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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 21, 2014, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Jonna Kulikowich, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Kulikowich: The September 9, 2014, Senate Record, providing a full transcription of the proceedings, was sent to the University Archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to this document?

Seeing none, may I hear a motion to accept?

Senator: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Second?

Senator: Second.

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, say nay. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The minutes of the September 9 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Kulikowich: The Senate Curriculum Report of October 7, 2014, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETING OF OCTOBER 7, 2014

Chair Kulikowich: Minutes from the October 7, 2014 Senate Council meetings can be found at the end of your agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at the October 7 meeting. Also included with the Senate Council minutes is the 2013-14 University Ombudsperson report.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

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

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

As a reminder, parliamentary procedure states that any motion from the floor, including amendments, must come to the chair in writing.

The Senate officers have completed visits to Penn State Hershey, Altoona, Fayette, Schuylkill, Hazleton, Wilkes-Barre, and Worthington Scranton. The officers will visit Penn College on October 30.

President Barron accepted the report on Striking the Right Balance of Faculty Appointment Types at Penn State, approved by the Senate on March 18, 2014, with the understanding that in the spirit of shared governance, the recommendations must be discussed with the Senate leadership to determine if and how they can best be implemented for the good of the University. The report and the President’s response are posted on the Senate website.

At the October 7 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following reports on the Senate Agenda and website only: the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics’ Self-Study Report and Review of the Rawling’s Report and the Committee on Undergraduate Education’s Summary of Petitions by College, Campus, and Unit 2013-2014. These reports will not be discussed at today’s meeting. If you have questions or comments about these informational reports, you can email senate@psu.edu. Your questions will be forwarded to the appropriate committee chair for response. The remaining informational reports on the Senate Agenda will be discussed today.

This is Marissa Shamrock's final Senate plenary meeting. Marissa joined the University Faculty Senate office in April, 2013, and recently accepted a position in the office of the Vice President for Administration. Marisa began her duties in that office on October 13. We are sorry to see Marisa leave the Senate, but we wish her the very best in her new position. Please join me in thanking Marissa for outstanding service to the Faculty Senate.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Kulikowich: I have been informed that President Barron will not have the opportunity to join us this afternoon.

NEW BUSINESS - NONE

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Kulikowich: We are going to go now to Agenda item G, Forensic Business. Ethics specialist Tim Balliett requested a forensic session, which appears as Appendix B in the agenda. Tim will make a few comments, and I will open the floor for discussion. Joining Tim is Regis Becker, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer. Twenty minutes have been allocated for presentation and discussion.

Regis Becker, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer: Thanks, Jonna, and thanks everybody. Let me first say that I know we are back again a month later to talk about AD policy, and I want to first assure
you that we are not going to do this every month, and come for you to comment on every AD policy that comes up. This one is critical. It has to do with the standards of professional ethics, and it is particularly framed at this point entirely towards faculty. It is a 30-year-old, or nearly 30-year-old policy. It is time to review it, and we would like to broaden and include a second section that would be inclusive of staff as well. Dr. Balliett is going to go through some context to talk about the policy, what we have in mind, and we have a couple of forensic questions for this group to follow up on.

**Timothy Balliett, Ethics Specialist:** Thank you Regis, and thank you for the opportunity to address you and to ask for your input as we move forward on this important AD policy. AD 47, which is the professional standards for ethics, is currently written with the audience of faculty only. It was first enacted in 1986, and then has been substantially renamed without any major revisions. It is currently AD 47, and what we have discovered is that, although it is based on AAUP’s statement of ethics, there have been revisions of that statement since AD 47 was first drafted, which are not reflected in AD 47. That is one major concern.

Current best practices in ethics and compliance recommend that we have one unified code of ethics for all employees within an organization or institution. AD 47 as an ethical statement only addresses faculty and in particular, professors. As you know, there are faculty who are not strictly speaking professors. Except for AD 88, which was just recently adopted and is a high-level statement, there is currently no ethical statement regarding professional obligations for staff, or for students employed by the University, or for administrators.

We believe that this is an area that needs to be addressed. Freeh Report recommendations also encouraged us to take a look at all of our policies and revise as needed. This is clearly an area where we think we could enact some appropriate revisions. Dr. Poole, the Vice President for Administration, has asked that the University Ethics Committee take a look at AD 47 and propose some revisions. For that process, the ethics committee is currently looking at best practices in industry, but also particularly among CIC schools and our peers. Given the announcement of the Penn State Values, we would like to incorporate that in some way in terms of our aspirational statement for ethics.

We are also looking at professional standards across the University for all those in different disciplines, different professions, that are reflected by the staff, that we have a statement that truly reflects the University as a whole, and our obligations to our professions. Of course, we look at federal, state, and local law, and the obligations we have to them. The Ethics Committee is proposing-- again, the Ethics Committee has not made any specific revisions at this time, this is merely a proposal of how to move forward with the revisions. The first is to revise AD 47 to include staff, student employees, and administrators. It envisions one first section, which addresses the ethical and professional conduct obligations across all groups. Then a second section would address those obligations which are specific to faculty, and another section for staff, administrators, and student employees. The Ethics Committee’s goal is to have a proposed revised AD 47 available for President's Council sometime in May of this academic year. While the University Ethics Committee is charged with making these proposed revisions, it certainly does not want to do so in isolation. The committee believes that we do need to have some consultation with those affected by the policy, and most noticeably, of course, faculty, if this is a change we move forward with. The Ethics Committee has recommended creating a Consultation Committee of those who would be affected by the changes, who could be a sounding board during the revision process as we come up with the revisions to 47 proposed draft changes for feedback, consultation, and advice.
Right now we propose that, among the members for that committee would be three members from the faculty, preferably chosen by the Faculty Senate; faculty members with specific areas of expertise related to ethics, academic freedom, faculty concerns, organizational ethics, and management. The questions that we would like to entertain your feedback on, and take it as we move forward, is, one, what input you have regarding changing AD 47 to be more inclusive of the University community as a whole; that is including staff, administration, and student employees; therefore, having two sections—one that relates to the whole, and then a second section that relates to the responsible ethics obligations for each constituent group.

The second question will be, what input does the Senate have regarding the use of a Consultative Committee and the proposed makeup of said committee to help advise the proposed revisions in process?

**Chair Kulikowich:** Input for questions?

**James Strauss, Science:** I am going to break protocol and ask a question from the front of the room. We had a discussion about this in CC&R this morning and I think one of the questions I would put to you is, why not vet this proposal through one of our standing committees, like Faculty Affairs? They can actually take time and have discussion, rather than trying to get questions and input from this audience. This is probably going to take time and consideration. Would you be open to that, and if so, why not do that?

**Timothy Balliett:** First, we do not object to that idea or motion at all. I think we wanted to get a sense of the faculty as a whole before we move forward with the specific proposal, of who among the faculty might be represented on that consultative committee. We thought it would be more in the realm of this committee of Faculty Affairs. If that was an oversight of protocol on our part, I will take the mea culpa for that.

**Michael Krajsa, Lehigh Valley:** Two questions. Is there a reason you left an undergraduate student off?

**Timothy Balliett:** No, we could certainly include an undergraduate student either at the recommendation of UPUA or CCSG. We thought that a graduate student may have more particular experience, but certainly we are not opposed to them.

**Michael Krajsa:** I think it would be more inclusive. Second question, once this is all done--I realize it is an internal situation, but is this going to also be in some way conveyed with the private sector that we do business with? Had you thought about how that is going to be communicated to people we do business with--that they have good supply chain--that they are not using child labor, et cetera.

**Timothy Balliett:** Regis, did you want to speak to that?

**Regis Becker:** I think that is probably an entirely different policy. I think it is a noble one. I think it is one we should consider, and look at our procurement processes. I have been involved in similar things in other organizations, and I think for this one we should focus entirely on the internal audience; including the undergraduate student employees. I think once we start broadening it out--the diversity and the concerns--I think in the procurement process would beg to have different wording, a different policy for it. Certainly, we can have it on the website. We can have people be aware of it. I think it goes in the
overall fabric of our ethical tapestry here, if you will. I think it is a different matter for procurement process.

Dawn Blasko, Erie: Thank you for coming today. I appreciate the opportunity to look at this. I do have one question. It is probably a silly professorial question, but to go back to the beginnings of this—why is it necessary to have a big general policy that covers everyone—then one for professors and students and staff and administrators that fit under that? What I am thinking is, Faculty Affairs does a very good job working with our administration to revise AD policies, and they could probably do a very nice job of that. Then, certainly, a values statement as you are working on your surveys for the entire University could certainly be worked on—then I am thinking administrative groups could do a good job with this. What I am wondering is, putting together that bit of everybody—big consultative committee—I am wondering if you are going to get the expertise and the depth of discussion that you need to be able to accomplish something like that. I am really asking you for your background on the process you decided on. Thank you.

Timothy Balliett: Sure. There was discussion within the University Ethics Committee as to whether it would be best to have separate policies regarding the ethical obligations for each group; therefore, keep AD 47 for faculty, engage new policies for staff, and administrators. The thought being—one modeling best practice—that there should be one overall obligation for all employees, faculty, and staff at the University. The other being that as we are moving forward with the Penn State Values and what our expectations are to have that within policy, that we are all held to a certain ethical standard as a whole, as a group, and then there may be differences based on our specific roles.

As part of the University community we are all held to a similar, or same ethical standard among various areas. That was the decision initially from the University Ethics Committee. That would be a powerful statement in terms of the ethical responsibility of the University as a whole.

Regis Becker: Maybe we did not get your question right. Were you asking about why the process includes all the diverse parties in the drafting process, or why they were together versus apart? I am sorry, I just thought I heard you asking about the process of how we decide who is included in the consultative process.

Dawn Blasko: No, I was just saying that if you want to have a section that is just for faculty, AD 47, then we have a really good group already thinking about that. We have the Faculty Affairs Committee in the Senate, and putting together a group where you have a couple faculty, a couple staff, a student member, a lawyer, that kind of group—I am not sure they are going to be able to have the depth of understanding.

You have this one poor staff person who is supposed to help write the whole staff part—do you see what I mean? It is about the depth of understanding. I can see having a group that is broad that could work on the general statement and then bring it back to the groups, but I am just wondering about the specific statements.

Regis Becker: Maybe we would want to start the process, because I think the idea of my expectation—and I think Tim and I are on the same page—is that we, the subcommittee, the Ethics Committee, will draft the language. This will be a consultative process with the various constituents. That does not mean we should not use a committee of the Faculty Senate. We can take your advice or whoever you think should give us input into that. We will do the drafting, and then we will go out for consultation. Frankly, I was afraid, administratively, that if we had a big committee of 12 or 15 people writing—you know how
committees are with writing—it is difficult to come to consensus and get anything before the group to consider. We will send a straw man of a policy out, and get comments back and forth, but if there are people who preemptively want to give us the comments on how they think it should be structured, or particular things that should be in there, we are open to that as well.

**Dwight Davis, Medicine:** I am assuming that some of our specialized faculty at various locations have ethical principles established. As you think about this second level, what are you going to do, or what are your thoughts, about what happens to existing statements that serve as guides for those faculty?

**Regis Becker:** For example, this policy would not replace or supersede current policies at the College of Medicine regarding professional obligations and ethics for those who are engaged in the medical profession. Rather, we view it as being integrative. It would integrate with what we have. In fact, we have a member of the College of Medicine on the University Ethics Committee who has a particular eye to that. That is where we would want to make sure that in that section which relates to each individual group—that the professional standards of ethical conduct for the various professions and disciplines, which are represented by the groups would be examined and consulted and make sure that there is nothing in our language that would be in conflict with anyone’s professional obligations.

**Peter Dendle, Mont Alto:** Thank you. I was actually surprised going back and reading this policy on, not only how well written it is for a University policy, but really inspirational. In Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle unfolds a way of being an ethos, not as a set of obligations or things that you should not do, a list of no no’s, but a meditation on how we can be our highest selves—what it is we are aspiring to. Out of the many ethical considerations in here—for instance, faculty should do their fair share in shared governance—that is a noble goal. We all know people who may be burned out a bit and stopped doing that—have clocked out and are just teaching their classes and going home. That falls short of what I think we all agree is the ideal, but we do not fire that person or anything like that.

I think there are some conflicts also between various units. It sounds like you are already aware of these and taking them into account. I would like to see that in the policy, as professors, always telling the truth and the truth for truth’s sake. I was delighted to see that in black and white. As I interact with other units within the University—for instance student life, there can be conflicts. At my campus they sometimes invite a demonologist under the student activities fee, to get up on stage and talk about how he drives demons out—not as entertainment. Student life is in the business of entertaining students, and I am in the business of trying to undo that sort of damage in the classroom. I respect that both of us have important roles on campus.

I guess I would just like to ask, as you continue, that you keep in mind here we are still very fresh coming out of the scandal. We may have in mind legal obligations, and how do we root out bad behavior and get rid of bad eggs, and that is important. I think there is a higher purpose here, which has already been well expressed and which could be extended. I guess I would like to ask the committee or whatever faculty are on it to keep in mind a positive, inspirational—how can we be our best? Which is a slightly different set of considerations from what we should avoid. Thank you.

**Regis Becker:** If I may—that is one definite decision that the committee has already made, that we do not want this to be a policy on misconduct, but a policy on expected conduct that is somewhat aspirational, while still being concrete in manifestation.
Christian Brady, Dean, Schreyer Honors College: I am a member of the Ethics Committee, and I was going to concur with you, and just remind everybody as we are asking about the different constituencies--this is a policy on professional ethics. It is an aspirational policy. These should be things that, in general, all employees strive to--even when we get to specific implementations, and particularly on the negative side--when there are issues to reconcile in a Student Affairs area that might be reconciled in a different way than for Faculty Affairs.

This statement as it stands, and I think as it is going forward, will be one of aspiration. It is professional ethics for all of us. It is setting the high standards, as opposed to something punitive. That makes it, I think, a little bit different than some of the other kinds of policies where we are getting into. What path does this follow if this person is part of the union? What path does this follow if this person is part of Student Affairs and so forth?

Regis Becker: Thank you, Dr. Brady. Anything else?

Chair Kulikowich: Any additional input? We have one minute left.

Regis Becker: The second question pertains to the notion of having a Consultative Committee. There have already been some questions related to that, but we will certainly open that to the floor as well.

Chair Kulikowich: Seeing no additional input, Tim and Regis, we thank you.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – NONE

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Kulikowich: We have five Legislative reports today from Committees and Rules. The first three reports are grouped together because they relate to the reorganization of law education at Penn State. These revisions, with regard to the reorganization of Penn State Law and Dickinson Law, are being made now in anticipation of Senate seat allocation and committee representation for the 2015-16 academic year.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to the Constitution, Article II, Sections 3 and 5 (Membership)
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The first report appears as Appendix C. Because this report is revisions to the Constitution, we will discuss the report today and vote on it at the December 9 Senate meeting. Committee Chair Mark Casteel will respond to questions. Are there any questions for Chair Casteel? Seeing no further questions, we will move on to the next report.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to the Bylaws, Article II, Section 2 (Senate Council) and Article VII, Section 4 (Delegation of Authority)
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The second report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix D. Because this report is revisions to the bylaws, we will discuss the report today and vote on it at the December 9 Senate
meeting. Mark will respond to questions. Are there any questions? Seeing no questions, we will move on to the next report.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6 (e and i) (Standing Committee Structure)
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The third report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix E. Mark will respond to questions. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote?

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

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 157 in favor and 3 opposed. The motion carries.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to the Bylaws, Article III, Section 3 (Election to the Senate) Procedures for Retiree Senators
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The fourth report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix F. Because this report is revisions to the Bylaws, we will discuss the report today and vote on it at the December 9 Senate meeting. Mark will respond to questions. Senator Moore, do you have an amendment to this motion?

John Moore, Retired Faculty Senator: I move that we make the following editorial changes in the document title Revisions of Senate Bylaws, Article III, Section 3. The editorial change should read, Procedures for Retired Faculty Senators. Then on page 2 of the report, nine lines down from top of the page, the sentence beginning with the word “One,” that sentence should read, "One retired senator will serve on the Committee on Faculty Benefits, and one will serve on a standing Senate committee of the retired faculty senator's choosing."

Mark Casteel, York: In our discussion today in our committee meeting we were fully in support of this. John recently pointed out that it makes sense to have somebody assigned to Faculty Benefits. The interests of the other candidate should be paramount, where he or she wants to be placed.

Chair Kulikowich: Is there a second to that amendment? Any discussion or questions about that amendment? The parliamentarian says that we can ask for a voice vote here. All those in favor of the amendment, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. The amendment passes. We are now to the original motion. Any further discussion? The amendments stands, as approved, but the amended motion will be voted on at the December meeting.
Chair Kulikowich: The final report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix G. Mark will respond to questions. Any questions about Appendix G? This is the revision to the Standing Rules Article III, Section 7, Discontinuation of the Joint Faculty Administrative Committee to Monitor Travel Policies.

The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. If accepting the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 148 in favor and 6 opposed. The motion carries.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS - NONE

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

GENERAL EDUCATION PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT TASK FORCE
A Progress Report to the University Faculty Senate
Task Force Co Chairs Janet Schulenberg, Maggie Slattery, and Mary Beth Williams

Chair Kulikowich: The first Informational Report is a progress report to the University Faculty Senate from the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force, and appears as Appendix H. Committee co-chairs, Janet Schulenberg, Maggie Slattery, and Mary Beth Williams will give a presentation and respond to questions; 45 minutes has been allocated for presentation and discussion.

Mary Beth Williams: Thanks, Jonna, and thank you all for your time today. I am Mary Beth Williams, and on behalf of the task force, we appreciate the time that you have taken to read the report that we have submitted, and engage in this discussion today. The General Education Task Force is here to present an Informational Report. It has been posted publicly on our website since September 19 for open comment and dialogue, as we have tried to engage faculty members, staff, and students in this process. The report represents an enormous amount of work by a large number of people--more than 90 members of this task force.

It is a compilation of their efforts over the past 19 months--it does not represent everything that they have done, as they try to have this conversation about what we want as a faculty for our students in General Education. I would like to take just a minute to acknowledge their contributions. Would the members of the parent General Education Task Force and the co-chairs of the subcommittees who are here today please stand for a moment? Would all other members of the task force in the subcommittees who are here, or senators who have come to the retreats that we have held and participated in the discussions also please stand?

Thank you. This group of people has been working enormously hard on this project, and we thank you for your efforts, dedication, and your focus on student learning as we talk about this enormous project. The task force would also really like to acknowledge the Senate office staff--Marissa, Cindy, and Amy, who have been instrumental in organizing this enormous task force. They have booked hundreds of
meetings, four retreats, they attempt to navigate Polycom and keep our schedules together--we could not do it without the three of you, so thank you very much.

As a result of the conversations that we had in the Spring with faculty and students, and other stakeholders--as well as the forensic session that we had on this floor in March--the task force heard loud and clear that there were two things that we needed to do in the Spring. We tried to respond to those by extending our timeline, and to have this conversation now in the Fall. Secondly, to look at multiple possible curriculum prototypes. We are here today to talk with you about that work and those ideas as we go forward. The first page of the report that was in the agenda packet that you received is a reading guide to this lengthy 93 page report.

I would like to direct your attention there today--to this reading guide. It serves as a guide for our parallel discussion today.

Janet Schulenberg: We would like to hit a few high points from the report. The first is, the background to this--we are engaging this revision because our number one goal is to facilitate student learning that speaks to the skills and knowledge that we need of our 21st century citizens. For example, the ways that students engage in information, that they access information and engage with the world has changed. There have also been changes in pedagogy and in learning objectives. Each of you know this as you alter your class content to meet those. We are looking to build a curriculum that supports that kind of change, and a structure that recognizes the changing needs for our students--that places those efforts into a coherent curriculum.

The task force, through these retreats, has affirmed the breadth of the existing knowledge domains as a particular value--that General Education is complementary to the disciplinary learning in the major. The learning that students do in General Education is the hallmark of what a Penn State degree offers as a University in contrast to vocational education. This is an attempt to re-center and refocus that important role of General Education.

There are areas for curricular updating that are elaborated from pages 40 to 50 in the report. Some of the high points are--number one, we have the opportunity to reset and perhaps expand the foundational skills in writing, speaking, quantification, and other key literacies. Second, we have the opportunity to promote students' abilities to integrate across the knowledge domains, and to create meaning from what often appears to be disconnected learning experiences. Third, we have the opportunity to expand students' intercultural skills in interacting with others who are different, either from other countries, or from other social or racial groups within the United States, and to facilitate students to recognize their own place in a global context.

We also have the opportunity to realign our General Education to measurable learning objectives, which is a hallmark of modern general education. We have an Assessment Subcommittee composed of a team of some of Penn State's experts on learning and assessment who have based their recommendations for these seven outcomes on their expertise in General Education and in assessment. As a faculty we need to agree on what we want our students to learn through General Education. This is one of the important areas of conversation we need to have with you: a set of clearly articulated, measurable, visible, and programmatic-level learning outcomes is critical to providing transparency and intent to both students and to ourselves.
The key here is to define these measurable objectives for General Education, which allows us to evaluate the effectiveness of our curriculum, and therefore to make dynamic changes on a much shorter time frame than 17 years. The learning objectives are broad. There are many sub-categories within them. You can see on page 61, which is Appendix A, a few more details. Page 91, Appendix K, offers some of the ideas that are out there for how we could assess General Education. There are tools that could be adapted to Penn State and offer us the opportunity to unobtrusively embed assessment into regular operations.

**Margaret Slattery, Engineering:** Something Mary Beth mentioned was in response to the feedback we heard last Spring. We have put forth multiple curriculum prototypes. In the Informational Report, there are three possible prototypes that reflect modular components for our discussion—both here today, and our discussions with our colleagues and online on the website. These prototypes draw from our knowledge and our understanding of the scholarship on General Education—our Gen Ed model, other institutions, ideas, and what has worked for them, and input from our University community. For example, there are pieces in the three prototypes that were ideas that were presented, or we heard from last Spring.

For example, when Mary Beth visited Harrisburg, there were ideas about requiring a C or better on some of the skills courses such as English 15, and discussion with the learning objectives. Ideas on incorporating creativity and visual literacy—at Dubois, ideas on integrative courses. Some faculty members in Math from Hazleton and Altoona have put together some alternative ways to conceptualize GQ courses. We have also heard from faculty, students, and alumni on an increased need for financial literacy for students.

As another source of input, we have been working with the Joint Equity Commissions and the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force—especially in discussions regarding global competence and the importance of the content in the US Cultures courses. As we have been meeting with campuses and UP units recently, there is more feedback coming to the Task Force. We will be incorporating that into the next phase of our progress. For example, there has been an idea to just use minors to replace a large portion of General Education. That is something we need to discuss as a University community, and as a faculty. We are asking people to consider the different components in the three prototypes, and how they match to Penn State's vision for areas where change will lead to better facilitation of student learning and to provide the feedback on our opportunities and tradeoffs that each component provides.

We are looking for new ideas and additional ideas on how to best achieve our learning goals. We fully anticipate that none of these three models are The Model, and we are looking to find the right combination that will work for Penn State. As I mentioned, Mary Beth, Janet, and I visited nearly every campus and nearly every UP unit, and we encourage you as Senate leaders to continue those conversations with your constituents. Using the deliberation guide in the Appendix J is one way to facilitate that discussion. We also have an updated version on the website, gened.psu.edu. There are many ways by which you can feed more information back to the Task Force—website, email, all sorts of different ways.

We encourage you to respond individually, or however is most comfortable for you. We will be responding to the feedback and re-formulating it into additional versions of the prototypes in the future. One piece of the discussion that has been identified as a need, regardless of curricular model, is the need to support and reward excellence in General Education: supporting and rewarding innovation in teaching General Education, providing opportunities for professional development, and paying attention to the
contributions of part-time and fixed-term faculty, as well as graduate student instructors in their roles in General Education delivery.

We need to facilitate the collaboration among faculty across colleges and campuses, while finding ways to build on local strengths and autonomy for the campuses. There is a faculty support discussion that has been going on to facilitate this. The faculty support part would facilitate curricular assessment, and rather than burdening individual faculty members or departments with assessment, the faculty support unit would be tasked with that. It would be a way to provide feedback and data to the Senate as to how well we are achieving our General Education. This is a specific place where Penn State can lead the nation in assessing General Education. Senate leadership has encouraged our collaboration, and this has been done today with the Senate committees on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations to develop proposals for these support mechanisms. One last thing we would like to draw your attention to in the report is the list of additional questions. As a task force, we are paying a great deal of attention to students in the 2 plus 2 program--transfer students, adult learners, different types of students. We are also concerned with additional curricular questions which are outlined on pages 54 through 56.

Some of these are included in models; some of these are not included in models. Our subcommittees are in the process of trying to address working through the discussions of these questions. As an example, a common topic has been the number of credits associated with the General Education--currently it is 45. Each of the three models that we have presented has 45 credits, because we need to hold something constant. In our early investigations, we did not have clear benefits to reducing the number of credits, but that is still an open topic of conversation.

Another open topic of conversation is on the learning objectives--where we really need feedback is on what the faculty think about the learning objectives. We would like to spend the rest of the time facilitating discussion about this report and General Education. We are going to start by talking about learning objectives. They are listed in Appendix A. I would like to open the floor to questions, comments, discussion.

Of course this is a PowerPoint version of something that is much larger. It is fleshed out in a little bit more detail in Appendix A.

Chair Kulikowich: Questions or comments?

Margaret Slattery: We can move on to the curricular prototypes. Are there questions or comments, discussion about curricular prototypes?

John Moore, Retired Faculty Senator: I only began looking at the prototypes in the document here last night and this morning, and my suggestion is that the one characteristic a prototype should have is it should be instantly understandable. It should be as simple as possible. I think that, at the current moment, it has a lot of complexity. I think that is going to lead to a lot of advising problems. It is going to lead to confusion on the part of the students. I think as you work your way through this, I think you want to end up with something that is not going to be complex and complicated.

Margaret Slattery: Thank you. That is a comment that we have heard.
Chair Kulikowich: Additional questions, or comments? As you wait for the microphone, please state your name and your unit. All right, we can move on to faculty support if there is no additional discussion. Questions or comments?

Jane Wilburn, Harrisburg: I have a question that ties in with the faculty support and to the learning objectives. I am in Faculty Affairs--this came up after I left the meeting. If you are talking about measurable learning objectives, then we are looking at assessing and somehow reporting these measurable objectives in terms of student performance. We are looking at faculty support and how are we going to help students to be able to design and implement the types of assessments that are going to be specifically targeted to measuring those objectives. I see that as a huge piece of responsibility on the part of faculty and added time, and effort, and I am sure that is all taken into account. Just to recognize that measuring those objectives—I am curious as to how that is going to look in the big picture.

Janet Schulenberg: I am looking around for members of our Assessment Subcommittee here, but there have been a lot of advances in the world of assessment. There are some tools that are readily adaptable to Penn State. Some of those are represented in an appendix of the report; they could be embedded within the normal course assignment—that would take professional development on the faculty's part, and an investment of time in adapting an exercise to both meet the objectives of the course, and meet the objectives of the assessment program. Once that is developed, that is something that could be embedded within the course—it matters for the student to complete that.

It could be used for determining the grade, but then also be evaluated through this faculty support mechanism—whatever that looks like. It could be evaluated there to see if are we meeting, as a curriculum, the objective for student learning in an aggregated way.

Mary Beth Williams: I will add to that, that what we are talking about is assessment of the curriculum. This is one place where our size is going to work to our advantage. What it means is, we do not have to assess every student on every learning objective in every class. We can do sampling and statistical analysis to understand how the curriculum is working—establishing the right kind of structure to enable that across different modes of delivery and in different locations, to aggregate that data. Not to look at individual students or faculty, but to look at the curriculum—is the concept that we have here.

Kim Steiner, Agricultural Sciences: Could we go back to the learning objective page, because I think I have some comments. I had difficulty with these simply because they are not parallel ideas. Some of these are activities like communication—others are sorts of a state of being, maybe, or an achievement level. I realize that is sort of nit picking, but it did bother me. I think, actually, if you are going to apply critical thinking, it would be good to apply it to these seven objectives. I do not think they all make complete sense, and as something as separate and sort of parallel objectives that should be pursued in a General Education curriculum.

My main point I want to make is, I do not think these are objectives at all. I think they are not because I do not see how they could be measured—I am not new to this. We went through an activity 30 years ago in my curriculum, which I led, to establish learning objectives. We brought in experts to sort of handhold us along the way so we would know what we are doing—we came up with a great product. In fact, I published a paper on it. These I do not think are measurable.
What I think you have here are actually goals. Goals being something that may be a little less concrete--maybe not quite attainable. Something on the distant horizon that we strive for. Probably not measurable in their achievement--but objectives certainly should be. I think that perhaps setting goals out there, and letting instructors put the objectives up they would pursue--in pursuit of those goals--might be a more reasonable approach. Does that make sense to you at all?

**Mary Beth Williams:** Thank you. I think that is a good point, and we have struggled with the language. I would agree that these are more global and that they are goals. Under these, we have worked at developing measurable objectives, but we have to keep in mind that these are at the curricular level, whereas I think the example you are giving is more course level assessment. We do have to step up and, within these, we are working on developing probably what you are more familiar with--the statements in the form of a student will be able to x, y, and z. Whereas these are definitely a level up. I think your distinction between goals and learning objectives is on point, and I think we have incorporated that, and you will see more of that as we move forward.

**Adam Muchmore, Law:** I do not teach General Education courses, so my perspective is simply from some of my students who have gone through the curriculum. I wanted to ask a question, this was a question that I saw in your report and also that came up in your oral comments. This was the idea that you had identified no clear benefit to reducing the number of General Education credits, and the portion in the report is page 34. In the other direction, discussions about reducing the number of credits have yielded no clear positive benefit for student learning. I got a little bit curious because to me a General Education is basically a tradeoff between either advanced courses in your major, or freely chosen elective courses that you would not otherwise be able to take.

I ran a word search for elective in the document, and it came up only once on page 49 in a faculty member's comments. I guess I am wondering, to me, I wanted to suggest that there is a tradeoff analysis involved here. I want to suggest that it is a clear positive benefit for a student to be able to take either a more advanced course in their major, or an elective simply because it intellectually interests them. Now, I do not have an opinion on whether that means we should reduce the number of credits or increase the number of credits, but I am bothered by the idea that a reduction is seen as having no benefits on either side, and that the word “elective” only comes up once surprised me.

**Janet Schulenberg:** In part, the reason why elective only came up once is because in the Penn State curriculum, elective and General Education are two very different categories of courses. We are speaking exclusively about General Education in this report. Your points are very well taken, and they are points that are part of what the Task Force is talking about, and reflect some of the feedback that I heard on my campus visits. In part, the question is, what benefit would come to student learning in General Education by reducing the number of credits? What would be cut from our current program, and where would those credits then go? Your points are well taken, but that is the logic underlying it.

**Adam Muchmore:** Let me quickly follow up to say that I think it is a real mistake to--if you are only looking at benefits to the General Education curriculum, because the fundamental tradeoff--I recognize that they are entirely different things--electives and General Education, but electives are things you get less of when you have more General Education. I think benefit to the students' overall education is the proper metric, not benefits to the General Education program.

**Janet Schulenberg:** Thank you.
Dawn Blasko, Erie: First of all, thank you for all your hard work. This is a pretty tremendous undertaking you are about. I am glad that you are trying to be creative, and yet listen to everyone. Those two things, I am sure, do not always correspond. My question-- in here, you said that no one has done a pre-test/post-test examination, and I am just wondering, are we doing that--because here is our opportunity.

Mary Beth Williams: With respect to General Education assessment, there are some pilots for critical thinking assessment using the Critical Thinking Analysis Test, which is called the CAT, right, even though it is CTA. What the Assessment Subcommittee has been working on is exactly what kinds of instruments could be used, and that pilot has been started. We will be starting to collect and be able to examine data. Where we are going is, if we can articulate what the learning objectives are, and we know what the curriculum will be based on then, exactly those kinds of pre-post analyses will be much more feasible for us to do. We are doing both at the same time--starting these pilots.

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: To follow up on Adam Muchmore's comment, while they are not labeled as electives, if you look at the prototypes, you will see areas where that may be called exploration. I think we have been focusing on the foundations and the integration pieces of these curricula, but they also have various aspects for exploration and how that is done. I think that is where it allows for students to explore other areas and have more--if we want to call it free choice rather than feeding into those categories of integration and foundational skills.

Patricia Hinchey, Worthington-Scranton: I was thinking about your objectives and trying to follow them forward with the idea of assessment, and I am thinking--communication and literacy and critical thinking are objectives of the Gen Ed Program, and we are going to assess them. I wonder first, if they belong to the Gen Ed program, does that mean then that other kinds of courses, courses in the major, don't pursue those goals? If students turn out not to have them in the end, is that because the Gen Ed program failed, or because we continued the current pattern of, English is taught in English class, and Speech is taught Speech class, and if this is not English class, and this is not Speech class, then what are you bothering me for? I am just trying to think through what happens when we split out to these kinds of objectives and have kind of two domains of learning.

Margaret Slattery: These are objectives that were put forth by the Assessment Subcommittee, and are not meant to be exclusive to General Education. There are many cases where objectives of majors would duplicate, to some degree, some of these objectives--that is OK, that is good, but there are other majors where some of the objectives may not be part of the major discipline courses. What we as a faculty need to come to is a list of objectives that are important enough that they be made available to every single student, irrespective of major program. One way of accomplishing that is through General Education. Your question perhaps of which course covers which learning objective--this goes back to the idea of assessing the curriculum as a whole, where some of the objectives may be more clearly tied to a certain type of course, like English 15, CAS 100, something like that.

We are assessing how students can improve and achieve in these objectives over the course of the curriculum, not in any one course. The intent of the integration is to help students move forward out of the idea of learning for a test. We are trying to work out of that mold to help students integrate how what they are learning in a natural science class has some bearing, some relationship, to what they may learn in a humanities course. The fallacy of an inoculation model--taking English 15 does not mean you know how to write, necessarily--it is a stepping stone.
Thomas Beebee, Liberal Arts: I want to commend the Task Force on the kind of conversational structure you have set up about General Education. For example, in the report that we have, I find useful the results of talking to focus groups—the surveys that have been done with various stakeholders, alumni, recruiters—comments on the website and all that; all that information that is coming in. I think it is a model of a deliberative process. The recruiters were particularly interesting to me. Unfortunately, it is a small sample size—6% to 8% maybe answered. The nice thing about it is, that when they say what they are looking for in students, we can get rid of all the metaphysical hippie stuff about building the whole person, and educating for life and lifelong learning—does not matter.

You need to do this to get a job—right? What are they looking for? They are looking for critical thinking, teamwork, oddly enough, and integrative thinking. I took that little quote out of your report and put it up on a slide for my Gen Ed class that I am teaching this semester. I said, so there is no more important course you are going to take at Penn State than mine. Because I use teams, which is like SRTE suicide, of course. The other thing is, I am most interested in, of anything, is the scaffolding idea.

This notion of, these courses that we get out of the way, right? Continuing with my previous remark, this idea that, every course you take at this University is important. That it is integrated into a system of learning—a whole system of learning. The idea that students would take advanced courses early, and continue Gen Education throughout their four years I think is worth pursuing at all costs. My question is, of those three I mentioned earlier, I am not sure I know what integrative thinking is. I just wondered if you could explain it. Maybe talk about current examples of it, and how this might be developed through a new Gen Ed system.

Janet Schulenberg: I am wishing Peggy Van Meter were here. She is our local expert on this, and is part of the Assessment Subcommittee. There are lots of different ways to define integrative thinking. One is at a basic level, where a student can recognize a concept taught in one case, and apply it to another situation—this is the law of thermodynamics—to recognize that. That is one kind of integration. The kind we are talking about here is where students make connections across disciplinary areas, especially across our knowledge domains.

We want to encourage students to look for, and discover, the connections between their natural sciences courses and their humanities courses—for example. That is the kind of integration that we are structuring into these prototypes. We could also ask students to integrate across general education to their major, and to draw connections—like the ones you have just made, between their Gen Ed and their real life. Not that this is not real life, but they do not think of it as such. Those are different kinds of integrative thinking that we are seeking here.

John Nousek, College of Science: I already shared with Mary Beth some thoughts about this that came up at our recent astronomy meeting. I would say as a general thing. In this same forum, at the last meeting, I expressed concerns to President Barron about the coupling between measurable things and, shall we say, offering Faustian bargains with state legislatures as to performance in the area of research. I think there is always a risk when one starts to identify measurable quantities. That those can sometimes be misused in political regimes, especially in a situation like this.

We are talking about difficult things. I agree with Senator Beebee that it is important that if a particular person wants to get a job, that they have a set of skills that make them marketable. On the other hand, we also hope we are training people for a lifelong thing, and I am not at all clear that the assessment will be
able to-- I can ask a student to memorize something, and pretty much guarantee that they memorize it at the end of the course. To ask them to do many things on your list, I do not know that I can guarantee, no matter how I stand on my head, whether they will do all those things. I can lead the horse to water, but I cannot necessarily make him drink. In that, it becomes very dangerous to have a measurable quantity that then might be used to assess other aspects--let us say, state legislature appropriations at Penn State University.

Mary Beth Williams: John, thanks. That is an important point. We do not want “No Child Left Behind” in Gen Ed at Penn State. That is not what we are talking about. The concept that we will be teaching to an individual student reaching an individual level of mastery before we let them go is not-- what we are talking about is being able to provide the Senate with information and data on how the curriculum that you all agree on is performing for our students. Not saying that all students must obtain this bar. It is a different way of thinking about assessment and evaluation data.

Mary Miles, Liberal Arts: You actually essentially just addressed my concern, that I teach RCL, which is a class that is for all of the entry first year Schreyer students. I was thinking about how could we best engage and get the students excited about General Education reform, because their first response is typically a little bit of apprehension that they are thinking things are going well--two of the things that they value are exploration and flexibility. What you were saying--the chance to take electives--they really do not want to see that go away.

The other is exactly what we were just discussing--that they have come from high schools where they feel that their educational experience was limited by having the teachers teaching to externalized tests--and they are concerned about that. They worry about the creativity and innovation for individual classes and teachers being limited. When we are framing this, I think any way that we can discuss assessment in a more-- like you were saying--a different way. There is already a little bit of push back from students that they do not want to see that happening in college--they like the individualized experience.

Mary Beth Williams: Yes, I agree.

Kathryn Jablokow, Great Valley: I have one quick question. I do not know the answer to it. Did we assess our current method of General Education? Has our current method been assessed?

Mary Beth Williams: No, my understanding is that this program was adopted in 1997--there was discussion at that point about an evaluation and assessment plan, and there ultimately was financial support, to enable that to happen.

Unidentified Speaker: Do you think we should assess our current program before we change it?

Mary Beth Williams: There are aspects of what we are doing with this pilot that Dawn referred to, right? Some of the data that we are collecting now is assessing portions of it. One of the opportunities we have is to identify ways-- what we want students to learn, ways to do the assessment and to start applying them at Penn State--because we do not have that now.

Asad Azemi, Brandywine: My question is, at the end, when you have four or five of these models, are we going to pick them based on discussions like this--or are we going to see some sort of a practical test of maybe in a small scale and then see the benefits, and then choose one?
Margaret Slattery: We need to collect and have conversations amongst the task force with all the feedback that we have received in the last six weeks—three and a half, or four weeks. We anticipate to put forth even different versions of the prototypes on the website to continue the deliberation. We do need to coalesce around one model, and we anticipate doing that with the Task Force as members of the subcommittees—which is a representative body. With all the feedback we have gotten, and then we will—I think your next question was about a pilot? It depends on how you define a pilot.

There will be a phased roll out of sorts, if a new curricular model is adopted, because we need to get the existing students through the old Gen Ed model, and we will have new students arriving on the new Gen Ed. We need the old students to graduate with the old model, new students to come in on the new model. There will be a phased roll in. Because of the intense amount of student mobility at Penn State, it is difficult to think about how we would do an individual campus or individual college kind of pilot program. We have thought about ways where we could have some early adopters, thinking about phasing in parts of different curricula—using that to substitute for parts of the old curriculum for existing students, if they chose to adopt it.

There have been lots of discussions, primarily with the Logistics Subcommittee, about how we could do different versions of piloting. Yes, there is inherently some phased roll in because of the way students matriculate through the University—right, and evaluation with the phased roll out.

Chair Kulikowich: I believe we have time for about one more question. Senator Malloy?

Margaret Malloy, Business: Maggie, I wanted to follow up on a comment that you made briefly at the beginning about the minors and the role of those, and if you could tell us a little bit more about that discussion.

Margaret Slattery: As a component of two of the prototypes in the Informational Report and some of the discussions that the task force has had, there has been the idea it would be good to have multiple paths for students to achieve integration. An interdisciplinary minor has been proposed as one way of doing this—and that is represented in two of the models. As we have done what I affectionately refer to as the Gen Ed road tour, although that road tour has primarily been on the backs of Mary Beth and Janet, it has come up at additional campuses and several UP colleges where there is a desire to possibly replace part of General Education with just requiring a minor.

There are a lot of logistical details with that, and we as a University need to discuss what those tradeoffs could possibly be. Can minors be offered at every single campus in the numbers that would be fair for students to be able to select from? What types of minors? We as a task force have talked about interdisciplinary minors. There have been arguments that any minor is integrated. We do not have fleshed-out details about that. I would anticipate seeing an additional model that might reflect that—for more input, and to solicit the feedback of the entire University. What may seem ideal for one college, is not necessarily ideal for the other units and all the campuses.

Laura Pauley, Engineering: I can see that the learning objectives are desirable, that we would want students to have those, and I can see them being included in course proposals. What is important is that they are actually being used in the classroom, being taught in the classroom, and how will we monitor that and still allow for flexibility throughout sections—instructors, years, decade, 17 years, however long?
Margaret Slattery: This is a common conversation. It is a topic that has come up frequently in the General Education Task Force. There is a need to make sure that courses are delivering what they say they deliver—the exact mechanism for that is not fleshed out. Currently, there is no revision or review process in the curricular process at Penn State. That is something that we will need to work out and discuss with Senate and primarily Curricular Affairs—how they will review and approve courses; it is their purview.

Chair Kulikowich: That is the close of our presentation. Thank you very much. Janet, Maggie, and Mary Beth.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS
Student Transition Issues from the Commonwealth Campuses to University Park, Appendix J. Early in 2011, the Faculty Senate responded to a suggestion by the Intra-University Relations Committee that it look into the suggested decrease in GPA of students transitioning to University Park (UP) from the Commonwealth Campuses (CC) following four semesters at the CC. The preliminary informational report documented a drop in GPA between semester four and semester five. Initial suggestions for this change were focused in two areas: academic issues and social issues. Committee Member Carolyn Mann and Committee Chair Robin Bower presented the report and responded to questions. http://senate.psu.edu/agenda/2014-2015/oct2014/appj.dotx

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGY
ScholarSphere Basics and One Button Studio, Appendix K. Patricia Hswe, Digital Content Strategist, University Libraries, and Ryan Wetzel, Manager, Media Commons, Education Technology Services, presented information on ScholarSphere and One Button Studio. http://senate.psu.edu/agenda/2014-2015/oct2014/appk.dotx

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS -NONE

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kulikowich: Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor, please say aye. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until December 9, 2014.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.
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