What happened? When we designed our legacy system in the '80s, that is what we used, the SCHED to REG. It has not been changed since. Now is a good time to make that change.

Richard Robinett: I think it is a simple, in some sense, document that is well-written. Thanks to all the people in Registrar, Admission, and LionPATH, who came up with this simple document.

Jamie Myers, Education: Yes, it is a great change. One thing that was unclear, and I would just like to know, will the student complete the affidavit of financial responsibility once, or will they complete it each semester they register by some type of a check off box, or whatever? I just need to know this for advising.

Richard Robinett: Right. Roseann, by the way, thank you again for coming all the way to answer these few questions. I appreciate it.

Roseann Sieminski: Students will have to complete that financial responsibility statement each semester, before they register for classes.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I think this is great. It is marvelous. Just a small suggestion that I hope, in the student financial responsibility statement, that a little bit of a loophole can be closed, whereby
especially in small classes, short-term classes like the Summer Language Institute, World Languages courses, we have seen occasionally that students have under the current system been taught to receive a lot of feedback and so forth. Then we are actually paying the receiving grades along the way, because that is how those courses work. Then they have come to the department asking for credit by examination, which is much less expensive for tuition than the standard tuition costs for actually being in a course where you are taught by a faculty member and the use of credit by examination in that unanticipated way.

Richard Robinett: For the first time in my standing up here, I actually know the answer to a question that someone has posed. Because Undergraduate Education saw this brought to us maybe two or three years ago, where students would take a whole bunch of courses, be in Scheduled status for the whole time, then come back and say, “Oh, please. I would rather do it the cheap way,” so that was fixed. Students who had been in Scheduled status— I believe it is after add/drop-- are no longer, as of a couple years ago, allowed to request credit by examination. That was fixed even under the current system.

Chair Kulikowich: Any additional questions? Are we ready to vote? If you are joining us by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 155 accept, and 3 reject. The motion carries. Thank you, Rick, and thank you, Roseann.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revision to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6b (Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid)
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: We have two legislative reports from Committees and Rules. The first appears as Appendix D. This is Revision to the Standing Rules, Article 2, Section 6b.

Committee Chair Mark Casteel will respond to questions.

Mark Casteel, York: I would like to provide a little background about this report, this actually was given to CC&R from ARSSA. They recognized the need to have a subcommittee to look at articulation agreements. The report that is in the Senate agenda today was what was voted on and approved by Senate Council. After Council had approved that report, Rob Pangborn's office shared some comments about potentially the need to write in there the ability for this subcommittee to also deal with potential termination of articulation agreements, because as it was presently written, the ability to terminate was not included in there.

Rob Pangborn's office shared with both ARSSA and CC&R some modest suggested changes. We looked at those in committee this morning. You have a door handout that I am going to ask you to ignore because it was not complete.

Can we have the correct version on the screen? I will show you the suggested changes that CC&R has voted on, and unanimously accepted this morning. The first change is under Number 1, Membership, V. The old office name was archaic, and it has simply been replaced with Rob Pangborn's correct title-- the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Director for Student Aid.
The second change is underneath number four, which is the new Standing Subcommittee on Articulation Agreements. If you look where it says, for new submissions, Number 1, a cover memo. What has been added is “from the sponsoring unit.”

Then for renewal/revision/termination the word “termination” is new. Then again, the underline “from the sponsoring unit,” CC&R added in this morning. Finally, there is a new number six there for Termination and Explanation of the Reason for Discontinuation and Plan for Phase-out.

According to parliamentary procedure, since this was voted on unanimously by CC&R, what my job is to ask this body if you will allow us to substitute what you now see on the screen for what is in the agenda. If there is no objection, this substitution is going to be what we are voting on. Are there any objections? Thank you.

Chair Kulikowich: Seeing no objection. Are we ready to vote? If you are voting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 136 accept, and 1 reject. The motion carries.

Changes to the Bylaws, Article II (Senate Council), Section 1
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The second report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix E. The report has proposed amendments to the Bylaws. It was presented at the January 27 Senate meeting, and will be voted on today.

Mark will respond to any questions that you have. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote?

If you are joining by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 157 accept, and 2 reject. The motion carries. Thank you, Mark.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
Report on Policy AD-77, Engaging in Outside Professional Activities (Conflict of Commitment)
Committee Chair Patricia Koch

Chair Kulikowich: We now move on to Item J of our agenda, Advisory/Consultative Reports. We have two of these reports today. The first report is from Faculty Affairs and appears as Appendix F in the agenda. This is the report on Policy AD77, Engaging in Outside Professional Activities.

Committee Chair Patricia Koch will respond to any questions.

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: Are there any questions about this report? Good, it is the easiest time I think I have ever had up here.
Chair Kulikowich: The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? If you are joining us by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 154 in favor and 3 opposed. The motion carries. The report will now be sent to President Barron for his action. Thank you, Pat.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS
Employee Contributions to Penn State’s Self-Insured Health Care Costs
Committee Chair Willie Ofosu and Committee Vice Chair Matthew Woessner

Chair Kulikowich: The second Advisory/Consultative report is from Faculty Benefits, and appears as Appendix G in the agenda. This is Employee Contributions to Penn State's Self-Insured Health Care Costs. Committee Chair Willie Ofosu and Committee Vice Chair Matthew Woessner will respond to any questions.

Willie Ofosu, Wilkes-Barre: Thank you. There are quite a few points that I would like to make. When we submitted to Senate Council, there were certain points that they raised that we had to modify. One of them, actually, is what you would have picked up coming in here, in terms of conclusions of the revised version. I hope you have no objections in terms of their addition to that one.

To start off with, I would like to give sincere appreciation to the Office of Human Resources for their patience and understanding in responding to our numerous questions and requests during the preparation of this report.

Also, I would like to point out that these came about— the report actually, and the follow up activities came about— as a result of a lot of emails I received during the summer of 2014. The request was to look into the index that was being initiated. In the report, in terms of the presentation, you will find that we have done a bit of history in what has happened, and have included some of these.

One of the points that I would like to make is that over and over, we have had this situation brought to our attention in terms of communication. To highlight that, I would like to refer to the report of the Health Care Task Force that was presented April 18, 2014. The point that I would like to bring up actually refers to where they stated in the subcommittee's section on communication and on Section 6. They said that— and I will read this one here— that Penn State should follow its own dictum of— "take of care of your health by taking care of its employees", and they are going to say their position needs to consider the human face of its employees, and express good will in ways that serve to boost their morale.

In part, what we have done actually refers to these points. What my co-chair is going to do is take us through an introduction to the report itself, so that we have clarity in all of this.

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: Without objection, there is a slight revision. We have an expanded conclusion, which I am not sure it is posted on the board, but it was handed out to everyone. So without objection, I would like to change the conclusion from what was included online to what was handed out today. It is merely an expansion of the description of why the “Cadillac tax” will not necessarily be in effect at Penn State for some time to come. It lays out the position.

Are there any objections to us replacing the original conclusion, which is a little bit more succinct with an expanded conclusion? Ok, I am going to walk through the slides. We were at this for six months trying to
get into the weeds, because we saw many of us had a substantial increase in our faculty benefits contributions as of last year. In some cases, the rates actually doubled. We are going to talk about why that happened, and what the committee proposed as the solution to the substantial increases we saw last year. There are a series of recommendations.

First recommendation. This is a brilliant insight by Senator Myers, that-- I am sorry. We will go back to recommendation one. There is a longstanding agreement that Penn State University would cover a large percentage of the faculty benefits contributions. Unfortunately, when we changed our insurance system, and we began having new out-of-pocket expenses, deductibles, co-insurance, and surcharges, there was not at the time in the budget consideration a way of measuring what we as faculty and staff were contributing outside of normal insurance. Recommendation one merely says that when University increases, or co-insurance increases, or out-of-pocket expenses increases, that our deductible be included as part of the faculty's assessed portion of the contribution.

Recommendation one is merely to say that what we put in the insurance system formally, but the coinsurance and the deductibles that may be applied to the faculty and staff, that we combine these things to show how much the faculty and staff are truly contributing to the overall health care expenditures.

Recommendation two is simply a reiteration of the 1998 agreement whereby Penn State would contribute 80% of the insurance toward the individual employees’, and 70% for retired employees’ dependents. Again, this is not new, but it is reiterating that there was a balance that has long been agreed to that the University would sustain, and that we would do this moving forward.

Recommendations three and four are a bit more technical. The amount of money-- the contribution that employees made from 2010 and before to the insurance system was for a long time a flat rate. Insurance, whether a person is a higher paid employee, or a lower paid employee, the cost of insurance was roughly the same; everyone was charged a flat rate for insurance. Unfortunately, that places a very heavy burden on lower income employees, which is why the percentage of income which they have to contribute under a flat rate system is much higher.

In 2011, the committee heard a briefing from HR with a plan to try to flatten the rate for those at $45,000 or below. The plan did not impose a flat rate across the board, but it was designed to protect low-income employees, and allow the percentage to gradually drop for those above $45,000. The idea was that most employees would experience either a decrease, or a relatively stable contribution rate from one year to the next.

That is exactly what was put in place in 2012. On the yellow line, you see the monthly contribution under the old system was flat. Under the purple line, you see that those who were the lower income employees saw a reduction under the new system, and higher income employees had a slight increase. On the right you can see that there is this sharp yellow line moving down. The old system was redefined so that those at the lower end of the scale now have a flat lower percentage. It protects them, but we do not see a giant increase in those at the higher end of the scale.

Now as far as we know, without consulting with the Faculty Benefits Committee, the University decided to change the formula, rather than applying a flat rate to those $45,000 and below, they decided to move to a flat rate across the board from zero dollars to $140,000.
Now, that increase-- the flat rate applied to those in the upper income-- that is where we saw the dramatic spikes. This is like a cruise missile aimed right at the faculty. At the $60,000 and above, we see dramatic increases in health care contributions, which many of you experienced when this system was put in place.

As you will see on the other side, what this has the effect of doing is it creates a flat percentage for all employees. Now why did this happen?

We have two explanations. One is that HR was of the opinion that a flat percentage of contribution for all income brackets up to $140,000 was the definition of fairness. Everybody pays the same percentage. The second explanation, which was more startling, came from the University's benefits consultants. When we asked them why did they allow-- or why did they recommend-- such a giant spike on upper income employees, I will never forget the phrase. They said it was actually a wonderful thing, because it will wake the employees to the opportunities available in high deductible insurance. It was benevolent, because that way it would force you to take a second look at high deductible insurance, and consider jumping ship.

The rationale for it, I think, was meant well. It affected many faculty and staff who were not willing to jump ship because they like traditional benefits. What we propose in recommendation three is to go back to the second indexing system as designated in the 2011 agreement. We protect those with lower income, and we allow the rate to move down gradually so that we still protect those at the lower brackets, but we are not imposing sharp increases on upper income employees across the board.

Now, what effect does this have on the overall system? What we found is that the large spike that we saw in the upper income employees caused an imbalance in the PPO Blue-- the traditional health insurance-- revenues.

This shows on the left side, we see some employees under $50,000 saw a decrease in their monthly contribution rates. On the right you see increases. Looks balanced, but when you look at the numbers-- and this is what caught our committee's attention-- on the right side, the numbers are substantially higher on the right side of the table than those on the left. We suspected there was a revenue imbalance.

We ran a series of models in which we estimated the amount of revenue coming in and flowing out of the PPO Blue Plan-- the traditional plan-- and estimated there is a three-to-one ratio of increases to decreases. About six weeks after we first presented this to HR-- this is a number produced by the University's benefits consultant which shows the increases and decreases in revenue in the PPO Blue Plan. This is the contributions. If we go to the next portion, I have aggregated-- the green section shows those earning over $60,000, and the orange section shows the revenue from those under $60,000. This is in the traditional PPO Blue Plan. We have a $4.7 million increase in revenue on the high end. Those at the lower end have a $1.4 million decrease.

Our estimates were spot on-- 3/1 ratio-- if we go to the next slide, the question is, where did the money go; it did not disappear. If we go to the next slide, this is what you just saw. This is the green-- or upper income employees in traditional benefits-- orange, lower income employees and traditional benefits. This was when they introduced the new high deductible plan-- the PPO Savings Plan.

If we go to the next section, this is where the puzzle fits together. We saw at the same moment an almost identical decrease in contributions from those in the PPO Savings Plan. Keep in mind that there are a relatively small percentage of employees who are receiving-- or the beneficiaries-- of essentially a $3
million reduction. So 17% of the employees are reaping the benefits. The PPO Savings Plan is slightly less expensive. You would be surprised; it is not a big difference.

Effectively we have $2 million worth of decrease is going to the employees not at the lower end of the scale, but at the upper end of the scale-- go to the next slide-- which creates a de facto subsidy. In other words, people in PPO Savings are paying an artificially low rate because of the rate spikes which occurred in the PPO Blue Plan.

This is ultimately unsustainable, because if you rely on subsidies paid by the PPO Blue Plan to support the entire insurance system, as HR continues to apply-- I should say, the University applies pressure-- because they believe it is in the financial interests of the University to move people out of traditional benefits. There will be fewer people to pay the subsidy, and therefore it will not be possible to maintain the artificially low rates in the long term.

In order to really get a grasp of how this works, we had to break down the individual University's contribution per person, per income. We did this by triangulating several figures. This is an example-- and this is the most dramatic example, I warn you-- of employees at $140,000. You will note that we took the true cost of each plan-- listed on the far left-- and we took the employee contributions as listed on HR's website, and we derived the cost, the amount of money that Penn State is contributing to that individual's plan every month. This tells us how much Penn State is kicking in. It allows us to examine plans side-by-side and account for the fact they may cost a different amount.

Here it is for four income brackets. $25,000, $60,000, $100,000, and $140,000. What you will note, and you see that dark blue column, the PSU contribution, that is how much Penn State is contributing. As you would expect, lower income employees are receiving a greater support from Penn State-- as it was designed.

Now compare it to the PPO Savings Plan. What you find is that the PPO Savings Plan for those earning between $25,000 and $60,000 are receiving roughly the same support from the University. Over $60,000-- and especially in the $100,000 to $140,000 range, we see substantial differences in the amount of money that Penn State is contributing.

You can either say they are withholding compensation from those who are in the non-preferred plan, or you could argue that they are giving extra compensation to people in the PPO Savings Plan. If we go to the next slide, you will see-- this is again, the most dramatic example. This goes to show how an employee in the PPO Blue Plan-- this is traditional benefits-- is receiving, if they are an individual, they are receiving $1,109 less compensation a year because they have chosen the University's non-preferred plan. It is not that the plans cost a different amount. We have accounted for that. It is that the University is actually not giving them the same dollar-for-dollar support. If you are in a family plan, you will pay as much as $3,200 more.

What we propose as a way to try to clean this up and provide a principle which would make this work equitably for all faculty and staff-- if you move forward one-- is that we move from the principle of equitable compensation that Penn State University, for any faculty within the same income bracket, should receive the same dollar-for-dollar support regardless of the plan that they choose.

If PPO Blue Plan is more expensive-- and it will always be a bit more expensive-- that they will give the same dollar compensation, and the employee will be expected to pick up the difference. We are calling on
the University to end the practice of giving special dollar support in an effort to try to pressure employees out of traditional benefits, and incentivize them to move into high deductible insurance.

If high deductible insurance grows at a slower rate, then in fact, over time it will become more and more attractive. To artificially put their thumb on the scale, we argue, is problematic ethically, and that the University should suspend the practice. Although it is difficult to estimate exactly how this will wash out, in short, we suspect that there will be a modest reduction in the PPO Blue Plan’s monthly rates, and a rather hefty increase in the PPO Savings Plan. If you are in the PPO Savings Plan, understand that this was a subsidy that was not sustainable. What we are asking for is that the subsidy be terminated, lest the plan become unsustainable.

Here again, this is roughly how it would look. Again, this was our best estimates. You would basically see ideally, that both groups would receive the same compensation per month, per year, the same contribution from Penn State, and the employee would be responsible for the difference.

The final recommendation. Number five. This is merely a reporting requirement. The numbers that we calculated in this table as provided in the Center report, we would like HR to make available to the employees every year. If they are putting their thumb on the scale, we deserve to know.

We hope they do not. We hope that they adopt this policy of equitable compensation. At least with this, we would not be forced to go and make these calculations ourselves. We should know how much dollar support is being given per employee, per plan, per income bracket, so we have more transparency and better accountability in how our benefits are used, and to make certain that the University is not trying to push us in or out of their preferred plans.

**Rebecca Bascom, Medicine:** That is a wonderfully clear presentation. It is so compelling, I am about to cheer and say, boy, you are right. Then I am thinking, well, is the risk the same if you choose plan A or plan B? Is it not part of the University's job to set what they think is an interest to the University, and then us as a people who are in choosing an insurance plan, to then make our best guess as to which plan makes sense for us. I am not sure that I-- if the risk to me is different, then why should the University pay the same amount for each of these two plans? How come they cannot have some skin in the game and tip things the way that makes sense to them for their long-term view of our interest?

**Matthew Woessner:** That is an excellent concern. There are two points there. One is, the PPO Savings Plan will, by definition, always be less expensive than PPO Blue, because it does involve more risk to the employee, and therefore there is the opportunity for gain by saving money. That is always gonna be the case. PPO Blue will always be more expensive moving forward.

There is the argument that because it is in the University's long-term interest to push us out of traditional benefits-- because some of the benefits consultants believe that is the future-- the best argument against this plan is that the University has a rationale for putting its thumb on the scale. My concern is, we were not informed of it in advance, that it was done in a draconian manner for some employees, and that if it had not been done with such force, we probably would not have raised objections, and now that it has been done, we are asking that it be done more equitably.

**Thomas Beebee, Liberal Arts:** Thank you for this. I had basically the same question. Let me go back to Recommendation one, which is that the actual employee contribution should be calculated on the basis of everything the employee puts in, not just the premiums.
Two questions. One is, when we talk about deductible, if we make the deductible part of that calculation, are we talking about the actual deductible that the employee ends up paying? Or the overall risk--deductible risk--we might say.

**Matthew Woessner:** I wish you were on the committee, because you have instant insight into the question. That is a great point. The ideal way to calculate this is not the actual deductible, but the average amount of the deductible that is used by the typical employee. For example, and we can work this out into the details, this is HR's call as to exactly how to calculate it.

The general principle is, if we are being asked to put money in as a deductible, if the average person gets to 80% of their deductible, that calculation should be included as what the typical employee puts forward as a contribution to their insurance system. So it doesn't have to be the max of the deductible, it should be the average of the employee going up to or exceeding the deductible.

**Thomas Beebee:** Then related to that, I would assume that the point you just made about the difference in the two plans did not actually deploy your Recommendation One. In other words, the contributions you showed were the premiums that were paid, not the overall input from the employee. Is that correct?

**Matthew Woessner:** Senator Myers, he is the expert on this one. We will defer to him.

**Jamie Myers, Education:** Thank you. That is correct. The last few recommendations with the equal compensation proposal only deals with premium. On top of that is the deductible issue. With the PPO Blue, the average deductible expense across the entire group is about 9% of the total cost. With the PPO Savings, it is about 15% of the total cost.

What you have to understand--and this is related to the first question--is that the University can contribute an equal premium to either plan for an employee at a particular salary level. Then the employee has to decide how they are going to pick up the rest of their cost. They can choose to pick up the rest of their cost by paying a higher premium and less out-of-pocket, or they can choose to pick up the rest of their cost with a lower premium and more out-of-pocket.

The more out-of-pocket one then is the incentive to be healthy, do not see the doctor--which may be good or not good, but I hope that makes it clear that the deductible is not part of that last part. The deductible is the choice the employees have to make, and that is what makes--the two plans cost the same. When you average amount across the University.

The total cost divided by the number of people covered arrives at an average. It is the same for everybody, regardless of which plan you take. It is inside the plan that makes the difference in terms of the contributions.

**Michael Bérubé, Liberal Arts:** Thank you. First I would like to add a recommendation six that Professor Woessner conduct the financial literacy program we talked about earlier this afternoon.

To get to the question of risk, I understand the complaint is legitimate and very good question. It seems to me that the argument here is that even under this revised plan, with these recommendations, employees would still have to do their calculations of whether they want PPO Blue or PPO Savings; whether they want to pay lower premiums and potentially higher deductibles, or go with the more traditional benefits plan.
It seems to me the arguments of the employee’s risk is still an independent variable. Now should Penn State have skin in the game, it seems to me the counterargument to that was that Penn State did have skin in the game in such a way that would ultimately be self-undermining. Right? If you drive so many people into PPO Savings without the subsidies from PPO Blue, all of a sudden you are going to find a lot of people in PPO Savings facing enormous premium increases sooner rather than later.

Matthew Woessner: I am not sure that the premium spike-- if we had the death spirals, as it were, and we were assured by the benefits consultants that the premiums, they would not allow them to fall into the death spiral where there were too many people in PPO Savings. But yes, you would eventually, because of these subsidies, or at least de facto subsidies, you are seeing artificially low rates in PPO Savings. When they are trying to sell it as this is a really attractive plan, well, it is more attractive than it looks on the surface, because your fellow employees are picking up part of the difference.

Ira Saltz, Shenango: Thank you. First of all, there has been a lot of talk about the overall long-term interest of the University. The fact of the matter is these high deductible plans are a ticking time bomb, and we all need to be very concerned about them.

What you are doing is you are providing an incentive for people to not go to the doctor, to not go and get prescription medications, and we are going to have that employee who is getting cheap insurance on a high deductible, who then, because they did not go to their doctor and find out they had hypertension, and did not want to pay the $300 a month for the medicine, has a stroke. Now this person is in the hospital with tens of thousands of dollars of bills, plus rehabilitation expenses, plus all that. These high deductible plans are the dumbest, dumbest idea ever created by man in our entire existence and in this universe. Let us do away with it. It is a ticking time bomb. Ten years from now, we are all going to be sitting here repealing it, because of how much it escalated the cost. Thank you.

Matthew Woessner: Thank you. I want to disagree. I want to disagree in part. The high deductible plans, I think there are rational economic reasons why it compels people to think more thoughtfully about their health care, whether they visit a doctor. It does come with a cost. There are risks as you described, but there are also benefits. One of the arguments we heard in committee today is that one of the problems with health care expenses is that people go to the doctor too often.

Ira Saltz: No. That is not true. I have evidence. In the US, we go to the doctor less than the average person in all the other countries, but yet we still have the highest expenditures. The data does not show any evidence to that at all. The high cost in this country is because of the people who do not have insurance, and do not go to the doctor, and end up in the hospitals.

It is not that. I could run to the car and get my laptop and give you the data. I have it with me. OK? It is absolutely not the case that we go to the doctor too much in this country. We go less than in the other countries where people as you know, can even go for even less, and they do not have that problem.

Second thing about the risk, is--

Chair Kulikowich: Ira--

Ira Saltz: Give me one more minute. Automobile insurance, where somebody is a risk if they are speeding all the time and getting too many tickets. Most people who have high health expenses have it through no fault of their own. It is because either they are getting older, or have certain genetic dispositions. When we
talk about risk, it is not-- what these high deductible plans become-- it is no longer insurance. It is punishing the unhealthy who are most of the time unhealthy through no fault of their own.

Willie Ofosu: The first question is one that is based on a much earlier discussion that occurred right here on wellness. Of course, no conclusions were drawn on that for a very simple reason-- we did not have time to discuss this in committee, and hopefully we started that today. Hopefully in time, it would be good to bring up a report on that one.

The point of monetary gain in relation to your question is that particularly those who would normally go to see the doctor would normally be those who would regularly do that. The idea here therefore, is that whether it is only them or the others who do not—OK, exactly as you say that-- as people grow old, invariably they grow sort of weak and also some various sickness shows up. Definitely it gets to a point where assuming of course, everybody will grow old naturally, that there would be the need for some support.

Again, we are not criticizing insurance generally as it stands. The intention here is to make sure that the way, that it is trying to at least by our University, is equitable across the board is what we are looking at.

Matthew Woessner: We took no position on high deductible versus traditional insurance. That is for you to sort out. It is a very complex issue to be on your health choices.

We are merely asking that the pricing be transparent, that the support be equitable, and that it be based on market forces, and to some extent, based on income, that there should not be an attempt to push us in or out of a plan because it is the University's preference.

Delia Conti, Fayette: I think we have excellent, excellent health care coverage. I have had it 27 years. My family has used it. Just very good coverage.

I always get a little shock or surprise whenever I open a bill, because I have no idea what it will be, and they have been higher. We have horrible prescription coverage, just horrible. I mean hundreds of dollars for prescriptions.

Does your committee plan to do anything about that? Is there anything that can be done?

Willie Ofosu: The way that this discussion started, particularly based on the emails that we are getting on the index, we were in a sense forced to start looking at this from the start. Even though the wellness question came up earlier, we deferred and picked up on this to basically get some information out so that people will be in a state, or position, to be able to make decisions.

At the time when we started talking about all this, it was the beginning of the academic year. The time to choose, coming up in November, we thought, let us try to get something out to help in some manner in terms of people making decisions, and so conditions actually made us start off with this.

We started, as I said, that wellness is one of the topics that we have talked about, but we have never worked on. We started that today, but definitely, there are a whole bunch of follow up discussions that we have to get involved in. Hopefully bring out reports on these, but definitely prescriptions is going to be part of what we are looking at.
Mahdi Nasereddin, Berks: I just want to point out all these numbers are actually based on salary, not income. For example, for people who have one single income like me, I could not actually even afford the traditional plan.

I have family, and with my income-- as I said, there is a single income. It does not take into account that my wife does not work. There is some inequity in that, too.

Willie Ofosu: You see, the point here is that, let me sort of bring up this point again from the report of the Health Care Task Force, Communication Subcommittee. This is the point that they make, it says that Penn State should follow its own dictum of take care of your health by taking care of its employees. The idea here is that Penn State is after some process, actually doing that. All right, but then this year you see that the University needs to consider the human face of its employees and express good will in ways that serve to boost their morale. Definitely when it comes to money out of your pocket, be it health care or whatever it is. Definitely wherever they can be some assistance would go a long way to help.

As I said earlier on, Penn State's already doing that. It is just the mode that is being done is what we looking at and saying, how best can we position ourselves to make sure that we take full advantage of what is being done.

Chair Kulikowich: If there are no more questions, are we ready to vote? The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. If you are joining us by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

We have 128 yes, 26 no. The motion carries, and the report will be sent to President Barron for his action.

Thank you, Willie and Matthew.
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Chair Kulikowich: Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor, please say aye. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until April 28, 2015.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.
The following Senators were noted as having attended the March 17, 2015 Senate Meeting.
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Connolly-Ahern, Colleen
Craven, Rebecca
Crawford, Gregory
Davis, Dwight
Dendle, Peter
Desai, Madhuri
Dessel, Andy
Duffey, Michele
Eberle, Calvin
Eberle, Peter
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Lynn, Valerie Ann
Mahan, Carolyn
Mangel, Lisa
Marko, Frantisek
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Elected 163
Students 15
Ex Officio 3
Appointed 11
Total 192