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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 9, 2014, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Brent Yarnal, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Kulikowich: The April 29, 2014, 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 this document? May I hear a motion to accept?

Senator: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Second?

Senator: Second.

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

Senator: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. Motion carried. The minutes of the April 29 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Kulikowich: The Senate Curriculum Report of August 19, 2014, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETING OF JUNE 24 AND AUGUST 19, 2014

Chair Kulikowich: Minutes from the June 24 and August 19, 2014 Senate Council meetings 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 June 24 and August 19 meetings.

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.

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.

Parliamentary procedure states that any motion from the floor, including amendments, must come to the chair in writing.

I would like to introduce the officers of the Senate: Chair-Elect Mohamad Ansari, Berks; Secretary Jim Strauss, Science; and Immediate Past Chair Brent Yarnal, Earth and Mineral Sciences, who is in the audience. I appreciate greatly the contributions of my fellow officers. I look forward to their continuing support and input as we move through the year. Larry Backer, Dickinson School of Law, is serving as Parliamentarian.

Will the chairs and vice chairs of the Senate’s 15 standing committees please stand? Thank you. Over the summer the Senate officers charged the standing committees. Committee priority forms are posted on each committee website. As the Senate year progresses, committee minutes will also be posted on the committee websites.

I want to take a moment and introduce some new administrative members of the Senate. Please stand as I say your name. I am very pleased to welcome President Eric Barron to his first Senate meeting. I would also like to introduce Karen Sandler, Chair of this year’s Academic Leadership Council, who is unable to join us today; and Marcus Whitehurst, Acting Vice Provost for Educational Equity. Please join me in welcoming our new members.

Lastly, I would like to introduce the 2014-15 administrative fellows. Please stand as I introduce you. Wanda Knight, Associate Professor of Art Education and Women’s Studies, is mentored by Nick Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost. Janda Hankinson, Director of Information Technology Services in the Office of Information Technology Services who is unable to join us today, is mentored by Rodney Kirsch, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations. Finally, Lisa Wandel, Director of Residential Dining in Auxiliary and Business Services who is also unable to join us today, is mentored by David Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer.

I would like to congratulate our fellow College of Medicine senator and colleague, Dr. Dennis Gingrich, who was recently chosen by the American Academy of Family Physicians as its 2014 Exemplary Teacher Award recipient.

Each fall the Senate officers visit one-third of the campuses. This year, we will visit Medicine on September 30, Altoona and Fayette on October 3, Schuylkill on October 15, Hazleton and Wilkes-Barre on October 16, Worthington Scranton on October 17, and Penn College on October 30. I encourage the senators from these campuses to urge your colleagues and students to attend the meetings. Information on meeting times and locations may be obtained from the chancellors’ offices. A report on the visits will be presented to the Senate in January.

The Senate is pleased to join the Division of Undergraduate Studies and the Office of Undergraduate Education again this year in sponsoring the annual DUS conference on October 1. I want to encourage you to register for all or part of the conference at dus.psu.edu.
President Barron accepted the Engaged Scholarship report approved by the Senate on April 29, 2014. The President has asked the offices of Student Affairs, Outreach, and Undergraduate Education to take the lead in reviewing the report’s recommendations and identifying appropriate avenues to further this important aspect of the student experience at Penn State. The report and the President’s response are posted on the Senate website.

President Barron also made recommendations on the Report on the Procedures Used to Hire Faculty which was approved by the Senate on April 29, 2014. With respect to the first recommendation, the Provost has been asked to communicate to the deans and chancellors and through them to the department heads and search committee chairs, the importance of following the “Guidelines.” The President will implement the second recommendation to modify Form B of the Affirmative Action Recruitment Report, by emphasizing the efforts made by the search committee and Deans/Chancellors for increasing faculty diversity. The third recommendation, for EECE to report diversity data every five years to the full Senate, was accepted and the President supports the reporting structure as suggested.

Finally, President Barron responded to the Implementation of the Affordable Care Act: Health Benefits for Part-Time Faculty report which was approved by the Senate on April 29, 2014. The President has decided that Penn State will use the 3.05:1 ratio of hours per credit recommended by the Office of Human Resources.

I would like to announce the formation of a Special Committee on Shared Governance and Communication. At a time in Penn State history when there is significant fluidity and transition, I see a special role for the University Faculty Senate as we work toward goals of Shared Governance and seek to improve ways to communicate within our University. I have asked Dennis Gouran, senator from Liberal Arts, to chair the Special Committee, and I am pleased that Dennis has accepted the invitation. The Special Committee will consist of approximately 10 members to be identified soon.

At the August 19 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following reports on the Senate Agenda and website only: the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities’ Annual Report for 2013-2014 and the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics’ Annual Report of Academic Eligibility and Athletic Scholarships for 2013-2014. 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.

Finally, the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force held two retreats in May and in August to continue their work on proposing revisions to general education. The Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force will also continue to promote diversity and inclusion initiatives throughout our University.

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

President Eric Barron said he is looking forward to working with the Senate. He introduced Sandy Barbour, the new Athletic Director, who emphasized the importance of supporting both the athletic and academic interests of student athletes. Dr. Barron stated his support for the concept of having both a faculty member and a student on the Board of Trustees and spoke about his idea of a new approach to seeking state funding. He pointed out the opportunity for Penn State to be a proactive driver of the
state’s economy and the need to focus on student success and partnerships with industry to bring Penn State discoveries to the marketplace. He sees a need to increase the number of faculty positions in key areas. He mentioned the removal of sanctions by NCAA reflected Penn State’s focus on students. He commented on rankings and their importance to various groups. Finally, he briefly discussed the importance of civility in discourse and the need to communicate freely within the University. In response to a question, Dr. Barron spoke about the magnitude of health care costs for the University and their impact on the overall University budget.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Kulikowich: I would like to recognize Chair-Elect Ansari, who will read a resolution, which appears as Appendix C, on behalf of the Senate Council.

Mohamad Ansari, Berks: Thank you, Chair Kulikowich. Good afternoon, everyone. While I am deeply saddened, I am honored to present this resolution to honor our beloved friend and colleague, the late Vice Provost W. Terrell Jones.

Resolution to Honor the Late Vice Provost W. Terrell Jones

WHEREAS, W. Terrell Jones, Vice Provost for Educational Equity, earned both his master's and doctoral degrees at The Pennsylvania State University; and

WHEREAS, Vice Provost Jones was responsible for planning, developing, coordinating, articulating, and advocating the University’s goals, policies, and procedures pertaining to equal opportunity for under-represented faculty, staff, and students; and

WHEREAS, Vice Provost Jones was a dedicated colleague and friend who championed diversity initiatives and equity for faculty, staff and students at Penn State; and

WHEREAS, Vice Provost Jones was very passionate about transforming the lives and contributing to the success of our first-generation and low-income students, and author of “The Realities of Diversity and the Campus Climate for First-Year Students”; and

WHEREAS, Vice Provost Jones was an affiliate faculty member of the Department of Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education at Penn State, and taught courses on race relations and cross-cultural counseling; and

WHEREAS, Vice Provost Jones was instrumental in establishing a "Trustee Scholarship" through the Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment; and
WHEREAS, Vice Provost Jones was a board member of the International Partnership for Service Learning and served as President of the Pennsylvania Black Conference on Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, The Pennsylvania State University was very fortunate to have had the opportunity to know and work with Vice Provost Jones for so many years,

Be it resolved that,

(1) The University Faculty Senate of The Pennsylvania State University mourns the passing of Vice Provost Jones and expresses its deepest condolences to his family and friends

(2) The University Faculty Senate of The Pennsylvania State University recognizes the many significant contributions of Vice Provost Jones in leading the implementation of the University’s strategic plan that embraces and supports diversity and that made the University a better place.

(3) The University Faculty Senate of The Pennsylvania State University with deep sorrow acknowledges the passing of Vice Provost Jones as an immeasurable loss for Penn State, the Centre Region, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(4) The University Faculty Senate of The Pennsylvania State University honors Vice Provost Jones not only for the impact of his contributions to Penn State, but also for the exceptional person that he was.

Chair Kulikowich: Senate Council passed this resolution. They would like to present to the Senate for ratification. Is there any discussion concerning the resolution? It has been moved and seconded that the Senate ratify the resolution. All in favor of the motion please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Motion carries. The next item of New Business appears as Appendix P and is a response to Pennsylvania State Senate Bill 1240 from Senate Council. Senate Council passed this statement that I would like to present to the Senate for endorsement.

Senators Egolf and Szczygiel will respond to questions on behalf of the Senate Council. Is there any discussion concerning the statement?

Bonj Szczygiel, Arts and Architecture: Just to reiterate that this is a summary of the special committee's report on University Governance that was presented to this body in March of 2013 and was ratified. It is meant simply to take a 52 page report, and bring it down to one and a half pages for consumption by those of you who had expressed interest in the Senate's position on the Board of Trustees membership.

Chair Kulikowich: Is there any discussion concerning the statement?
Emily Miller, Education Student Senator: I would like to move to amend the report appearing on Appendix P to insert "voting member," in Recommendation 3 after "ex officio."

Chair Kulikowich: Again, I will read the motion. I move to amend the report appearing in Appendix P to insert "voting member" after "ex officio" in Recommendation 3.

Senator: Second

Chair Kulikowich: There has been a second. Any discussion?

Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts: If you have an ex officio member, you have a voting member and it is redundant.

Emily Miller: I am happy to clarify. Ex officio, it does mean voting member, but depending on the bylaws of an organization, unless it is explicitly stated that it is a voting member, it could be ex officio nonvoting. For the sake of the work that you are doing for us and that the student body has been doing, we would just like to put that in stone with voting member.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: Dennis, you are absolutely correct as far as Robert's Rules go, but the Board of Trustees uses a somewhat different definition of ex officio, and if you look at the charter of the University, the charter actually describes certain people; specifically right now, the Governor and the President, as ex officio nonvoting members. It describes the other ex officio members, which are the cabinet members, as ex officio voting members. I know that is not the standard Robert's Rules definition, but it is the definition that the charter of the University uses and I think that is why the student wants to put those words in. I think that is actually a good idea, considering that this is a resolution that is going towards amending the charter of the University which uses those types of wording.

Robin Bower, Beaver: I would further point out that to insert the word "voting" to amend Section 3 to “an ex officio voting member” would bring that wording into conformity with the prior section in which the President of the University—I am quoting-- "should continue to serve on the Board of Trustees as an ex officio voting member." It would establish linguistic conformity across the two categories.

Chair Kulikowich: Seeing no further questions, all in favor of the amendment, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. The motion on the amendment carries. The main motion has been moved and seconded that the Senate endorse the response to Pennsylvania State Senate Bill 1240. All in favor of the motion please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. The motion carries. Thank you, Bonj and Roger.

It has been moved and seconded that the Senate endorse the response to Pennsylvania State Senate Bill 1240.
FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Kulikowich: Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer Regis Becker requested a forensic session, which appears as Appendix D in the agenda. Regis will make a few comments and I will then open the floor for discussion. Joining Regis is Stephen Dunham, Vice President and General Counsel. Twenty minutes is allocated for presentation and discussion.

Regis Becker, Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer: Thank you very much. This is a little bit unusual, if not unprecedented. We have not brought, I do not believe, administrative policies before the Senate before, but since you are affected by this and because we value your counsel, we want to just go through this today quickly. We did send you all the materials in advance, and I have a few slides.

Just to frame the forensic question, we would like to go through the slides, and I will make one correction to the draft that you have in your possession regarding these two policies. The first is AD86, which is the Code of Responsible Conduct, it is a new policy that in many ways codifies a lot of the things that we already have in policy, but it is a general higher level policy. The second is AD88 and AD86 will be the policy on gifts and entertainment.

Quickly, there are five components to the code of responsible conduct that we will follow the law and our own policies that we will abide by all our conflict of interest policies that records that what we submit will be accurate, that we will report misconduct, and this is the one change I wanted to make in the document you have. The draft you have neglected to say in the first part of that sentence that, "in compliance with the University's policies and federal, state, and local law, we will report misconduct." Then finally, AD67, which is non-retaliation, is reinforced in this policy.

We have done some socialization with this; we have reviewed it with the General Counsel, our Office of Ethics and Compliance, Ethics and Compliance Council, the University Ethics Committee, the Staff Advisory Council, and the Advisory Council for Continued Excellence. It has been debated. The wording has been pretty thorough and we have had a lot of concerns expressed each way. We think we have addressed those in the documents that you have before you.

If I could go to AD86, the acceptance of gifts and entertainment, first, we wanted to just make sure that we understand gifts and entertainment establish a relationship of goodwill. It is important that we have good relationships with our commercial partners so we understand that in commercial enterprise, these are necessary. We do not want to ban them entirely, but we wanted to put some structure around those. We wanted to provide guidance on avoiding possible conflicts of interest, the undue influence, or the appearance thereof.

Before we go through some of the other pieces I wanted to make sure that you understood each of these four conditions must be met for the policy to be enforced. One, the gifts and entertainment must be offered by an individual or party who has current or prospective University business. The employee involved has to have authority or influence in the current or prospective University business. The gift or entertainment has a value of more than $100, and we will talk more about that in a minute, and the gift or entertainment is offered either directly or indirectly to the person who has the influence.
We have a definition of "gift" that we have worked on. It obviously covers a broad variety of things, but we wanted to point out that honoraria are not covered by this policy. Honoraria are gifts and entertainment for purposes of this policy. Entertainment is obviously included but not limited to paid limitations to or subsequent reimbursement for events, including tickets, transportation, room or housing, meals, and other such activity provided to an employee beyond the acceptable amounts established by University policies. Again, this is subject to those four provisions that we talked about just a minute ago.

The amount of $100 is the upper limit of our CIC Peer University policies. The PA ethics law permits $250, but along with that they have much more strict financial disclosure that we would not be subject to since we are not subject to the ethics law; we did not want to go to the $250 level. As I said, we have worked this through a number of committees around the University, and while it could be described as an arbitrary number it falls in-line with our peer schools, as you can see from this chart. They range from zero dollars, at Indiana, Wisconsin, Maryland, Rutgers, to nominal value up to $200 at the University of Pittsburgh, so we thought it was a moderate number and it was in-line. Again, those four previously mentioned criteria are met.

We understand that in certain cultures, particularly Asia, and other parts of the world, give gifts, and it would be very offensive or detrimental for the University to refuse those gifts. We wanted to provide a clause for that. If it is culturally insensitive to refuse a gift because of individuals we are dealing with the part of the world we are in, then we have a couple caveats here. If you do accept that gift it must be disclosed and approved by the Ethics and Compliance Office.

Even if it is post hoc, that you get it and you come back to the University, describe it, and then donate to a charity or properly display it for the benefit of the entire University, in other words, not benefiting you personally or donated to a charity, that would be approved by the University.

The final question we are asking is, what suggestions do you have for any adjustments in wording or particularly for the successful implementation among University faculty of the following codes; the code of responsible conduct, and acceptance of gifts and entertainment? With that, I open the floor to questions. I have also asked my colleague, General Counsel Steve Dunham, if he has anything to add to what I just said.

**Steve Dunham, Vice President and General Counsel:** Good afternoon. Just a general concept. Both of these policies are traditional best practices normal. You can see by the reference to the CIC institutions. Almost everybody has policies like this.

There are various legal requirements, both federal and state law, for things like codes of conduct which we meet because we have a conflict of interest policy. We have rules and purchasing that restrict it. We do not have an umbrella statement such as the first one, the code of conduct that brings it all together. It is a compliance policy that highlights compliance with law and policy. That is at its most general. It pulls out three or four specifics; conflicts of interest, employment, discrimination, and not lying on expense reports, because those are a politically correct thing to identify that is hard to say we do not do that. Of course, we are committed to that.

It seems to give it strength and integrity to highlight among the most important of those policies. It is a broad umbrella policy for all compliance. Then, it doubles down on non-retaliation, which is an incredibly important part of our University’s rules on integrity and ethics. It specifically cites the hot-line,
which is also an incredibly important part of our commitment to ethics and integrity. In this simple one page document, it accomplishes a lot, and I think, will be very helpful for us in all kinds of ways dealing with external authorities and dealing internally to be sure we all have general acceptance of standards of behavior.

The second one, gifts and entertainment, is much more specific. It could have been included in the first policy. At many institutions, it is. One way to think of it is a very specific example of conflict of interest because that is all it is. It only applies if the employee has a role in contracting. If you have no role in a contracting decision, it does not apply to you. It only applies if you are making decisions for the University with respect to a particular vendor or company that we are doing business with.

Currently, in the bylaws of the University included in the President’s letter that goes out to everybody at the beginning of each semester, there is a broad conflict of interest provision that says if you have any conflict of interest, tell your supervisor. It does not try to define it; it does not try to go into specifics, kind of a common sense, do you have a conflict of interest, disclose it. This is just a specific example of a kind of conflict of interest to answer questions.

These questions come up all the time. We get these questions, purchasing gets these questions—can I accept these basketball tickets, can I go to this box game, can I do this, can I do that? This is an attempt to get ahead of those hundreds of questions, establish a kind of ground rule of $100, but limit it to situations where you have a role in purchasing. I want to emphasize that. This is not—if you are not involved in purchasing decisions, and faculty can be, obviously, in all kinds of ways serving on committees for their own labs and various ways. It is not that it does not apply to you, it certainly can. It is a limited focus on people who are involved in purchasing decisions, dealing with vendors, to give us a rule of thumb to act on.

Conflicts of interest are not illegal. There are circumstances where they can be. Research conflicts are regulated by the feds, but most conflicts are not. There are standards of good behavior, standards of good decision making, standards of responsible conduct, and this is an example of that. There is nothing illegal in general. It might endanger a particular contract if we favor one vendor over another because of a gift.

In general, it is not external law that controls this. It is internal integrity of good decision making that we want to be sure that our decisions, as an institution, are on the merits and not because somebody is wined and dined excessively in a way that could change the focus of what is best for the University. That is just context for it, but obviously we are here to answer any questions or suggestions anybody may have.

**John Nousek, Science:** I am glad you made it clear that honoraria are not covered. Commonly I am asked to participate in peer reviews, conferences, things like this in which my travel expenses are reimbursed; sometimes by foreign governments, sometimes by corporations as well as the federal government. There is the potential that these are quite valuable, much more than $100, and I could imagine, though I believe it does not apply to me, but I could imagine abuse could occur if you were invited to a nice location and you receive travel reimbursement. How does this affect traveler reimbursement?

**Steve Dunham:** That is a good question, and a common problem under these policies. In general, it does not, because travel reimbursement for legitimate business purpose is not a gift or entertainment, but you are absolutely right. If you are flown buy a bank to Hong Kong to discuss the renewal of a particular
contract and you go first class and they tack on a week's vacation in Baja afterwards, then you have a question. The only answer I can give you is that it has to be a judgment call. If it is routine business expense as part of the relationship it just does not come under the policy at all. It is not a gift or entertainment. If at the end of that routine business relationship, somebody says, here is $25,000 thanks so much for doing business, which actually is a question I had once-- and I actually made a permanent enemy of this person who was my friend by saying, you cannot take that!

It is a line drawing thing. It is a good question, and I think the best we can do is rely on your good judgment and the good judgment of people in Regis's office, or my office, or purchasing, or sponsored programs, or wherever you may ask about--is this appropriate?

Rogerio Neves, Medicine: I am glad to see that you mentioned it. It is somewhat related to the purchase of something, but in our institution, they are seeing that I am the one prescribing a medication or something to the patient. I am not purchasing anything. They believe that if I get anything, it is a medication or drug that I will go and prescribe to my patient. That creates a problem. I would like to know what we have to do.

Steve Dunham: That is also a good question, and I cannot give you a completely crystallized answer. First of all, there are separate rules for clinicians. Hershey has separate conflicts rules. I do not want to--this does not trump that. There are separate, as you know statutes and regulatory issues on drug companies and medical device companies providing information to clinicians which has ratcheted that way back in the last few years.

It is also true that most places do not actually have a clinical conflict of interest policy where if you have an interest in something and you prescribe it that is a conflict of interest. We are not trying to address that. Free drugs that drug companies drop off at your office, I would say I would defer to the Hershey medical process for that. I do not think it is under this policy in a traditional way. It is not a gift or entertainment in the sense of personal to you and your free time to go have fun and wine and dine.

Regis Becker: As Steve said, the pharmaceutical companies have very strict compliance policies regarding that. Obviously, they are trying to influence you to prescribe their drugs, but they have prescriptive policies that will prevent them from trying to exercise too much influence in your decision making. Was there another question?

Tramble Turner, Abington: Mr. Dunham, you already highlighted the hot-line in terms of the non-retaliation item with AD88. I am just curious if you would see it advisable to include other direct means for reports on non-retaliation? Also, would it be useful to look to see what systems are in place to make sure that the posting of that number is available at all locations? I know that I have seen it at other locations other than UP including ours, but I do not know that is monitored.

Steve Dunham: Yes, two things. I think both of those issues go to the absolute core of a lot of things Regis and his office are working on and are beyond the scope of this policy. The non-retaliation and the hot line both have their own independent need to be advertised and proselytized and pushed and advertised broadly on all the campuses--Regis's office and others do that. Off and on, there have been special campaigns to get out the information. Actually, it is a good thing. Complaints go up when we do that, and that is a good thing. You want your complaints to go up because you want to be responsive to wrongdoing and provide avenues.
I think rather than try to expand the language here, although it could be, but rather than that we should just remain as sensitive as we can to both your questions in the retaliation policy that exists and the hotline policy that exists and make sure we are getting that out as broadly as we possibly can. I am sure there are additional things we should be doing on that. The President has expressed particular concern about non-retaliation issues that we have seen in the values and culture survey you are about to hear from next where there are concerns about that. We institutionally need to continue to get that message out as broadly as possible.

**Regis Becker:** I would just add that you will see aggressive campaigns on both of those things in the next few months to Steve's point. You'll see more.

**Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts:** This is just a suggestion for implementation on the gifts and entertainment policy. I think you are hearing some uncertainty among us as to what it covers, and what it does not cover. If you could provide implementation guidelines, that would save a lot of time and anxiety. Otherwise somebody may report something to their department head or to supervisors and not know, is this covered, is this not covered? There could be misunderstandings along the way.

**Steve Dunham:** That is an excellent suggestion. We think that is a good idea. We are going to try to have some FAQs as well, to have common issues that come up so that those are addressed.

**Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development:** I wanted to thank you for coming to the Faculty Senate and having this forensics session with us. As you said, this is the first that has happened for thinking about a policy, and I hope that this will pave the way for this to be happening more in the future.

**Steve Dunham:** Thank you. We will include you in our discussions. May I just close with the administrative path forward?

Please if you have other thoughts that you were not able to express today just sent me an email or call me. Our plan is to go to the University Staff Counsel with a similar presentation to also notify the bargaining unit. We want to talk to the Teamsters and let them know about the new policies. We will go ultimately to the President's Council, I believe, next week to ask for their endorsement of the policies. Then, down the road, we will of course notify the Board of Directors. I just want to make it clear, the administrative process from here, is fairly short. We will be taking these to the President’s Council in the next couple weeks.

If you have any comments or further suggestions, please get them to me before then. We will be happy to work with you. Thank you.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Thank you, Steve and Regis.

We now move to our second forensic session. Ethics specialist Tim Balliett requested the next forensic session which appears as Appendix E in the agenda and was distributed by mail. Tim will make a few comments and I will open the floor for discussion. Joining Tim is Christian Brady, Dean of the Schreyer Honors College.

**Christian Brady, Dean, Schreyer Honors College:** Just quickly to give you a context for it, there are two different streams that have converged here. One significant one began with the Faculty Senate in
2011 before November. It happened in July when a committee was formed to look at whether or not we should have a University wide statement of integrity and honor code, if you will.

That was followed up in 2012-2013 with our Student Conduct Code Task Force. You can see here just the three key points that came out from it. A single unified and compact statement of honor and integrity that applies to all faculty, staff, and students still has great merit and should be pursued. Intentionally engaging the community, gathering input, engaging interested parties and ultimately form a set of aspirational statements for which the University community feels ownership. Our goal would be to distill the input into a simple and clear set of statements that would replace the Penn State principles.

This is what was coming from the Faculty Senate. I was on both of those committees. Then what had been the Freeh Implementation committee, which is now the Advisory Committee for Continued Excellence, or ACE, also then looked at it. Looking at a similar question began with a qualitative analysis of existing University documents, which simply means that that committee looked at all of our Penn State website, sent notes to all of our different units, and said, what statements of honor and integrity do you all have? Those were collated together.

Last October, we all-- current staff, faculty, and students, had the opportunity to participate in the values and culture survey. All of that comes together, and the ACE committee came up with these three of the six recommendations that are particularly relevant to the Faculty Senate for us today. Again, these are all in your handout.

From the qualitative analysis these were the main terms that came out. That was the first step from that ACE committee or the precursor to ACE. You can see on the right hand side, the final words they distilled down are integrity, excellence, discovery, respect, responsibility, and community. These came forward as key principles based upon things that we are already saying in our units, colleges, campuses, and so forth, our key values.

That coupled with what came out of the culture and values survey, a similar list of terms coming forward, comes up with this proposed Penn State value statement. I will say we have eschewed an acronym because acronyms always lead to all sorts of other amusing, unintended interpretations. Where we are now is to take this forward out into the broad community, so the faculty community, the student community, and the staff to have discussions around these six values to consider whether we feel that they represent who we are as Penn State, as a community, and can we all get behind that? Hopefully that would then be finalized at the end of the fall.

Then, the next step would be to begin to institutionalize that. That is where discussion of this, but also our forensic questions are. From our perspective as academics, as faculty, how should we look at integrating these? Our Penn State principles, some of you may remember, a lot of folks are not even aware that we had these Penn State principles. These values would replace that. Instead, we would now have these Penn State values.

How should we incorporate it? Do we incorporate it into our syllabi? Do we incorporate it into our class discussions? Where should that be? What should we be doing as a Faculty Senate to promote that acculturation? I think that is where we want to end in summary. Tim, is there anything you wanted to say?
Timothy Balliett, Ethics Specialist, Office of Ethics and Compliance: The Penn State values would be also far reaching beyond academics, of course. We have been working with Dr. Jones in implementing and incorporating it within the strategic plan in a number of different areas in the University. As you may have read in the report, one of the results of the survey was that people identify with the Penn State community primarily through the academic experience, which is a good thing. Since you are the drivers of the academic experience and academic college, we wanted to enlist your support and your input as a way in which we could more deeply acculturate this for this true reflection of the University community.

Dean Brady: The very last thing I would say is, both of the Senate committees that I served on, one of the suggestions that came out was that there would be an even more succinct and shorter statement of honor and integrity that would distill this down and go with it. That would be something that would happen after we first determine these are the values and these then become acculturated or disseminated through the community.

Chair Kulikowich: Any questions?

William Carlsen, Education: I am wondering, could you explain what the plans are for releasing the results of the survey to the University community? I think there is some interesting data in that report that do not agree at all with some of the other information that we are going to hear today, specifically the Academic Integrity committee's report. Those kinds of disagreements in the data may, I think, might be a good place to start conversations about how we want to proceed.

Dean Brady: The plan is to release all the tables of data specifically because, and actually alluding to Dr. Barron's earlier comments regarding health care, we have many experts who work on a day to day basis with this kind of data. That is all going to be out there for you as well as the summary. Do you have a timeline for that, Tim?

Timothy Balliett: We are currently in the process of an internal strategy where we are speaking with different key groups, among the Faculty Senate. We are also speaking with the University Staff Advisory Council. I will be speaking with the University Park Undergraduate Association this week leading up to the presentation, discussion of this by David Gray with the Board of Trustees next week, at which time we anticipate having a public release of the values survey and information within the coming weeks.

Chair Kulikowich: Any other questions? I do not see any other questions. Thank you, Chris and Tim.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Kulikowich: I would like to recognize Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg senator, who will introduce a motion for consideration which was submitted by Jim Ruiz. Senator Ruiz is unable to join us this afternoon. Senator Woessner will provide a two minute introduction about this motion. This motion appears as Appendix F in the agenda. The motion was made and seconded at the April 29, 2014 Senate meeting.

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: Thank you. Senator Ruiz was here earlier, but he has taken ill and asked if I could present on his behalf. Pennsylvania State University faculty often teach overload courses under a contract, and they usually know six to twelve months in advance that these contracts are planned. Typically administrators execute contracts well prior to the beginning of the semester. This is what Jim
Ruiz writes, for a number of years this has not been the case of capital campus, and the delays have taken
the form of days, weeks, or even months.

Senator Ruiz reports that in the spring of 2014 the contracts were not distributed until 91 days after the
beginning of the semester. More recently we saw an improvement. Senator Ruiz reports that in the fall of
this year contracts were distributed on the first day of school, August 25, 2014. There is no official policy
on when contracts should be distributed for overloads, and Senator Ruiz's motion asks that there should
be a set policy and suggests that the Senate back a motion whereby about five days prior to the beginning
of the semester contracts should be issued to faculty.

Senator Ruiz writes, when Penn State contracts for work to be performed that contract is executed well
before work begins. Should not the same courtesy be extended to faculty? I ask your support for this
resolution not just for one campus, but for all campuses and faculty of this great institution. Thank you.

Chair Kulikowich: Is there any discussion concerning Senator Ruiz's motion?

Matthew Wilson, Harrisburg: I am going to rise to oppose this motion, not on the merits but
procedurally. I think that, as we saw last year, it is very important for the Senate to have the ability to
bring motions to the floor. I think that this is jumping over the whole process. I think that this is
something that should be dealt with on a lower level, than having the whole Senate vote on this. I am
opposing it, just simply procedurally. The problem that you bring up is undoubtedly a real one. I do not
think it is one that the whole Senate needs to deal with.

Matthew Woessner: I am not affected by this either way. I am not involved in any overload contracts. I
very much respect your concerns about this. I share some of them, and we have to be very careful not to
jump the gun. I think in this instance, Senator Ruiz brought this motion forward because they had tried
before repeatedly to get some motion to get these things submitted more quickly.

I think that there are special circumstances where sometimes we bring this to the Senate to raise
awareness, to make people concerned and hopefully to remind administrators that these matters are
urgent concerns to the faculty. I would not want to see this happen regularly. I am ambivalent about this
motion because it is a special case. I think this is worthy of support, and provided we do not see these
types of resolution brought for the lightest of reasons. Given that Senator Ruiz did in fact try to deal with
this at the lower levels, I think it is worthy of your consideration, but I certainly do respect your concerns
about this procedurally.

Chair Kulikowich: We have a few more questions. Let me go way to the back on the right side of the
auditorium from the front of the auditorium.

Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts: I am new here, so this may be an irrelevant question. I completely
support the sentiment of this, but what happens if somebody falls ill within the first two weeks of term
and an administrator has to find a solution? I am wondering if this wording would account for that
eventuality.

Chair Kulikowich: Again, I want to hear some more of the questions. Any other questions over here?
Patricia Hinchey, Worthington Scranton: I am also sympathetic to the sentiment. I am worried terribly about this being read as "five days before the start of the semester" being considered adequate time to give a faculty member notice that they will be teaching some course they were not anticipating teaching. Teaching takes far more preparation than five business days, and that worries me greatly.

Chair Kulikowich: Matthew, I will allow you to respond to one question. We have a question from Ann Taylor and a question, I believe, from Carrie Eckhardt. I would like to hear both questions.

Matthew Woessner: I made an error; it was five business days in the resolution. I do recognize it is not quite the five days, if that is any help.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I want to reiterate what was said before. I definitely appreciate the need for this kind of policy, if you will, to be put in place, but this is not the way to handle it. This is a serious issue. This needs to go through one of our committees. We have excellent questions and concerns, and these need to be investigated by those committees. We are not going to come up with the answers on the fly on the Senate floor. I urge us to not vote in favor of this, but for the reason of hopefully getting it to be vetted by an appropriate Senate committee.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I think we have heard multiple queries about the readiness of this to be voted on as a policy per-say. I think it clearly is not ready. I would like to ask what options do we have procedurally. One is we can simply vote no. Do we have the option of suggesting to our Senate chair that it be referred to Faculty Affairs or to a different Senate committee of her choice? Procedurally, what are the options?

Chair Kulikowich: I believe you can make a motion to refer to a committee if that is your intention to do so.

Caroline Eckhardt: Does the motion have to specify which committee, or can that be left up to you?

Senator: Specify.

Chair Kulikowich: It sounds like it would be Faculty Affairs, I believe.

Caroline Eckhardt: I move that this action be referred to Faculty Affairs.

Senator: Second.

Chair Kulikowich: There is a motion to refer to the committee. There has been a second. Is there any discussion about that motion?

Tramble Turner, Abington: While I appreciate the emphasis on working through standing Senate committees, I have a question as to whether or not the current concern does not mainly call for establishment of administrative policy. Had Senator Eckhardt not already made a motion? I would have thought appropriate motion would be to amend the motion-- simply to call from the Senate for the administration to establish a reasonable policy on when contracts should be let. The only other comment I would make is, working with administrative staff, I think it would probably be not only in their best
interest, but they would appreciate having some clear guidelines on this. I would prefer not to see Carrie's motion go forward, and that there be other discussion.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: I am a little confused. I thought there was already a motion on the floor.

Chair Kulikowich: The motion now is a motion to refer to the committee on Faculty Affairs. I am going to confer with the parliamentarian.

Larry Backer, Parliamentarian: The original motion that he waits until the committee is done-- we can always reintroduce it later. The process of considering the motion stops.

You are done. It goes to committee. We wait. We wait to hear from the committee. If Jim is annoyed about that, he is always free to bring back the resolution, but we are done.

Chair Kulikowich: If the motion carries.

Larry Backer: The motion does not carry; we are back to talking about the motion and all related matters.

Chair Kulikowich: We are now at the motion that pertains to referring to the committee of Faculty Affairs, and there was a second to that. We are in the discussion of that.

Senator: Call the question.

Chair Kulikowich: Call the question. All in favor?

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed? The motion carries to call the question. We are now to the vote on referring to the committee to Faculty Affairs.

We will use the clickers. We are voting on whether the resolution goes to the committee of Faculty Affairs for their consideration of this topic.

Senators joining the meeting 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 140 in favor and 28 opposed. The motion carries.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID
Revisions to Senate Policy 54-00 and all related Senate policies regarding Academic Warning, Drop Action, and Reinstatement: 54-58, 54-80, 54-82, 58-60, 14-00, 14-10, 16-00, 18-30, 18-70, 51-70, and 67-00

2013-14 Committee Chair Martha Aynardi
Chair Kulikowich: We have one Legislative report today from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid, which appears as Appendix G.

2013-14 Committee Chair Martha Aynardi will respond to questions.

Martha Aynardi, Berks: Just as a preamble, in addition to the committee, I would like to thank David Salvia and David Bender for their helpful suggestions and review of numerous iterations of the draft. The University Advising Council more than two years ago asked us to look at policy 54-00 and to consider several things; including simplifying the policy, eliminating deficiency points, eliminating non-degree conditional status, creating concepts of academic warning, probation, and dismissal, using the semester GPA as an early warning sign, developing consequences of warning and probation, and proposing alternatives to a four-year dismissal. I think that this policy has achieved those goals. I guess with that, does anybody have any questions?

Chair Kulikowich: The report is brought to the floor by committee. Is there any discussion?

David Smith, Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies: I appreciate the work that has gone into this new proposed policy, because I do think it brings much needed clarity to how this will work. Part of my question, I think, has to do with the warning, as it is currently worded. It suggests that students would automatically be-- a registration hold would be put on their record if they fell below a two point at the end of a given semester.

Martha Aynardi: If their semester GPA is 2.0, they get a letter telling them what will happen if their cumulative GPA drops below a 2.0. They do not go into a hold on their registration until their cumulative GPA drops below a 2.0.

David Smith: In Fall '13, there were 6,500 students that had a 2.0 or less, and my concern is how do we manage those numbers? Part of the preamble for this speaks to the need to encourage campuses for additional academic support. My underlying question, I guess, is how are we prepared to help students in these situations? This creates a clear policy, but the underlying issue which often is student well-being-- I think mental health is often an issue that is contributing to poor performance. It is just the need to address that and make sure we have the resources available to support students broadly across all campuses here at Penn State.

Martha Aynardi: I agree 100%, and we added that last paragraph in the introduction as a last point to actually look at numbers and look at the impact of the individual units. I think a lot of that lies in the type of academic support that each unit develops and provides. I think it needs to begin when we admit students. I think we need to tell them during New Student Orientation what the policy is. I think we need to have a lag time of about a year to announce this broadly and to give the advising centers and the learning centers time to put something in place that will provide that support for students.

Chair Kulikowich: Any additional questions? Seeing that there are not any, the report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting 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 172 in favor and 9 opposed. The motion carries.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Implementation of Recommendations on Structure and Organization of the University Faculty Senate:
Revisions to the Bylaws
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: We have three Legislative reports today from Committees and Rules. The first appears as Appendix H. This report is proposed amendments to the Bylaws. It was presented at the April 29, 2014 Senate meeting and will be voted on today. Before we vote, are there any questions for Committee Chair Mark Casteel?

The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting 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 165 in favor and 6 opposed. The motion carries.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article I, Section 11(g) (Reporting of Senate Election Results)
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The second report comes from Committee and Rules, appears as Appendix I. Mark will respond again to any questions that you have.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: First, a procedural question for our leaders. May I speak about the content of the wording? I will start, and then you can tell me if I am off.

I regret that I was not here when this was discussed at the January 28 meeting. I may be bringing up things that others have already brought up, but I do want to reiterate them in case. I am concerned about this potential change to our rulings. This to me seems to absolutely counter the spirit of collegiality. I am having a hard time understanding what good comes out of something like this, which seems to me a potentially divisive tool.

I have always been taught in my degree programs that the key to a successful team, successful collaboration, is that when we choose a direction, we choose a leader. Once that decision is made, the successful groups get behind that leader. If we publish election results and we see that we had two or three qualified candidates, and by majority rules, the one got it over the other I am afraid that if that comes to public light whoever we put in that leadership position is going to be disadvantaged and feel like we are the United States government trying to play the Democrats off the Republicans and so forth. I have a hard time understanding what this is going to help. If you could help me see that, maybe I could be turned around.

Mark Casteel: I cannot help you see that. Philosophically I agree with many of the points that you made. Unfortunately, this body voted. Our rule, our job as CC&R is simply to put that into the standing rules. Now, that does not preclude this issue coming forward again, but since we have already voted on it, our committee's job is to simply codify it. I do not have a good answer.

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: As a political scientist, I think there is value in having votes. Nothing about a narrow win invalidates the election victory. Jim Strauss beat me by six votes, and he is a fine
candidate. He did a wonderful job. It still tells us something about the importance of the electoral process into threshing out whether or not an individual should run again. Whether they enjoy broad bodies of support, and it also tells us something important about how we should compromise when we sometimes have differences of opinion.

If we have two candidates with very different ideas who win a narrow victory, it encourages them to seek out broader coalitions to find compromise, to find common ground as it was before. In the election cycles we had no idea whether a candidate won by 90% of the vote or 3%.

There is nothing about a narrow win which invalidates the success, the honor, of winning the majority of the vote. I think there is something important in the margin of victory, which teaches us how to seek compromise where there are differences. Ultimately it gives us more information so that we can make informed judgments in the future. There is nothing divisive about this. I think this is a wonderful idea, and because as a political scientist-- we just love elections day. Perhaps I am biased, but I think even in this process, it helps to bring some transparency, which is so important to the system. I am very much in support of this resolution, of this amendment.

**Thomas Beebee, Liberal Arts:** With all due respect, I think that last statement echoes the concerns of the previous senator. In other words, the idea that elections for offices in this body are based on ideological differences-- I do not think I have even published a statement for myself in the last times I have been elected here in that sense. It seems to predict a kind of future in which we have those kinds of ideological divisions that are driving how we choose our leaders. I have a question. If we are only voting on the wording of this, then what if we vote no? What happens then?

**Mark Casteel:** I was going to ask that exact question. I do not know the answer to that.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Any other questions?

**Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts:** The choices are simple and straightforward. It depends on what you all want to do. If a majority of the people vote no, then the resolution, the wording goes back to the committee for reworking. Then it will come back to you, and you can do this again. If you are unhappy with what you did before and you want to change your minds, in this deliberative body that would not be unusual in the historical context, then you are free to engage the deliberative process.

As we have just recalled, not by resolution, but perhaps by invoking the committee process to, at the appropriate time and after appropriate consultation, to eventually come back with a recommendation that would suggest that what we have just voted on, the words of which we are now discussing, ought to be reconsidered and perhaps eliminated. That is what has to be done which means that there will be a time period they will have to go by while you are doing this. Right now you vote no it goes back to committee; it will come back reworded. You do not like what you did before, and then it has to go to a committee for reconsideration and then eventually a report that may result in the revision of the words to which you are considering now.

**Mohamad Ansari, Chair Elect:** Dennis, correct me if I am wrong, I think in parliamentary procedures, we have a rule which says we send or amend something previously adopted. I think we adopted this as a motion in January, and if this body is feeling that adoption was an incorrect decision that this body made, then this body can also move to amend the previously adopted resolution. Thank you.
Chair Kulikowich: Is there a motion for such amendment?

Senator: They called the question then seconded.

Chair Kulikowich: You called the question and second? All in favor of calling the question?

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed? Now we are back to the original motion. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting 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 89 in favor and 82 opposed. The motion carries.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article III, Sections 10-12 (Committee on Athletics Searches)
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The final report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix J. Mark will respond to questions.

Adam Muchmore, Law: I have a quick question where I think that maybe the wording of report was not what the committee intended. I wanted to point to ask about that. Then if folks are interested I have a couple of options for what you might want to do about it. This is on Appendix J of your agenda, page 41 of the PDF. I am looking at the last full paragraph above revised sections.

I am looking at the last sentence where it says, ESCAS members will be expected to participate fully in the search. Then it is this next phrase that I am concerned about, “weighing their considerations entirely by academic concerns.” I guess that it is my impression that in the process of searching for a varsity football coach; you could not participate in anything but an obstructive way in the process if you were only to consider academic concerns. I would think it would be a balancing of academics, coaching competence, ethics and integrity, and all these sorts of things. I wanted to ask if the committee intended what it said, or if it wanted something different than that.

Mark Casteel: We vetted this through the previous Athletics Director and the Intercollegiate Athletics committee who urged this particular wording. I cannot justify why they simply said academic concerns, but that is the function of the faculty members. I guess the Intercollegiate Athletics committee would be in fact faculty members. I guess that is the best response, because they are a faculty member on that committee whose job is to evaluate candidates based on the academic input they are giving to the committee. They are only one member of a larger committee.

Adam Muchmore: What I am suggesting is that what you are trying to do is say that they need to ensure that academic concerns are an important part of the process. I would be inclined either to strike that language or just assume that the member on the committee would do that. That they would be chosen for that purpose, or I have some more complex language that I am happy to throw out if people were interested. I am very concerned about that language, and if there are others who are similarly concerned, I would want to make a motion to revise it.
Mark Casteel: I think my reply simply would be, as a faculty member, let us say I was on that committee, I do not think I am in a position to offer anything about potential candidates other than in an academic aspect.

Linda Caldwell, Faculty Athletics Representative: I am faculty representative, and I have been on probably 20 search committees for the athletics department. I would like to support the notion that faculty do not only just deal with academics, although as you suggested, we just had a head surge for track and field.

I do not know anything about statistics with track and field, so I cannot do that. We do look at integrity issues, we look at APR issues as well as just general academic issues, we look at recruiting and the type of kids that they recruit and characters. I do agree that it is beyond academics; that is one point. Another point is-- small point-- that it is not "The Senior Women's Administrator," it is "Associate Athletic Director and Senior Woman Administrator," for the title. Also, the Athletic Director is typically not the chair of these search committees; only in cases of, maybe, football coaches or other high profile coaches.

The biggest issue I have with the way it is written is with the faculty partner program. It will be very difficult with the timing of faculty partners because some faculty partners end their association in May. Most faculty partners are not active during the summer and some of them don't start until September. There is a process where they have to go through compliance training and covered persons training. I think some of the timing and the details still need to be worked out on this.

Mark Casteel: I do think the mechanism that-- during the summer-- because members of IA could also serve. I think the way-- this is a vision-- would be put into process is that even though CC&R puts forward the slate of candidates to sit at council, we would certainly pull IA before we put forward that slate of candidates to sit at council to see who would be available throughout the entire year, not just the academic year.

Linda Caldwell: On all of these deliberations-- and I think the main point of having faculty partners or Intercollegiate Athletics committee members, is having faculty members who have some knowledge of the way the program is run and hiring coaches. I think that can be worked out.

Chair Kulikowich: At this point in time, given the two comments previously heard, I would entertain a motion to return this back to committee. All in favor of that motion?

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: The motion carries.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Kulikowich: Next we have one Advisory/Consultative report from Faculty Affairs. The report appears as Appendix K.

Committee Chair Patricia Koch will respond to questions.
Any questions? The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting 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 134 in favor and 1 opposed. The motion carries.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
Pennsylvania State University Academic Integrity Violation Report, Appendix L.

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Annual Report for 2013-2014, Appendix L. This annual report provided a summary of the cases considered in the last academic year.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
Annual Report of Academic Eligibility and Athletic Scholarships for 2013-2014, Appendix N. Included in this report are basic statistical data, a summary of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics activities and related legislation passed during AY 2013-14, student-athlete academic highlights, team-by-team data on the Academic Progress Rate (APR), three reports on the Graduation Success Rate (GSR), two reports on the Federal Graduation Rate (FGR).

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE
Initiatives at Penn State to Address Alcohol Issues among Students, Appendix O. Damon Sims, Vice President of Student Affairs, presented baseline metrics from some of the wide-ranging initiatives to address student alcohol issues at Penn State.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Kulikowich: I would like to take a moment to introduce the 2014-15 Penn State laureate, Susan Russell, Associate Professor of Theatre. Susan, would you please stand? The Penn State laureate, an honorary position established in 2008, is a full-time faculty member in the humanities or the arts who is assigned half-time for one academic year to bring an enhanced level of social, cultural, artistic and human perspective and awareness to a broad array of audiences. Please join me in welcoming Susan.

Are there any additional comments for the good of the University?
ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kulikowich: Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor please, say aye. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until October 21, 2014.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.