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Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 15, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Mohamad Ansari, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Ansari: Good Afternoon, Everyone. As we begin the new academic year, I want to take a moment to welcome all of you to our first Senate meeting. We have a busy year planned, with important work to consider. I wish to express my deep appreciation to those senators who began working on Senate business this summer. These Colleagues took time away from family, research and other activities and devoted that time to the work of this body. For that I am most grateful.

The April 28, 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 this document?

Seeing none, may I hear a motion to accept?

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Second?

Senators: Second.

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed, say nay. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The minutes of the April 28 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Ansari: The Senate Curriculum Report of August 25, 2015, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETINGS OF JUNE 30 AND AUGUST 25, 2015

Chair Ansari: Minutes from the June 30 and August 25, 2015 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.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Ansari: Out of courtesy to our presenters and your fellow senators, please turn off your cell phones and pagers at this time.
President Barron has invited me to serve in a liaison role on the President’s Health Care Advisory Committee. Please send your suggestions or concerns to maa4@psu.edu.

The "2014–2015 Faculty Benefits Report on Faculty Salaries,"(Appendix O on the March 17, 2015 Senate Agenda), has been returned to the Senate Archives and is posted on the Senate Website.

Under Standing Rules, Article I, "The Chair of the Senate shall appoint Special Committees to consider subjects not already assigned to Standing Committees of the Senate." In order to address several important topics that fall outside of the Standing Committee’s structure, I have appointed three Special Senate Committees, and two Joint Administration Committees. These Special Committees have been charged to implement General Education Reform, to implement LionPATH, to assess the First-Year Engagement Plan, to undertake a review of issues related to Cultural and Diversity Awareness, and to explore issues related to the First-Year Students’ Well-being and Safety, respectively. The Special Committees will be submitting Forensic, Legislative, and or Advisory and Consultative Reports to the Senate during the 2015-16 academic year.

Also, I have re-appointed the Special Committee on University Governance, which was established in 2012 and chaired by past Senate Chair John Nichols. For more information on the Six Special Committees, please visit the Senate website.

Now, I would like to recognize Retired Senator and Past Senate Chair John Moore, who is Chairing the Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform. Thank you, John.

**John Moore, Retired Senator:** The Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform thanks Senate Chair Mohamad Ansari for this opportunity to bring you up to date today on the nature and purpose of a survey that we will soon be sending to each member of the Faculty Senate and to others as well.

Our Special Committee was charged last May to implement Recommendation #6 of last Spring’s General Education report. That recommendation, as approved by this body on April 28, 2015, adds an Integrative Studies requirement to General Education. It reads in part: “(a) Require 6 credits of Integrative Studies as part of the General Education Baccalaureate requirement; (b) create inter-domain courses as a way for students to accomplish the Integrative Studies requirement; (c) create linked courses as a way to offer the Integrative Studies component.” We set about our implementation task on June 2nd, and we soon discovered that, before we could create clear criteria for inter-domain and linked courses, we had first to update the descriptions for the domains themselves.

Last Spring, working groups had been appointed to suggest revisions to the current descriptions and criteria for seven categories within General Education: the Skills area, now called Foundations, consisting of Writing and Speaking (GWS) and Quantification (GQ); and the Knowledge Domains, consisting of Arts (GA), Humanities (GH), Health and Wellness as it is now called (GHW), Natural Science (GN), and Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS). Each of the seven working groups submitted its suggestions last Spring; other suggestions have since been added. The Special Committee now wants to open up this process to a larger audience by sending the current draft out to colleagues for their further input.
Why does it matter that we revise the existing domain criteria descriptions now and get them right? There are two principal reasons:

First, the recommendations approved by the Senate last Spring will require that Gen Ed courses be assessment ready. Updating the domain descriptions will make our courses more assessable. The stress on assessment, corresponding to recommendations of the Middle States accreditation process, is a new feature within General Education, and it needs to be included as the new Integrative Studies category becomes implemented. The existing domain descriptions, last revised in the 1990s, need a new look in other respects as well.

Second, the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs will soon be reviewing courses for alignment with the new General Education Learning Objectives that were also mandated last Spring. Domain criteria are a critical first point of review for the new Inter-Domain and Linked Course pathways that were mandated in April. Therefore, this is a crucial time to update the domain descriptions.

For these reasons, we turn to you for your assistance. We need your advice and support. Within the next few weeks, we will send each of you a survey that will be distributed by the Penn State Survey Research Center with funding provided by the support of Provost Jones. That survey will contain seven sections, one for each of the seven General Education domains. You will see the existing General Education statement for that domain side by side with the proposed revision. Is the proposed revision better? Can it be made better yet? We ask you to let us know.

Specifically, the survey will ask you to compare the old and the new domain statements and then to answer one of three questions: 1) Do you support the proposed new version? or 2) Do you wish to suggest a further revision? If so, there will be a text box in which you can write down your suggested version, or 3) Do you want to reject the proposed new version? If so, there will be a text box where you can explain why.

As arranged by Associate Vice-President Edmondson, the Survey Research Center will compile the results and prepare a numerical tally that will be available to you. The Special Committee will consider all the written comments. On the basis of what you tell us, a final version of the proposed domain descriptions will be brought back to the Senate to be voted on later in the Senate year.

In addition to all senators, we are also sending the survey to all department heads and other unit heads, such as division heads, and to several thousand full-time faculty who have taught a Gen Ed course within the past three years. These colleagues will speak from recent Gen Ed experience.

The survey will be arriving before the end of the month. We are counting on you to give us your counsel. Thank you from all members of the Special Committee.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Sir. Next, I would like to recognize Past Senate Chair John Nichols, who is chairing the Special Committee on University Governance.

John Nichols, retired faculty member and 2001-2002 Senate Chair: Thank you, Chair Ansari. I, like John Moore, am here to ask for your assistance, for your input. The Special Committee on University Governance was appointed as a key response to the events of November 2011. The charge of the committee was to examine University governance with special attention to the structure and operation of
the Board of Trustees; to also look at any communications breakdowns that might have contributed to the issues.

The special committee's report and recommendation was approved by this body in March of 2013, unanimously, I might add. And, given the interest and the importance of the issue and the particular emphasis this body placed on that report with its unanimous vote, Chair Ansari thought it was important to update the Senate on the disposition of the various recommendations.

The one that, of course, got the most attention was the highest profile. Certainly not the only, and maybe not even the most important was the appointment of an academic trustee to the Board of Trustees. But there were other extremely important recommendations in there. And so we will update the report and report to you on the disposition of the various recommendations.

What I'm asking you to do is for new senators to read the report. It's now on the Senate website. Or if you're a continuing senator to maybe go back and at least read the executive summary. It's a quick two page executive summary, if you don't want to wade through the whole report. And based on that, a lot of water has gone over the dam since the report.

And any recommendations, input, advice you have for the committee about things that we may have gotten wrong, things that we need to change, amend, update, perhaps add, things that we missed, we would greatly appreciate your advice from the senators and the university community at large. And there's a link on the Senate website that allows you to offer those comments.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Sir.

John Nichols: Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Please join me in thanking Past Senate Chairs John Moore and John Nichols for their many years of great service to our Senate.

The National Science Foundation has awarded the Office of Engineering Diversity in the College of Engineering a five-year, $1.7 million grant titled, “Sustainable Bridges from Campus to Campus: Retention Models for Transitioning Underrepresented Engineering Students.” The Principal Investigator of the project is Amy Freeman, Assistant Dean of Engineering Diversity at University Park. The co-principal investigators are: Pradip Bandyopadhyay, Division Head of Science, Penn State Berks; Ann Schmiedekamp, Division Head of Science and Engineering, Penn State Abington; and Peter Shull, Associate Professor of Engineering, Penn State Altoona. Congratulations to these colleagues on receiving funding to improve retention rates of underrepresented engineering students.

Now, it is my pleasure to introduce:

My fellow Senate officers: Chair-Elect Jim Strauss; Secretary Laura Pauley; and Immediate Past Chair Jonna Kulikowich, who is in the audience. Our Parliamentarian, Past Senate Chair, and Senator Larry Backer.
Our Academic Trustee, Dr. David Han. Trustee Han was selected as the preferred candidate by the Senate in April and appointed by the Board in May, as the first Academic Member of the University’s Board of Trustees. Thank you, David, for your willingness to assume this important role.

Now, I would like to introduce the Leadership of our 15 Standing Committees and the Special Committees. Please stand to be recognized. As you are aware, much of the work of the Senate is accomplished by these committees. Please join me in applauding these colleagues for their significant contributions to our senate.

Next, I am pleased to introduce the 2015-16 administrative fellows: Rebecca Cianci, Human Resources Manager for Smeal College of Business, is mentored by Vice President Susan Basso; Madhavi Kari, Director of the Office of Career Solutions and Corporate Engagement for the College of Information Sciences and Technology, is mentored by Vice President Damon Sims; and Binh Le, Associate Librarian and Head of Reference for Penn State Abington, is mentored by Executive Vice President and Provost Nick Jones.

Last but not least, I wish to introduce a new member of the Senate Staff, Cortney Smith, who joined the Senate office on August 3 as Curriculum Recorder. Cortney came to us from the Department of Physics. Please join me in welcoming Cortney to our Senate.

This fall the Senate officers will visit seven Commonwealth Campuses: DuBois on September 29, New Kensington and Greater Allegheny on October 8, Great Valley on October 20, Abington and Brandywine on October 23, and Harrisburg on November 3.

A report on the Officers’ visits will be presented to the Senate in January.

On October 20, the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence and the Schreyer Honors College are hosting a conference titled, Transformative Teaching and Learning. The conference will be held at the Penn Stater. The purpose of the conference is to showcase what Penn State faculty are doing that is truly transformative when it comes to teaching and learning. Conference details and registration information can be found on the Schreyer Institute’s website.

At the August 25 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following Informational Reports on the Senate Agenda and website only: 1) The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities’ Annual Report for 2014-2015; and 2) The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics’ Annual Report of Academic Eligibility and Athletic Scholarships for 2014-2015. These reports will not be discussed at today’s meeting. For response by the appropriate Committee Chair, please send your questions or comments to senate@psu.edu.

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 sheet. As a reminder to senators joining today’s meeting by Mediasite, we are using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Instructions for using this voting system are posted on the Senate website. Please log in at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate now.
COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Barron discussed several topics. He expressed the value of the Academic Trustee position to bring the academic mind, voice, and values to discussions in the Board of Trustees. He spoke about the parallels between the strategic plan that is under development and the plans for the next capital campaign. Food, water, and energy security will be major thrusts, along with digital innovation. Key emphasis areas will be discovery, excellence, and community and he stressed the importance of global engagement. Several senators asked questions on issues ranging from the alignment of the strategic plan with the legislature’s priorities to the value of a Penn State undergraduate education and the relationship between funds garnered through campus development activities and expenditure of those funds at campuses.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Provost Jones announced Andrew Sears, the new Dean of the College of Information Sciences and Technology, has been appointed to serve also as the interim Chief Information and Security Officer in the new Office of Information Security. The new office will be separate from Information Technology Services (ITS) and will include Security Operations and Services, which was formerly part of ITS. The Office of Information Security will have an advisory committee of faculty and staff. He spoke about 2-factor authentication, which will soon be implemented into web access. He announced the hiring of Lance Kennedy-Phillips as the first Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment. The Provost addressed the concerns expressed about compliance with AD-35. He also reviewed the history of Facilities and Administrative rates, how they are determined, and their impact on the University and faculty research programs. Provost Jones responded to questions from Senators regarding the assessment of programs and General Education, challenges associated with email access when using 2-factor authentication, and security of information technology.

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Ansari: The first Forensic Business item, which appears as Appendix C in the Agenda, is from the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force. Committee Chair Backer will make a few comments and I will then open the floor for discussion. Twenty minutes is allocated for presentation and discussion.

Larry Backer, Penn State Law: I want to thank you all for your patience. I will speak very briefly. I'd rather hear from you. And, indeed, I want to suggest to you that that is the tune that we hope to be able to operationalize as the committee continues its work.

I'm going to do three things. I'm going to spend a minute describing what we're going to do and how we've organized ourselves to do it. I'm going to then introduce the questions which perhaps will be a framework around which we're going to have the discussion to the extent that you're all willing to have a discussion.

We'll get there. And then the third thing is perhaps to take those questions as a framing item and then to use it to work through that thing. I'll spend just a little bit of time going through my sense of that thing, and perhaps we can do the discussion around that.
This is intended to be an open-ended discussion. I know you're used to being managed into a particular sort of pattern. There's a ritual to these things that I sometimes find excruciating, but we're also trained in it. I was criticized for actually trying to break that in suggesting an open-ended meeting. There's no right answers. There's nothing but the need, the request for input so that we do not wind up coming back to you in March with some prepackaged thing that looks great because we've been looking at a mirror and talking to ourselves and then all of a sudden you all get engaged.

Again, we're looking for input. We're looking for data. Ultimately what we would like to do is not to do this in these little rituals of meetings, but to be able to develop an ongoing discourse through the website that we hope we will be able to create, which will be the Gen Ed website plus, if we can do that.

Briefly, the committee was charged. We've got six charges which I thought we could break up into three broad categories. The first I've called a very technical category. We're going to look at the way in which diversity can be embedded in our courses and course structures. To that end I've got a subcommittee that will be working on those issues, especially IL courses and Gen Ed courses. They'll be working with the Gen Ed Implementation Committee and the like.

This one should be fairly straightforward. Diversity, diversity issues, pedagogy content blend together, where, how, how often, and we will report to you on that from time to time, hopefully starting in December. The second one is a little more interesting to our administrative friends than to you, but it impacts all of your lives in one way or another. What we're going to try to do is look at the framework for diversity, which is the writings around which we tend to have conversations about these things to the extent we have conversations.

We're going to look at the institutional structures around which we practice or we perform diversity as an institutional matter, and see if we can't think through both the framework and the institutional context in which it's delivered. In large institutions like this, these kinds of things tend to be a cancer rather than an orderly ecosystem.

We're hoping to avoid the metastasis of stuff that may have no relation to each other and see if we can't develop something that approaches coherence; we'll see. Then the third is our biggest and most open ended, and one in which I hope you all will participate most strenuously.

This is the “let's pretend that we aren't bound by our own prejudices.” By that I don't mean what you think I mean. I mean the prejudices that have accrued over 30, 40, 50, 80, 1,000 years-- however old you are-- which have now become kind of the way you look at things, and see if you can envision the kinds of changes or activities that we can do that would actually, in a more forward-looking way, embed diversity; naturalize it within the cultures and practices of the University. With that I hope that we will be able to present a large enough set of recommendations. You're going to hate some of them. You're going to love some of them. You're going to think some of them are absolutely out of their minds, but then you're thinking in the past. We're looking into the future, and then we hope to present them both to you and to our administrative friends.

Hopefully you will, from time to time as you choose to the extent that all of a sudden it makes sense to you, use them as a resource. So that's sort of what we're going to try to do. The last two, we hope to begin to deliver a product to you in March and April. Before that, there will be extensive consultations and hopefully you will respond to our offers to consult.
You'll be seeing us more and more often. Of course, one of the problems with diversity is that I, like a special creature, I'll come up and you'll see me once a year, and then I'll disappear. I will be more present in your consciousness as we work through things so that you can begin to feel to perform this embedding in the course of your work here in the Senate and in your daily life, including our administrative friends who I'm going to invite on this journey with us and who I will assess in the same way that I will assess my staff and faculty colleagues and as relentlessly-- and those of you who know me will know I'm quite capable of doing that.

The questions. Three questions. Diversity-- what is it? And curiously, when you go through all of this, that's the one question we don't answer. We don't approach. We don't like to approach. Let's think it through as we work through this. What is diversity? Second one. What is your role? This is the Faculty Senate. You guys are driving this thing. What is your role in all of this. Everyone's got a role. What do you contribute? What is your value added to this? What is your role placed either as subject or as object of this exercise. Then the third one is, of course, how should diversity issues be incorporated-- this is a very specific one-- into General Education.

Hopefully that will help frame, what is this thing? This is the University's-- this is the fifth version, if I remember correctly, (right, Marcus?) the fifth version of our effort to produce a statement on diversity. The most interesting thing about this-- I went through this actually and you're welcome to do that. I'm not going to do this. It's a collection of verbs.

You've got one operative verb that sets up the principal with respect to which everything else has to be considered. You may or may not like that operative verb; I'm not sure I do. You've got three dependent verbs. You set out the standards that will be the subject of the principal. You've got then three sub-dependent verbs which are the policies that are to come out of these standards, and then you end with five operational verbs which are those things at the bottom, which suggest the implementation-- specific focuses of implementation-- of these things that came before, which is very interesting.

We've got one, three, three, and five. Those are the things we're going to do. What is it that we're supposed to do with all of this thing? Well, the only thing we're supposed to do is strive. I like to strive myself. I should do it more often. I don't. All right, so Penn State University is going to strive.

What's it going to strive to do? It's going to strive to do all of this other stuff. Is that what we should be doing? Should we be striving or should we substitute a different verb? I'd like to hear you, and what are we striving to do? We're striving to do three things.

One is we're going to strive to be fully committed and accountable that we'll be a work in progress. Mercifully, we've hired more people to help us do this. So we're going to strive to be committed and accountable. We're going to strive to embrace differences. And then we're going to strive to create a culture. Now, how are we going to strive to create a culture? Well, we're going to do this in three different ways.

We're going to strive to create a culture through support of a bunch of things through leveraging a bunch of things and then by engaging individuals to reach their highest potential in perhaps a new and interesting way, working your way up back from policies and standards of principle.
All right, that's what we're going to do. Pause, and then these five things come. What are these five things? Well, they're five operational things. We're going to create an environment of respect and inclusion. Actually, we're going to strive to create an environment of respect and inclusion.

We're going to educate you all-- staff and students. We're going to educate you to be social justice advocates-- I'm not sure what that means, you may be able to help me figure that out-- by providing a bunch of things. For your purposes, curriculum and programs and environments that reflect some things. We're then going to ensure access. Well, that one we're going to have do given our recent legal discussion, but we're going to do this now in a more open way.

We're going to then advance and build a workforce by assessing, hiring, and practice. The last thing we're going to do is we're going to address intergroup disparities, representation retention, learning outcomes, and graduation rates. If this is what we're going to do, then this becomes the central animating structure around which our committee and our University processes for diversity will be realized.

So what do you think about all of this? It's a mouthful but there it is.

Chair Ansari: The floor is now open for discussion. Are there any questions?

Christian Brady, Dean, Schreyer Honors College: Informational question. Where did this statement come from? I've tried to search our website and find it and I don't see it anywhere as an official statement in the University.

Larry Backer: It's a draft.

Christian Brady: Oh, so this is the draft of the new one? OK. That's really important to know.

Larry Backer: I want to thank Marcus, because it really is quite risky to take a draft and share it with everyone, but that's the kind of thing we're striving for, this kind of transparency. I'm extraordinarily grateful for doing this. I hope that what we wind up talking about may be helpful to you as you work through this.

Christian Brady: I just feel confident there will be some recommendations and advice on that first sentence. That's pretty long.

President Barron: I don't have a question, but in terms of thinking about this, as someone who wrote one of the Framework for Diversity plans, I was surprised to see that the first part of a critique of a college or campus plan was whether they had a good definition.

The thought that 15 years after we started this process we're arguing about definitions worries me a great deal. I thought that one should be one where we know what that definition is and we're not sitting there talking to a campus about their definition, we're talking about what they're doing.

It initially, as I remember, didn't say strive. I was worried that there was no way for the institution to say we are all fully committed, because my belief is there will always be someone who's not. Pennsylvania State University is fully committed to and accountable for, it seemed as if we couldn't achieve that. Kind of a sad thought, but at any rate, I want you to know in my view where the strive came from.
Two, I will toss in my own two cents here. In the view of create, educate, ensure, advance, I haven't been convinced we're asking the right questions of what it is that we want to do. Those things are really important to me. But I wonder the way we phrase it might often really change how it is we do; whether we lean to the counting and assessment mode or whether we lean into an active mode. What does it mean if everybody thinks it's their job to promote diversity rather than this being the job of some faculty members and some offices?

Do you say this institution will be the fertile ground at which a PhD starts for all types of people? Having that as a goal yields a very different operational process that wraps around a definition and a set of topics. I hope that in the process of also saying what we'll do and what we will be like, we don't lose sight of whether or not we are setting the goals and asking the questions that actually will define programs as opposed to a mechanism of counting an assessment.

**Thomas Brown, Abington:** Yes. Good afternoon. First of all I would like to say thank you very much for adding me to this committee. The thing of it is I became aware of it that I was added this morning. I'm not fully surprised at that. The thing of it is, I agree with President Barron that we do need to-- I'm glad I'm on a committee, because anyone who knows me knows that I like to break things down. And we will be able to find the wording to be very, very specific, which may upset some people, but that's too bad, because I've been here for 26 years and I've experienced a lot of things.

I was here as an undergraduate. I got a BA and a master's degree from this institution, and it was extremely difficult; extremely difficult. I'm not going to go into that. In fact, when we have our first meeting that I'm invited, and I will be there, I'll express some of my feelings about what approach we need.

And, again, thank you very much for putting me on the committee and taking up your time. Thank you.

**Jamie Myers, Education:** I'm going to take up Larry's invitation for brainstorming. Forensics is where we share ideas about diversity. For me, diversity includes all differences. All differences. As a teacher, what that means for me is two activities in which to engage diversity.

The first of those is uncovering our assumptions. Uncovering our hidden values that frame the way we interpret things we see. Not just people, but our disciplinary areas of knowledge. So it is in interrogating those underlying values, trying to uncover those, explicate those.

That's one activity for me in my classes with my students. The second one that follows on that is to identify and name situations. The consequences of diversity. The consequences of difference. The things that have to do with power, with marginalization, with belonging. All right?

Those are two key activities that are important in my classrooms as a teacher when it comes to enacting diversity.

**Michael Berube, Liberal Arts:** I just want to plunge into the definition question. I don't have anything to say about the verbs. It has been my experience, most recently on the Disability Awareness Task Force, that disability is the thing that gets dropped out of diversity even though, especially ensuring equitable and inclusive access and building our workforce are directly relevant to students with physical disabilities, mild intellectual disabilities.
This came to me semester after semester. We came up against not only the matter of putting this in the rhetoric of task force and memos, but also in the question of what constitutes a reasonable accommodation in the classroom. We found a lot of faculty members really behaved as if the ADA stopped with their classroom door, even when there was an accommodation very mild for people with cerebral palsy, people with carpal tunnel, people with arthritis, people with mild dyslexia. I'd like the folks to just keep that in mind. Thanks a lot.

**Tramble Turner, Abington:** I am a member of the task force and the chair of Educational Equity and Campus Environment, a committee which is listed as serving as a resource for the task force, and a committee that invites all present to continue this discussion with us.

In terms of the president's remarks, one of the things that our committee talked about today were other remarks that the President made this Spring at a Senate meeting about such items as geographic diversity. Definitions, indeed, do seem to matter; Professor Berube just brought up disabilities.

One other item the committee talked about that I would encourage you to think about-- maybe I can leave you 30 seconds to respond to-- if you go to the Affirmative Action Office site, you have one definition of protected categories. Many of us who have been commission chairs take that to be protected categories, one definition of diversity.

One of our committee members writing the draft report on diversity among the administration points out the difference between diversity and other ways of talking about advancing, let's say, areas or populations less represented. Look at state, federal, county by county, Hazleton versus Philadelphia definitions of affirmative action or of diversity.

There's a lot of murk there, and it can tie into what I believe President Barron just brought up again. Ultimately, what resources are needed where, and how are they tied to how we view the definition of diversity.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. Thank you all very much for your participation. Time has expired. You can send your additional comments to lcb11@psu.edu. Thank you, Larry.

The second Forensic Business item, which appears as Appendix D in the Agenda, is from the Special Committee on the Implementation of LionPATH. Committee Chair David Babb, Director of Project LionPATH Michael Busges, and University Registrar Robert Kubat will make a few remarks and I will then open the floor for discussion. Twenty minutes is allocated for presentation and discussion.

**Michael Busges, Director of Project LionPATH:** With me are Robert Kubat-- who is our University Registrar and also a senator and chair of the LionPATH steering committee, and David Babb who chairs the Special Committee of the LionPATH Implementation. I want to thank Chair Ansari for instituting this important committee right at the beginning of his tenure. Thank you.

Before we open up for questions we would like to talk a little bit about the timeline of LionPATH to remind you, and also a few concerns that were brought to our attention when we were invited to this forensic session, and then we will open it up for questions and we'll be glad to answer all questions that you may have.
Can you go to the next slide? It's just five slides. So this is the timeline. Everything remains to be geared to full implementation, a full switch to the new system by Fall 2016. Between now and then we will roll out new functions as they are needed for Fall 2016.

It's very important to keep in mind that this is a phased roll out. We will be in the old system, ISIS, and in parallel, the new system, LionPATH, the entire academic year that has just started. Some functions will be in the old system and others will be transitioned into the new system.

The good news is, if you see this red arrow there that's always moving further to the right and also getting bigger-- and I don't know why but it's moving to the right, I have to be more scared, I don't know. So for one month we are live with admissions. Admissions for fall '16 is now in the new LionPATH system.

Two weeks ago we went live with the undergrad admissions; one month ago with graduate admissions. We now have more than 3,000 applications in the new system for Fall '16. Also already converted into the new system are 4.3 million bio demo records, including yours, everybody's in here. And they will be kept in sync for one year between the new systems.

We converted 170,000 courses from the old system into the new system, and 430,000 classes dating back to 2000. In the coming weeks, schedulers will begin in the departments, and colleges will begin building the schedule for the Fall 2016. That's the next step of transitioning because we are already thinking about the schedule for Fall '16.

Today we converted transfer articulation rules for 60 institutions from which we receive the most transfer requests. There's functionality that will make articulation and processing of transfer credits much easier than it is now. For most faculty and students, the new system will become real next March when pre-registration and advising will take place for the Fall of 2016.

At that point, we will roll out the new faculty and student self-service functions, including a new degree audit. We will implement all policy changes currently before the Senate at this point. And one of them is on the docket for later today. Later next year we will roll out improved advising tools such as advising notes, advising appointment scheduling, and early progress reports.

The last piece of the puzzle then will be at the end of the next Fall semester 2016, when the grading procedures by all faculty will be done for the first time in the new system, which will probably also coincide with the roll-out of Canvas for the entire campus.

I just mentioned policy changes, so I'll turn it over to David for two minutes to talk a little bit about the policy changes that the special committee has been debating.

David Babb, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I just wanted to briefly talk about the workflow of this special committee. You'll probably see me every Senate meeting this year with various pieces of legislation, but we've been working all summer. We meet about twice a month to talk about policies.

Basically what happens is from one of either the LionPATH Steering Committee or the Faculty Advisory Committee or the Advisers Advisory Committee they make recommendations about policies that need to be changed. We look at the advice, we draft changes in policy, we send that policy out for consultation
from UE, ARSSA, and Curricular Affairs. They provide comment; we come back, and we incorporate those comments where possible.

Then we send it back out to those three committees for approval. Then once it's approved it comes before Senate. We have a lot of consultation that we go through before you see it on the floor. You can see some of the policies that we have waiting 34-60, which is Prerequisites before the Senate today. Then we're going to be bringing some of these others in the next couple Senate meetings.

**Michael Busges:** Concurrent with the invitation a few questions were already presented to us. I'll be brief and I'll go over them. As David mentioned, prerequisite checking is on the docket for today. LionPATH has the ability to check prerequisites at the time of registration, something the University has been looking for for a long time. You don't have to catch violators once they are three weeks into the semester and you realize they don't have the prerequisites. At the time of registration, the new system has the ability to block the registration of those students. We identified four disciplines that are piloting or are early adapting this functionality concurrent with the spring registration for Fall 2016.

Next March, those are Math, IST, Nursing, and David's Department of Meteorology. The long term recommendation in the policy that you will be asked to approve later on is to establish a two-tiered system of prerequisite checking where colleges and departments will have to decide whether their prerequisites are truly hard prerequisites, that will be enforced in the system at the time of registration, or not.

To provide for consistency for the students, the course catalog would have to indicate the two different levels of enforcement. The timeline for this rendition has not been established and we'll work on that once we get the approval; course attributes and course suffixes.

LionPATH delivers functionality that will allow us to reduce the dependency on course suffixes; H, Z, K, and so on and so forth. Of course, attributes will be used to indicate General Education courses, Bachelor of Arts requirements and also Honors courses. There will be an attribute attached to it, not necessarily the suffix anymore.

Another function that is in the new system is what is called course topics. Courses that have a generic title can then be identified by what the specific topic for the course is. In German literature you would have the course, Topics in German Literature. In one year, you would have Goethe, the next year would have Kafka, and then the third you would have Schiller.

That's the thought behind it. You wouldn't need the suffixes anymore. The last and third issue that I'd like to talk about, and we have brought two examples here, just examples of it, is the concern that was raised by some senators and faculty members about new terminology introduced by the LionPATH system.

I believe the concern is mainly around what faculty and students will see on the screen. We've brought two examples, one from the student center. Here is, for instance, just an example a student's program would be indicated as a career. With the undergrad there are five careers, Undergrad would be one of them. The program on the undergrad side is roughly equivalent to the college.
Then the major would be biology here. The system as purchased displays credits as units. There were some concerns about this vernacular being changed. Let me say one thing up front. I do understand the concern about the software system dictating a change of time-honored vernacular.

When I participated in my first implementation in 1999 at a different institution, I was a member of the faculty there and was brought onto the project to ensure the academic integrity of the system. I was as unhappy as some of you are with the vernacular changes and made that very clear.

In the 16 years since then-- that was 1999, oh, it's a long time ago-- I've learned through participation in several of those implementation projects, as well as witnessing what other institutions do that it is not a good idea to modify the system to accommodate for institution-specific vernacular, and here are a few of the reasons.

First of all, we've learned from other institutions that the vernacular and the interaction between student faculty and advisers will not change. Credits will be credits, semester will be semesters, and majors will be majors in your interaction when you meet with the students and how you talk about things.

To change the system to have all these terms display on every screen would entail costly and intrusive customizations that we would have to carry forward in perpetuity with every upgrade and bundle that we apply. Institutions who have done so ultimately regretted that decision because it stays with them forever. The underlying database, in one technical sense, contains more than 10,000 tables of data and code and thousands of configuration files that would have to be changed. Some of them are encrypted. That content would not be searchable at best and complicate those customizations further.

The team's recommendation would be that we do not customize the system at this point but keep this concern on our radar and on our post-production enhancement list. Should these issues remain after 1 year, we can definitely revisit the topic.

So, again, I do understand the concern. As I said, I've been there, too, but I assure you that it's really not a good practice to start modifying the nomenclature at this point. So that's all that we have prepared, and we'll open it for questions.

Chair Ansari: We are now open for discussion, comments, or questions.

Ira Saltz, Shenango: I presume with the prerequisite checking that if a student is trying to register for a class and they're taking the prerequisite now at the time of registration that that will count. Now, will the system go back and recheck that that student actually passed or completed the prerequisite again then when the semester begins?

Michael Busges: The answer to the first part of your question is yes. The system assumes that if you're taking a course concurrent while you're registering for the follow up course, that you will pass the course with a sufficient grade. The second part, it doesn't do it automatically, although there are reports that you can run to catch the violators later on, and then we can decide what to do. There's actually a functionality that you can automatically disenroll the student from the class.

I don't think we want to go there because that may have impact on financial aid and other things, as well. Or you just generate a report that tells you which students did not. It does not bring everything in. If you
take, for instance, of course at another institution, obviously the system doesn't know, but there will be exceptions. Exceptions will have to be processed. We're working with Meteorology and others on how to operationalize, how to process these exceptions that there will be.

There's always a student taking another course or for whatever reasons needs the prerequisite waived. That's why the department's and colleges will have to look very carefully. You don't want to enforce a prerequisite that you're not enforcing. Then you have long lines in front of your door. Everybody needs an override. Well, last year everybody was let in. Well, not anymore, but you don't want to be in that situation.

Rajarajan Subramanian, Harrisburg: We have problems always with the transfer of credits. When we tried to do that, we compare with the syllabus. First of all, we send it to the proper faculty to check it and back and forth, and if you could include it in the software, that would be great.

Michael Busges: I don't want to go too deep into this. But, as I mentioned, first of all, in the system, the processing of transfer credits is much enhanced and it is now a legacy system. We had to go through an exercise. I don't know how many of you were involved in this, but we asked many departments and colleges to look at their prerequisites at their transfer articulations because Penn State had a tendency to not articulate courses to specific Penn State courses.

You have to say English 400 from Shippensburg is English 375 here. You can't just say it's something. We had to go through that exercise. Now once it's in the database, you actually can do it by program. For the feeder schools you can just say this student comes from this and that community college, put all the courses in, it automatically transfers all these courses.

We have not built that for every school, but have a good base. There should be some efficiencies and enhancements for you. New courses, of course, will still have to be evaluated by the faculty, and occasional review has to be done.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: How does it work for the prerequisite checking for courses where the prerequisite isn't a course but it's a placement? For example, in math courses and in chemistry courses. Also between the soft and the hard prerequisite checks, how does it work when some locations-- or even within a location-- some faculty have one idea versus another idea on how many of the prerequisites to actually enforce? Will that be done at the level of the instructor that has taught the course, the level of the campus, or will there be a single decision for the entire University?

Michael Busges: Well, we will need the Senate's guidance on that. I think most important is that there's some consistency. It has to be articulated in the course catalog, so the student has to know where it is. The recommendation would be to do it on a departmental level at least, but that's a prerogative. I think that needs to be worked out. I don't think it's the instructor, because the instructor changes.

Roger Egolf: What does departmental mean when different campuses are not part of the same departments that teach the same course?

David Babb: That has to be worked out. I mean, I think that probably what's going to happen is that the departments across the campuses are going to have to talk about what they consider a prerequisite for a given course.
**Michael Busges:** I mean, I think the first analysis has to be, are we enforcing these prerequisites now? You may be thinking you are enforcing them from experience, and if you look at the real numbers, then who really got eventually in to the scores that the students have, you may think there's a much higher number of students who have the prerequisites than actually end up in the course.

**Roger Egolf:** Well, some of us actually go through the student's transcripts one by one to make sure. Because in the current system there is no automatic checking.

**Michael Busges:** If you enforce it you will not have to do that anymore.

**Roger Egolf:** Right. If the system is set up to do it. But my most important consideration there was how will the placement levels, especially for math and chemistry, be put into that system since it's not really checking a course it's checking a placement test result.

**Michael Busges:** I do believe-- and I will check that for you-- that we can do that. That placement scores can be used as prerequisites, as can many, many other things-- major, standing, grades, grade average. We can make this as complicated as we want. You can use them as gateways, if you want, but we don't want to go there initially.

**Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts:** This is a question related to General Education. I have heard that when courses are listed on the new Schedule of Courses website there'll be a text box so that we will be able to specify with more than the 18 digits that we have now. We will be able to specify how courses are related to other courses. For example, how they may be linked in General Education.

**Michael Busges:** I'll have to take that question with me. As I said, we will be able to use course attributes for indicating which General Education requirement can be fulfilled by a certain course. I don't know if that's something that would come from the Bulletin or from the Blue Book. I would have to look into that. If you give me the information or someone from the team, I'll get back to you.

**Margaret Meloy, Business:** Can you tell me how cross-listed classes-- so a psych class and another class that is taught by the same professor but it fulfills two different requirements.

**Michael Busges:** Well, the system has a robust functionality to account for cross-listed courses. I mean, that's in there. I'm not sure how we have set that up in the course catalog, but I'll get you the specific answer to that, as well. I mean, that's been talked about and there is a specific function in the course catalog how to cross list courses. I'm not sure if you have a specific concern with it. It will be in there, I'll have to look into that.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you all very much for your discussions and presentation. Michael, David, and Bob.

Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer Regis Becker will present the next Forensic Business item, which appears as Appendix E in the Agenda. Regis will make a few comments and I will then open the floor for discussion. Joining Regis is Sandra Weaver, Youth Programs Compliance Specialist. Fifteen minutes is allocated for presentation and discussion.

**Regis Becker, Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone. You'll recall that last semester we were here to talk about a new Pennsylvania law regarding
background checks, particularly on faculty that has affected us. There was, at that time, a lot of uncertainty both around the bill and its implementation.

I'm happy to report that we have had some amendments to the bill passed this summer; you've probably seen the headlines. They have dialed back what I think were some of the unintended consequences that really caused us some headaches. There are still some things that we need to clarify, though, and so we thought we would take this forensic time to have Sandy Weaver, our Youth Protection Specialist, explain where the current status is of the bill and its implementation at Penn State.

Let me thank you, first of all, for your patience in working through this with us. It has been quite a journey from the first announcement that we had in November that this was going to take effect January 1, and then through the next six months when we worked with the Government Affairs Office, the President's Office, and I'd like to thank Sandy for her diligence in working with the legislature and all the folks that were involved in this to bring it to, I think, a little bit more manageable place. Let me have Sandy go through the current state and then we'll take any questions.

Sandra Weaver, Youth Programs Compliance Specialist: Thanks, Rege, and thanks for having me in today. I'm just going to go through a few slides today. There's a lot of information on the slides. I know you have them there in your packets, but I'll explain some of those. The first thing I want to talk about is the clearance requirements for current employees and what has stayed the same.

The timelines that they passed in the law last October and November stay the same. When they talk about current employees, they meant current employees at that time. So when we talk about current employees needing to have their clearances completed if it's applicable to you, it's by December 31 of this year.

Any new hires-- and they're talking about new hires as of January 1 of this year. It's very important to remember that these timelines stayed the same and what those definitions were and still are as far as the timing. So the requirements for new hires or those by December 31, still remain what we refer to as the three publicly available background clearances, which is the Pennsylvania Criminal, the Pennsylvania Child Abuse, and the FBI fingerprint.

The individuals that need to get these clearances are those people who are responsible for the care, supervision, guidance or control of children, or routine interaction with children. The one thing that we did press for and they did define is what “routine interaction” means. Routine interaction is the regular and repeated contact that's integral to a person's regular employment responsibilities.

This is for those people working with minors. The law defines a minor as anyone under the age of 18. What we did push for were some changes, and there were some exceptions that were passed on July 1. So, again, the school: by law Penn State became a school. We're all school employees, with the exception of those people who do not have routine interaction administrative or support personnel.

They also gave us a couple more exceptions to those people who would not need these clearances. Individuals whose direct contact with children in the course of employment is limited to matriculated students. What we explained to the state is we have a lot of college students who are matriculated who are under the age of 18.
The law now says that if you work with a matriculated student, you no longer are required to have these three background checks. However, you can see that the exception does not apply to those people who are working with dual enrolled students. This is one of the things, like Regis said, we have a couple things that we have to work through; we're working through on the identification of dual enrolled students.

Any person who works with a dual enrolled student is still required to have these three background checks. The other exception is for those people who are meeting with prospective students-- pre-college visits; if minors come on campus to visit. However, the key word there is “visiting” the minor is visiting campus. We have a lot of people, however, who go outside of campus to meet with minors, and therefore, they would still need to have those clearances.

They define matriculated student for us as a student who's enrolled in an institution of higher education and is pursuing a program of study which results in a post-secondary degree. Another big win that we feel was a big win was the beginning of the year when somebody got their clearances, it was only for the position that they had. We have many people who work in a high school who want to come here and work in our youth camps, or people who work both in a high school.

We have principals who are student teacher advisers. The clearances were not transferable, which the state calls “portable”, and people were getting their clearances as many as two or three times in a matter of a month. The law has changed and now the clearances are portable; if you have those three clearances we can accept them even if they were gained for employment somewhere else.

They're transferable from employment to employment, volunteer to volunteer, employment to volunteer. The one place they're not portable is volunteer to employment, and the reason being is the state also waived the fees for volunteers for two of the three. If someone is volunteering in the state of Pennsylvania, they no longer have to pay for Child Abuse or the PA Criminal.

Another thing that is not on this slide is that the clearances are now good for 60 months. Once someone is cleared, they're good to go for five years. If there's a break in service we're no longer requiring to go back and get the clearances again, but signing an affirmation that someone has not committed a crime in the last however long the break of service was.

We mentioned about dual enrollment. This is an excerpt from a memo that was sent on August 14 from Dr. Hanes and Dr. Jones to academic deans and chancellors. This is something we do need to work through. We have identified all of those students and all those faculty who are teaching those dual enrolled students for this semester. We do have a report. We sent out three reports. We sent the final one after the drop/add.

We do know who these students are and we know who's teaching them. One other point is that it's not just the faculty, but it's teaching assistants, it's tutors, it's counselors, anyone who's providing a support service to that dual enrolled student also needs to have their clearances.

In this memo it laid out a couple of options, but we do have a committee that's meeting, being led by Yvonne Gaudelius to look at how we can be proactive in knowing earlier because we didn't know until right up at the ninth, tenth hour of who was in these classes. We are working on that, trying to figure out
a way whether classes are limited, whether faculty when they're hired if they believe they're going to teach one of these classes, we have some statistics on what classes usually have dual enrolled students.

More to come on that. The last is that we always want to remind people that this did not go away in the law. That there are criminal penalties for those persons who are responsible for employment decisions if they intentionally do not have someone get the clearances.

That's a brief update on some of the changes. We feel a lot better about it. It's not quite as hectic. There are still some operational challenges we need to work through, but better than it was, we believe.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. The floor is now open for comments and discussion.

Matthew Wilson, Harrisburg: I am going to give you a hypothetical that a faculty member has not gone through the clearances and that a Gen Ed course opens up and that faculty member is in the last minute slated into that Gen Ed course. Whose responsibility is it to find out if there are any dual enrolled students in there?

Sandra Weaver: I think that this semester the list went out to the deans, the chancellors, HR reps, so it's going to have to be within the units a process of how we identify that. I thought you were going to ask about provisional hiring. If the faculty is not cleared we do have an issue, but I think that is one thing we need to add into our process of how to appoint people at the last minute like that.

Keefe Manning, Engineering: Some of our faculty are approached by high school students, not necessarily from the area but from other regions. They're asked to see if they can do a summer research program. Some of these faculty are looking at this as a way to do outreach as part of NSF grants. Could you just clarify that?

Sandra Weaver: Sure. We've worked with several faculty who are actually working with high school students. Here in State College we have some agreements with State High and we have a process and forms that get filled out and we work with the deans and the people within the program to make sure that the faculty are cleared.

This issue, we realized, is happening probably across all campuses and that's part of our meeting of identifying dual enrolled students, we're also going to build in processes for making sure that we have those people identified; what's the process if a faculty is approached?

Karen Peters, Liberal Arts: I was wondering if faculty can volunteer to get it done just in case or do we have to be told to get it done?

Sandra Weaver: No, I don't think we have any problems with people who want to get the clearance. If they want to go ahead and get it; it is being proactive and then you know. You know that people have it.

Michelle Frisco, Liberal Arts: I was wondering, has anybody talked about whether or not we can get the state to accept federal clearances? All these clearances are pretty time consuming and a lot of people in my unit were pretty surprised that the federal clearances don't count towards these requirements.
Sandra Weaver: Sure. When we visited with the state, we did talk about the different types of clearances. And they did not budge on the Pennsylvania Criminal and the PA Child Abuse. There is information that's in the Pennsylvania Child Abuse check that would not show up on some of the other national federal clearances that we have.

It's three portals, three different background checks, they know. I think they're still in discussions themselves with this.

Richard Singer, Altoona: I wonder if you could comment on casual contact with minors and whether if the parents are present if that makes a difference. I frequently meet with prospective engineering students who want to find out about different programs at Penn State Altoona or at Penn State in general. And sometimes I meet just with the students and sometimes I meet with them with their parents.

Sandra Weaver: And that's on campus? They're visiting you on campus?

Richard Singer: It's on campus in my office with the door open.

Sandra Weaver: Thank you. Yeah. So that was one of the exceptions. Individuals whose contact with children in the course of employment is with prospective students visiting a campus operated by the institution will not be required to have the three.

The key word is “visiting.” That's why I asked if it was on campus. If they're visiting you on campus, but if you're going out representing Penn State somewhere else, that would be a different story.

Richard Singer: So that would include a fair where prospective students are coming onto campus in large numbers, as well?

Sandra Weaver: Yes. But I appreciate the other precautions.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: To Karen's point, can you remind us what the costs are?

Sandra Weaver: Sure. The PA criminal and the PA Child Abuse, they have reduced from $10 to $8 each. And the FBI is $27, $25 I think. So around $45 to $47.

Esther Prins, Education: How do these clearances apply to faculty or adjuncts who are teaching exclusively online and never have face to face contact with students?

Sandra Weaver: The law talks about regular and repeated contact with minors. It does not talk about the mode of communication, whether it's in person or online. At this point, we're also considering online contact with minors integral to your role.

Chair Ansari: We have time for one more question.

Mike Krajsa, Lehigh Valley: If we have online, which I teach a lot of classes, how would we know they're 18? Who would tell us, under 18?
Sandra Weaver: Again, we distributed a list at the beginning of this semester to all deans, chancellors, HR reps that had all faculty, all students and the courses and whether they were some were coded World Campus online, it's all coded out. Yes, I would hope that they would tell you that you have a dual enrolled student in your class.

Chair Ansari: Thank you very much. Thank you, Regis and Sandy, for a great presentation.

University Ethics Officer Tim Balliett will present the final Forensic Business, which appears as Appendix F in the Agenda. Tim will make a few comments and I will then open the floor for discussion. Regis Becker will also be joining Tim. Fifteen minutes is allocated for presentation and discussion.

Regis Becker, Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Let me just make an introductory comment and thank Tim. This has been a long journey. I think it actually began in the Senate. I think Dean Brady, who is no longer directly involved, started it maybe four years ago I think we began talking about whether we should have a consolidated code of ethics, code of conduct, student honor code. From that discussion, from the initial work in the Senate it took on a life of its own.

Post scandal, if you will, there were a number of other initiatives that finally coalesced into the Penn State Values that were approved this summer by the President's Council, socialized with the Board earlier today for our forensic session to just get your input as to how we can better live those values, how we can demonstrate those values, and how we can articulate things you have control over.

I want to thank Tim for his yeoman's effort. He's done, as you'll hear, a tremendous amount of socializing on campuses and out to colleges, many, many groups, and has done a tremendous amount of work with the data that we've gleaned through the survey to get to the point we're at right now. So with that, I'll let Tim go through the statistical presentation.

Tim Balliet, University Ethics Officer: Thank you, Regis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to the Senate. It's hard to believe it's been a year since I was first here in front of the Senate to show the proposed values that we wanted to vet with the Penn State community. I'm happy to announce that we now have those values finalized, or perhaps not.

Thank you. We have values. They weren't articulated. Now they are. You can see behind me there have been some revisions since we first launched the proposed values. The six values themselves have remained the same. However, the wording of three has changed as a result of our socialization efforts.

Integrity, community, and responsibility. The wording has changed. What I would like to do this afternoon is discuss briefly the following two questions. Now that we have our values in place and returning full circle to where it began here in Faculty Senate, how can we incorporate the values through the academic life of the University? What practices can the Faculty Senate promote for successful implementation? What can Faculty Senate do to help endorse and continue the socialization effort?

As to how we got to the changes, during the spring semester I and a few others went to all of the campuses, most of the colleges in the larger administrative units to hold a series of town halls to introduce the values, describe how they evolved, and then, most importantly, gain crucial information about their understanding of the values, where they see them being applied, and what are the challenges that they see in the values being lived out here at the University.
We had a very large turnout; well over 2,200 participants. We had 336 small discussion groups in which we focused on each value, talked about positive examples that they've seen of that value at work in the University, and what needs to be done either as individuals, a college, or a unit, a campus, or as a University to better live out that value.

We did utilize that feedback in refining the statements themselves. Some of the feedback that we received from this community initiative was that they very much appreciated the organic development of the values, incorporating the values and culture survey in the town hall process.

Staff in particular were very happy to have a voice, as were faculty. They very much preferred very short succinct statements, but there was the concern that the short statements might lose the Penn State quality to this value. In our official roll out coming later this semester, we will include examples generated from the town halls that make it Penn State specific, give it a concrete reality so that others can identify what they do with the values.

They also provided specific areas of disconnect where they see that a value that we've espoused is not being lived out, whether it be within their college or unit or within the University. The President's Council-- when I presented this-- were interested in what those disconnects are as are other unit heads that I've spoken with. I think this is an opportunity for good, engaging conversation about our culture here at the University.

Also, as a result of the work that we've done, the values will be incorporated into the strategic plan. In fact, one of Dr. Barron's proposed topics for our proposed new strategic development initiative includes, if you may have noticed, three of our six values explicitly-- discovery, excellence, and community.

You'll be hearing more about this as self-identifiers. One thing which was very helpful to me was to learn just how much people want to be held accountable to the values, not only as an institution but as individuals, and the tricky part there will be recognizing how do we assess that?

How do we assess whether I have a commitment to a value, or as an institution that we have commitment to values? That will be part of the ongoing conversation. One of the perhaps most helpful conversations was around the notion of community. We have a very strong Penn State community. But what is that? And what does that mean and how do we form it?

That very much changed the definition of community itself. With that in mind, that's the end of my very brief presentation. I'm very much more interested in the two discussion questions about how the Faculty Senate would like to take on returning back full term from where it started in 2011 to help socialize the Penn State values, particularly in the academic life of the Penn State community.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Tim. The floor is now open for discussion. Comments? Questions?

Sharon Holt, Abington: We are always required to put a great deal of boilerplate into our syllabi before we hand them out to the students. It strikes me that screen of the six values might be something to add to that boilerplate and make sure that it goes out to all of our students as part of our class planning.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: This all came out of the idea of having an honor code. Are there any ideas in the works of creating an honor code based on these values with actual, measurable and enforceable
rules that would allow Penn State to have an honor code in the way other universities have honor codes where students sign an honor pledge and then if they break certain rules they're held accountable. Is that in the works?

**Tim Balliet:** I think that's very much an option for a conversation particularly within the Senate if that's something that we would like to endorse and see as part of the very fabric of student life here.

**Christian Brady, Schreyer Honors College:** As Tim said, I was a part of the very first committee in fall 2011, which was before November. It was actually August 2011, and the question of honor code came up as a discussion point. There are a couple of ways of looking at it.

One is we already have all sorts of punitive measures in place. We don't necessarily need more codes and policies, and also in keeping with that, the reminder that the view was to have something for the entire University-- not just students, faculty, or staff, but all of us.

We have these now. One of the things I hope we will consider-- and the first two committees that met suggested that we craft a short statement that would reference prior Penn State principles, now Penn State values. Our students have become fond of emphasizing in the Alma Mater, "may no act of ours bring shame."

I would hope we could find a concise statement that's a little more positive and affirming than that, but that might be something that we consider collectively, not just the Senate, but as the overall Penn State University. Is there something like that could maybe serve some of that function that we look and we say this is the overarching umbrella that represents us, and then these things hang from it.

**Jane Wilburne, Harrisburg:** I agree with what Sharon over here was saying because I was thinking the same thing. I was also thinking if there was going to be some kind of a little logo design that maybe would have these six words that you could easily attach in all kinds of social media. Like anytime there's some kind of a promotion going on about Penn State or information.

**Tim Balliet:** Sure. We've had some preliminary conversations with Strategic Communications about whether development of a logo would be helpful in the initiative or not. With the current development of the new University mark there was a little bit of hesitancy in terms of confusion related to that, but it's something that I'm certainly open to exploring further. Thank you.

**William Wenner, Medicine:** How is the University going to make sure that it doesn't run into difficulties with due process issues as it decides to enforce and monitor the compliance with these values?

**Tim Balliet:** Well, first I'd like to move away from the word compliance when we speak of our values. They're purposely expressed in the aspirational form with the recognition that-- similar to the earlier conversation about diversity-- we will never be 100% at each of these values. That's what makes them values.

I think where there gets to be a lot of discussion is on how do we fairly and accurately-- if it's included in, say, performance assessment or not-- that conversation still needs to be had. What would we point to that would support that someone has a demonstrable commitment to excellence or to respect?
I think it's easier to think of the inverse. We know when someone is not committed to the value of respect. It's like, for example, with clear, egregious behavior towards others or the like. Perhaps it may be a structuring of the evaluation itself where we express excellence through our teaching, and how you're evaluated in teaching is then spoken of.

That's still very much open for conversation. We very much want to make sure that it remains aspirational and it's not an issue of a hammer over someone's head, but guides towards everything we do here at the University is focused towards our mission and our values which are the means by which we live out our mission.

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: First I want to thank Tim and the committee, everybody that you worked with because you really made the Faculty Senate an integral part of this process. Secondly, you mentioned one of our questions is about implementation, and you mentioned about all the positive examples and that you might use those in the roll out.

I would encourage that we continue to highlight positive examples. One thing, each day we get an internet email newsletter about news at Penn State, and there is that section in there that's "We Are," and it recognizes people at Penn State that are good role models and good contributors. Either within that or some other way, I think we should continue to highlight how students, faculty, staff are really living these values.

Tim Balliet: Thank you. Great minds think alike. That's one of our tentative plans is every two months to focus on one particular value in the life of the community at Penn State and tie that to the "We Are" notifications. Highlighting those who really demonstrate or represent a certain value at work in the community.

Jamie Myers, Education: In situations of conflict and values and due process and things like that, I wanted to point out that the University has a longstanding resource, and that is the ombudspersons. Each unit has an ombudsperson. What I'm saying to your office is when somebody calls up and says, hey, somebody's not respecting me or whatever, that you involve that resource because I think it's a very valuable one that faculty have contributed to.

Tim Balliet: I would just echo I very much agree with that. In fact, at our most recent Ethics and Compliance Council meeting we had a presentation on the ombudsperson program and what they do and so to use that as a means for addressing some of these issues, as you mentioned.

Chair Ansari: We have time for one more question.

John Nousek, Science: This is great. I think, as you mentioned to some extent, it was a fallout from the unfortunate events of November 2011 and before, but this kind of statement, as you said, the word compliance is ill-suited with this sort of thing. This should be something that we voluntarily and permanently adopt and commit ourselves to.

It is useful to state it, and for those cynics who take on the liberal concepts that you have stated here, that we're just touchy-feely, that we're just aspirational, that it has no substantive meaning. I think we also have to say why it benefits us all to follow these codes.
I, personally, do believe that this is a greater part when we form a community based on these concepts than if we're merely an association of people paid to do a job and we kind of randomly get together. The whole words "We are Penn State" means something, and it means that we share something, and we've now stated it.

I hope we can capture that. It's not only these specifics but it's the idea that's encapsulating a philosophy of what it means to be a Penn Stater.

Tim Balliet: Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Tim and Regis, for a great presentation.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Ansari: Please be reminded that Parliamentary Procedure requires all motions to be submitted to the Chair in writing. If needed, the Senate Staff can provide you with paper and pencil.

We will use clickers for voting today. 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 54-90 (Academic Renewal)
2014-15 Committee Chair Rick Robinett and 2015-16 Committee Chair Michel Haigh

Chair Ansari: The first legislative report is from Admissions Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid, which appears as Appendix G. The 2014 to '15 committee chair, Rick Robinett, and 2015-'16 committee chair, Michel Haigh, will respond to questions.

Richard Robinett, Science: This is one very minor thing that is a result of a huge, wonderful thing that was happening just about a year ago where many, many aspects of what we called the flunk out process, the deficiency points, and the being dropped for poor scholarship was totally rationalized to dismissal, warning, that kind of stuff.

One of the policies-- the renewal one-- was inadvertently rewritten to only imagine that students who had been dismissed could take advantage of academic renewal, not students who had chosen to step out, who had been on warning, so it's just a very minor wordsmithing of one part of that really nice new rational process. That's really all it is.

Chair Ansari: Are there any questions? Hearing none. This 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, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. Go ahead. We have started the clock. You have one minute.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 120 accept, and 1 reject. The motion carries. Thank you.
Chair Ansari: The next legislative report is from a special committee on implementation LionPATH which appears as Appendix H. Committee chair David Babb, will respond to questions.

David Babb, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I just had a couple of comments. To start I just wanted to thank-- or our committee wanted to thank-- all the committees and committee chairs that responded over the summer and I bugged them to provide feedback. Everybody did a lot of work there.

The other comment I wanted to make was a lot of concern that I've gotten about the implementation of this. I wanted to just make a couple of points. The implementation of this prerequisite checking will be a slow roll out. There is a pilot program. We're going to find best practices. I think it's a good opportunity for departments to have discussions about the prerequisites.

I know the Meteorology Department really benefited from sitting down and just looking at all of our courses. We found prerequisites of courses that we hadn't taught in 10 years; just go back and look and kind of clean out the closet a little bit. It'll be a phased implementation.

We're not just going to throw a switch and leave everybody floundering. We're going to progress as departments are ready. Then no one will be locked out. It's not like your department will be switched on and all of your students will be caught unaware and nobody will be able to register. None of those nightmares are going to take place. We're just going to proceed in a very methodical pathway to doing this, so everybody breath.

Chair Ansari: Do you have questions for David?

Richard Singer, Altoona: I know that there is the ability for exceptions in here, but I see a very large--very large-- number of students who, say, in the spring are registering for their fall courses who are intending to take summer courses at other institutions.

There's a large number. I mean, I see probably 50 of them just in my advisees. I don't understand how a student in the spring would be able to register for a course in the fall at the proper time without the prerequisites who has, at least in my purview, a documented summer plan either at Penn State or another institution for that matter.

Are these students kind of left out in the cold until they actually complete that course? Many times if they take it toward the latter part of the summer, it doesn't even get transferred in for a week or two after the fall semester starts.

David Babb: We've had that conversation. If they take the summer course at Penn State that's recorded. The system knows about that.

Richard Singer: But it doesn't know that at the time of registration, say in March of this semester that they're registering for the fall.
David Babb: Yeah. In that case, it would have to be an exception. That's all we were talking about.

Richard Singer: But can we give it to them at the time of registration versus the time of the start of the course, and who would they go to?

David Babb: That's what we're going to be working on. We want it to be as local as possible. I think it would be up to your unit if you wanted to require that the student show you some evidence that they had a plan, you know, rather than just saying, Yeah, I promise to take physics in the summer somewhere. You know?

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: Just following up on that. I hope you'll find a system that is not going to mean that the staff and individual departments will have to process hundreds of exceptions in spring during registration to allow hundreds of students to register for sequenced courses in the fall.

I'm not sure what to suggest, but I hope you will work out some kind of fast track way of doing that, because we don't have the staff time locally to go at it one by one by one.

David Babb: I think we tried to pick four Guinea pigs that were various sizes and kind of had various requirements. Math has a completely different set of issues than we do, and so we hope to develop some best practices that way.

I don't know how many. It's hard to figure out how many exceptions there will be forgiven things. Hopefully not too many.

Michel Haigh, Communications: I just wanted to point out that this actually puts more responsibility on the student, too. The student has to own their progress toward degree. If they know they're going to take a summer class it's up to them to figure that out and get permission.

I mean, a lot of this needs to go back to student responsibility and not coming in after add/drop or right before add/drop and saying, I don't have that prerequisite. This will make students take more responsibility, as well.

David Babb: Well, and I think it's an opportunity for departments and instructors to really say this is a prerequisite. You must have this knowledge before you can proceed. I think it's good communication.

Lonnie Golden, Abington: I understand there are many courses that have clear prerequisites to go into the next level. There are just as many courses and just as many instructors that feel just as strongly that they want to put the burden on the student; if they want to take the risk of taking a course, either concurrently or not without the prerequisite. Sometimes we don't have the luxury of enforcing that, or worse, having a system enforce that for us because maybe the enrollment would be too small to run the course.

I have certain situations at Abington where the same course has two different instructors and one wants to completely enforce all that prerequisites, and one wants it to be on the student to decide for him or herself. I'm just going to advocate that we-- since you asked for a Senate input on this-- at least in certain areas and certain courses where we are not always within the same unit on the same page about the importance of a prerequisite, that we leave some flexibility open for the instructors still.
Maybe compared for us the current system where the instructor says, yeah, go ahead. I'll let you take it. You've come in. You've given your reasons, or whatever. Or somebody who says I'm just going to let anybody take it, but I'm not going to cater or tailor the course material to this person who doesn't have their prerequisites. Can you please contrast the current system with the suggested implementation of the new system?

**David Babb:** I served on Curricular Affairs for nine years. Let me give you the Curricular Affairs answer. The Curricular Affairs answer is if the course is so different that it requires prerequisites in one case and doesn't require prerequisites in another, that's an issue. Right?

Now it's up to the instructor, if there is a significant number that want a waiver, that's fine. Or if the conversation is such that, you know, this we definitely agree is a prerequisite, but this other course it depends on the instructor, this legislation provides the ability to make that-- the problematic one-- to be recommended preparation.

There are conversations that need to be had, but saying there's two different requirements for any one single course makes me a little nervous.

**Margaret Meloy, Business:** I was getting ready to say the exact same thing. Curricular Affairs has requirements for a reason. I don't think that it's fair to be throwing those out for the convenience of class size.

**Joyce Furfaro, Liberal Arts:** I have a question regarding students who may repeatedly need exceptions; students who are transferred in from other universities or other colleges. Will they be penalized by trying to get into a course that fills up very quickly, and because they don't get their exception early enough, they're not going to be able to get into courses? That was my one question. The other is can you explain the soft versus hard.

**David Babb:** Let me do that one first. You'll see there's four now. There's prerequisite, that's a hard, and then the soft version of that is recommended preparation. That might allow a more diverse student group coming from different places. You can say, you should probably have of one of the following, but they're not hard prerequisites.

In terms of, again, what Michel said, is on the student. Now, correct me if I'm wrong here, the software will have a shopping cart. I've actually seen demos. It's pretty cool. A student way before enrollment can add courses to their shopping cart; it flags them based on the prerequisite checking so that they will have time to get the waiver so that when it's time for them to enroll they hit the button and they've got all green checks and it goes. For the student who's on the ball, it's going to be great.

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** With these soft prerequisites, can individual faculty ask for certain soft prerequisites? I mean, there's disagreement among faculty who teach the same course across campuses as to what should be prerequisite and what isn't. Could a faculty member who feels like, well this should at least have a soft prerequisite check.

**David Babb:** Well, soft prerequisites won't be checked. Those are suggestions that the student ought to have that knowledge, but you're saying that you can still be successful without having that knowledge.
Jyotsna Kalavar, New Kensington: I was just wondering about international transfer students because you talked about articulation agreements with 60 institutions locally, but how would the implementation process facilitate that?

David Babb: That would be prerequisites?

Jyotsna Kalavar: Yes. Prerequisites as well as in terms of students going abroad over the summer, taking classes elsewhere, coming back, and so on.

David Babb: Are you talking about Penn State students going abroad, not international students coming to Penn State?

Jyotsna Kalavar: Both.

David Babb: Well, transfer credit-- we built the rules now for the 60 institutions, and that facilitates the process quite a bit. It means once they submit their grades are when the course goes into the system it's automatically applied to their transcript.

For international students coming here it's going to be the same sort of manual process as it is now. The student would have to submit the transcript. The faculty would have to evaluate it, and then the admissions office who does transfer credit here will have to post it to the student's transcript.

Jyotsna Kalavar: So nothing changes?

David Babb: I think that would be the correct answer, yes. For international students, transfer credits, and for transcript credit, that is not, but the 60 schools that we built the transfer credits for, that's going to grow, that list whenever it makes sense to add another school.

That's just what we could bite off in the first attempt. We're going to build many, many, many more transfer credit rules. For schools where we have one student coming in from an international school in 10 years, it doesn't make sense to automate that process because it's much easier to just apply it.

Jyotsna Kalavar: Well, I'm part of the global committee and we've been talking today also about plans to increase international student enrollment. I think it makes sense to be able to pay attention to those issues in terms of implementation.

David Babb: Yes. We're glad to have a conversation. I mean, it's just not easy to automate this processes for students from thousands and thousands of international institutions.

Jyotsna Kalavar: Sure.

Chair Ansari: Other questions? This report is brought to the floor by committee and requires no second. Are we ready to vote? To accept a motion, press A. To reject a motion, please press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 120 accept, and 4 reject. The motion carries. Thank you. Congratulations, David and Michael. Thank you very much.
Chair Ansari: The next item on the agenda is advisory and consultative report. We have one advisory consultative report from Faculty Affairs. The report appears as Appendix I. The 2014-'15 committee chair, Patricia Koch, and 2015-'16 committee chair, Michael Berube, will respond to questions. Pat? Michael?

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: Good afternoon. First I want to thank Angela Linse who was a co-chair of the Faculty Development Subcommittee who worked a great deal on this report. Very quickly, just to summarize the major points of the report is that it is stated that emeritus status should be given in recognition of meritorious service to the Pennsylvania State University.

As we all know, that this has only been applied traditionally to faculty with standing appointments who have undergone University level reviews and also to administrators. Of course, this has excluded fixed-term faculty. Our most recent reports and statistics show that over half of our faculty members now--around 52%--are faculty that don't have standing appointments.

A charge was brought to this committee and the committee considered all the issues involved and then voted that we felt that HR25 did not fulfill its stated purpose because it excluded this particular group of full-time faculty members. We went about trying to amend HR25 so that it would be more inclusive.

We did that by clarifying the eligibility requirements, also providing a description of the process for initiating emeritus status, and then also we more clearly listed what the benefits associated solely with emeritus status are versus when you just retire, the benefits that you get.

That's how we ended up with the recommendations that we have. One recommendation was-- the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs-- recommended the following revisions to policy HR25, which were elucidated in the report, as you could see, and then an accompanying recommendation was that we recommend that the Provost's office, in consultation with the appropriate University Faculty Senate committees, develop a pathway for emeritus status consistent with the type of appointment for all full time faculty who meet the criteria. We will open it for questions, comments.

Ira Ropson, Medicine: My only real question has to do with the section under privileges of emeritus status. Essentially there are almost no privileges remaining. The question I had really was why would anyone at that point, including people who are emeritus now, bother?

Michael Berube, Liberal Arts: I want to take this one because I come from a discipline in English where we take symbolism very seriously. There is no status to emeritus status other than being called emeritus. It doesn't give you even a better parking place. It doesn't even get you an ID card with a star on it, but it matters.

It matters to people, especially the long term, fixed-term faculty who have served full time for sometimes decades. It seemed to us that there was no reason to bar them from an emeritus status that was, in fact, purely symbolic. When I say purely symbolic, I do not mean merely symbolic. It's still important because it's symbolic.
The objection came from Provost Jones-- well, at no point have these faculty undergone a University-wide review, to which our response was, great, let's do one. It's not rocket science, and it will honor the long term commitment of the faculty who served.

**Nick Rowland, Altoona:** I just stepped in when this question was being asked. If you want my opinion on this matter, it speaks powerfully and symbolically as well as literally who is allowed the status and who's not.

**Rebecca Bascom, Medicine:** I'm the counselor for the College of Medicine. This is of great interest and importance to the College of Medicine. We have clinical faculty who have served long and diligently and who place enormous importance on emeritus status, both to acknowledge their continuing involvement in their senior years and in acknowledgement to their contributions. As a caucus we are strongly in favor of this.

**Rogerio Neves, Medicine:** I want to congratulate you for this topic because we had in our lab an individual PhD that worked for 20 years. When we requested emeritus status two years ago it was denied. We, in the College of Medicine, more than actually maybe 90% are fixed-term, and we already feeling that we are second class citizens. For many things we cannot participate on other committees that are only for tenured, although we cannot be.

I think just moving to this emeritus status for many people will be very, very important, but more, they still can do a lot for our students. They can come back. I have two questions. First, can this be retroactive for some people that perhaps already left? Like my PhD from two years ago that was denied and now could be. Second, as was commented, why taking at least the privilege of parking or coming or having even a chance to give lectures to our own students?

I understand that the title is important, as well. It's almost a recognition of all those years there, but why not a little bit more which does not cost anything to us?

**Patricia Koch:** To answer your two questions. The first one, I am not aware if this has ever been retroactive, and if anybody is more informed about that, please speak up.

**Chair Ansari:** I can answer that question. This is an Advisory Consultative report, and when this body ratifies that, it will go to the President for implementation and approval. In my opinion, this will not be retroactive.

**Patricia Koch:** Then the second thing, that could be something that might be discussed in the future about further benefits. One of the things that we tried to do was to keep intact the parts of the policy that were ongoing and that we did not see any difficulty or issue with.

**Christian Brady, Schreyer Honors College:** Just quickly, would emeritus always be modified by the title; emeritus professor, emeritus lecturer, and so forth?

**Patricia Koch:** Yes. I believe so. I think that the position that you retire at is what the emeritus is applied to.
Michael Berube: What we have in Faculty Affairs this year is a great deal more on the agenda for the disposition and treatment and review of fixed-term faculty which actually may go to their titles. For now, yes. Next year, just you wait.

Ira Ropson: I was not meaning to imply I'm not in favor of changing the policy. I actually am, I think it's a great idea and these people are certainly deserving. It’s not just a title, though. I actually think that if they're going to be members of the community that are actually communicating with current members of the community, they're going to need things like an access email account. They're going to need things like library access.

That's what I was trying to focus on in my question, and I'm afraid given the hour I'm getting a little bit fatigued myself. It came out a bit more negatively than I intended.

Patricia Koch: I understood. Yes.

Jamie Myers, Education: Thank you. This really makes a big difference in terms of how I vote. It's my understanding that those items in the policy that have been taken out, that have been lined out that have to do with privileges of emeritus status are the privileges of all retired faculty.

That's why they're being lined out, and that hasn't been stated. I just wanted to confirm that so that if you're not taking anything away from emeritus faculty, emeritus faculty are eligible for all those things just as any retired faculty—fixed-term, full time, staff, et cetera, are entitled to.

Patricia Koch: Yes. Thank you, Jamie, for clarifying that.

Jamie Myers: One other point. I don't believe the policy says anything about the time lapse between your retirement and when you might become emeritus. It seems to me that somebody could retire and three years later they could be recommended for emeritus. I think there may be some window in there in which the retroactive issue could be addressed.

Patricia Koch: That is a good point.

Roger Egolf: There is a precedent on retroactive emeritus status. The Board of Trustees just changed their emeritus trustee policy. Trustees that previously had not been eligible for an emeritus status under the old policy who are under the new policy but are already gone from the Board will be eligible for emeritus status. I wouldn't see why it would be any different for faculty.

Patricia Koch: Thank you Roger, that's very good to know.

James Jaap, Greater Allegheny: As a senior instructor in English, I would just like to thank you for doing this. I hope that this is the first step in another process that includes fixed-term employees. For example, the Administrative Fellows program does not allow fixed-term employees to apply. It is only standing appointments. I think these are issues that we need to address. I'd like to thank you for doing this.

Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts: This is not so much a question as a statement. We just heard a report on Penn State values and what it means to be a Penn State community was held up as one of those six
values. It strikes me that to say that people who have served loyally for a long period of time can't be part of that community would be the height of hypocrisy.

**Asad Azemi, Brandywine:** My understanding is you're taking some of the privileges out because they are in the retirees, right?

**Patricia Koch:** Yes. The privileges for everyone who retires.

**Asad Azemi:** Right. I don't understand why at least a library part should not be there repeatedly. Why are you taking it out?

**Patricia Koch:** The reason why the committee felt it was important was that this was a policy on emeritus status so that people were confused about this that they thought that everything that was listed was just someone who had received emeritus status. To be clear with the policy, we want to only list those things that someone who gets emeritus status would get above and beyond what they get just from being a retiree.

**Ann Taylor:** If you read it carefully, it says the following privileges are available to a recipient of emeritus status in addition to the privileges accorded to all retirees. That's why it was silly to repeat things like internet access and library card, because you get those anyway. It's trying to enumerate the extra benefits.

**Michael Berube:** Which is why we thought it was an easy one.

**Ann Taylor:** That's what I was raising my hand to say.

**Michael Berube:** Right, because we're not giving fixed-term faculty emeritus status and anything else. It is simply emeritus status and all the benefits they will already have as retirees. It is simply a recognition, as Dennis suggested, of their long and loyal and meritorious service.

**Ann Taylor:** I'm not sure how to do this, but I think it's a friendly amendment.

**Chair Ansari:** We don't have friendly amendments.

**Ann Taylor:** It's an amendment.

**Chair Ansari:** Are you making a motion?

**Ann Taylor:** I am making a motion.

**Chair Ansari:** Then you have to put it in writing please. The paper is coming to you. I am enforcing the rules.

**Ann Taylor:** Yeah. Can I tell you before I write it?

**Patricia Koch:** Yes.
**Ann Taylor:** Pat and I have discussed this already. It just had already gone through Council before I noticed it. I'm a council rep. I love this policy, first of all. We list ranks that would be available for this opportunity.

**Patricia Koch:** May I clarify that we're looking at page four of the seven pages of our report and it’s number two-- hold any of the following ranks.

**Ann Taylor:** Yes. Thank you, Pat. As Pat and Michael know, I did a pretty extensive review and report of the fixed-term ranks available at the University. At least in one college-- which happens to be mine for full disclosure-- the pathway for a fixed-term faculty member is instructor, senior instructor, then lecturer, then senior lecturer. The bullet that says senior lecturer or senior instructor would leave out a rank that is higher than senior instructor in my college.

**Patricia Koch:** Which is?

**Ann Taylor:** Which is lecturer. What I'm going to write down is that we add--

**Chair Ansari:** Annie, please write it down because Nickie is going to put it on camera.

**Ann Taylor:** Right, but Chris asked me to say it out loud. I'm going to be suggesting that we say senior lecturer, comma, lecturer, comma, or senior instructor. I'm just adding the lecturer because in my college, at least, otherwise we're skipping over that rank, which seems unintended.

**Mohamad Ansari:** Very good. Please write it and give it to Nickie. She's going to put it on the camera.

**Ann Taylor:** I'm inserting the word lecturer between senior lecturer and senior instructor so there will be three items on that.

**Chair Ansari:** Is this your motion, Annie?

**Ann Taylor:** That's my motion.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Senators:** Second.

**Mohamad Ansari:** Discussion on this amendment.

**Roger Egolf:** I'm not sure how Earth and Mineral Science does that, because in the definition in HR21, lecturer or instructor are considered equivalent ranks, and senior lecturer or senior instructor are considered equivalent ranks.

**Ann Taylor:** I brought it here because we have had conversation about this, but it is my understanding I guarantee you that is how it is in Earth and Mineral Sciences, and it seems that there's a lot of differentiation, a lot of variance across the University in how titles are used for fixed-term, which is another thing that Michael alluded to that I think Faculty Affairs is going to be looking at. In the short term, it is what's in practice and, therefore, this would skip over that.
Margaret Slattery, Engineering: My point is about the variations in the way these titles are used across the University. Then because of that, there are people who are promoted from senior instructor to even assistant professor. Then that would be if we're skipping over, there would be people who--

Ann Taylor: No, because, well, I guess assistant is missing, but associate is not.

Margaret Slattery: Right, exactly. I misspoke when I said associate. I understand the rationale for all of these being titles in which somebody was promoted. Depending on how colleges do it, assistant professor could be a promoted title. I would argue that that would need to be added also.

Patricia Koch: Maggie, can I ask you, would that be the highest level that would be achievable in that area? That's the issue here, that the highest levels that are achievable.

Chair Ansari: Excuse me. Are you making an amendment to this amendment?

Margaret Slattery: No, this is a discussion around adding lecturer and the implications of that because of the differences in how colleges apply these appointments or these titles.

Chair Ansari: Right now the motion on the floor is to insert lecturer.

Margaret Slattery: Yes. And my discussion is that if we add lecturer that has implications-- I mean, where titles are omitted because I believe the intention was they were supposed to be promoted titles. Right? If we're including lecturer because Earth and Mineral Sciences does it that way, I can see scenarios in Engineering where assistant professor would need to be included also.

Beth Seymour, Altoona: Are we confusing ranks and titles here?

Ann Taylor: You're only talking about ranks not titles?

Patricia Koch: Yes. It's supposed to be ranks.

Jamie Myers, Education: I'm going to oppose this amendment. It's too confusing. You have lecturers that are at the first rank all across the University predominantly. To introduce this into a policy that's going to be read across units is just going to be a headache.

I don't know a solution to this. I think it's a very important issue in that one unit has a promoted rank that's named the same as most all other units have as an unprompted rank. All right? Because it's such a hairy problem, I'm going to vote against the amendment. I'm going to hope that the policy passes and that Faculty Affairs comes back later with another change to clarify this and to take care of the idea that it's a promoted rank that makes you eligible for this emeritus status.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: To further comment on Professor Seymour's and Professor Myers' point, I actually support this. We have done this to ourselves. We have decoupled rank and title. That gets to the heart of Maggie's question. There are faculty that will have the rank of instructor. They will have a title that is totally decoupled from that.
It may be an associate professor. It may be a full professor depending on the unit. We have done this to ourselves with the best of intentions. Because of that, the wording is very careful to say rank not title.

Now we are supposed to be using ranks of either lecturer or instructor, and that's supposed to be mutually exclusive. We wouldn't be Penn State if we didn't break our own rules. Bad College of Earth and Mineral Science, slap on wrist. You know, but I'm afraid that's just what we have. I support this amendment. I would like to call the question.

Chair Ansari: Hold on, please. I have to recognize that young lady over there before you call the question. Go ahead, please.

Kimberlyn Nelson, Science: Just to further complicate the issue, lecturer could be a promoted title in the College of Science. It could be an entry level title in the College of Science depending on your qualifications at the time that you're hired.

Victor Brunsden: That is true. That's why this goes by rank and not title.

Kimberlyn Nelson: That title is actually senior lecturer, too, is the top promotion.

Michael Berube: If I may, this is one of the reasons we would have a University-wide review. Regardless of your title, the case would have to be made that the rank was, in fact, a promoted rank if it was called clinical lecturer, instructor, professor and that's how it would be evaluated. Was it a promoted rank in which someone served for five years? That's the most important question.

Patricia Koch: That is recommendation two.

Sharon Holt, Abington: Thank you. I just wanted to point out that there are two Senate committees--Faculty Affairs and IRC--that have committed to discussing this problem all year long. Coming with forensic and consultative and informative and God knows what all else kind of reports. That's one thing I'd like to point out. The second thing I'd like to point out is that some of us have two and three hour drives home. Can we bring this to a close, please?

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Victor. On that note, make your motion, please.

Victor Brunsden: To that end, I call the question.

Chair Ansari: Is there a second?

Senators: Second.

Chair Ansari: All in favor of calling the question, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed, nay. Motion carries. We're now voting on the amendment by inserting lecturer in that sentence. We're voting on the amendment.
Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the amendment, press A. To reject the amendment, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 37 accept, and 65 reject. The motion is defeated. We are back on Appendix I. This is back on the floor. It is not amended. Is there any more discussion on this report?

Christian Brady: I call the question.

Chair Ansari: Is there a second?

Senators: Second.

Chair Ansari: All in favor of calling the question, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed, nay. OK now we are voting on appendix I. 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 accept, and 13 reject. The motion carries. Congratulations, Pat and Michael.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Report on Protection of Faculty during Budgetary Contractions, Appendix J. The 2014-15 Committee Chair Patricia Koch and 2015-16 Committee Chair Michael Bérubé presented this report which collected and presented all of the relevant policies in one report so that faculty can more easily access and digest these policies. [http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/september-15-2015-agenda/appendix-j/](http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/september-15-2015-agenda/appendix-j/)

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES


SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ALTHLETICS

SENATE COUNCIL


NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

Jeffrey Laman, Engineering: Mr. Chair, although the annual informational report from the University Faculty Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics titled Annual Report of Academic Eligibility and Athletic Scholarships for 2014-15 is a web-only report, I encourage all members of the Faculty Senate to carefully review the report.

This annual report addresses issues that are critical to the University Faculty Senate's obligation of athletics oversight and contain significant and important information regarding Penn State student athlete academic performance as compared to other institutions. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Jeff. Are there any other comments for the good of the University?

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari: Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor, please say aye. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until October 27, 2015.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>