THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate
AGENDA
Tuesday, December 8, 2015 – 1:30 p.m.
112 Kern Graduate Building

Senators are reminded to bring their PSU ID cards to swipe in a card reader to record attendance.

In the event of severe weather conditions or other emergencies that would necessitate the cancellation of a Senate meeting, a communication will be posted on Penn State Live at http://live.psu.edu/.

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the October 27, 2015, Meeting in The Senate Record 49:2

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of November 17, 2015 Appendix A
2016-2017 Senate Calendar Appendix B

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of November 17, 2015

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost

F. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations

Professional Ranks, Reviews, and Promotion Paths for Penn State’s Fixed-Term Faculty
[30 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Special Joint Committee on First-Year Students’ Well-Being and Safety

Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning Pathways to Promote the Well-Being and Safety of First-Year Undergraduate Students
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

G. UNFINISHED LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
H. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Committees and Rules

Revision of the Standing Rules (Rules of Procedure), Article I, Section 2  Appendix E
Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 4  Appendix F
Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 7  Appendix G
(University Athletics Representatives)
Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 9  Appendix H
(University Faculty Ombudsperson)

Special Senate Committee on the Implementation of LionPath

Change to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal)  Appendix I

Curricular Affairs

Revisions to Senate Policy 42-82 (Acquisition of Credits) Accredited U.S. Institutions  Appendix J

I. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Faculty Affairs

Revision of the Tenure Clock for the Penn State College of Medicine  Appendix K

J. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Faculty Benefits

Communication and Culture: Follow-up Report to Communications Subcommittee of the 2013-2014 Health Care Task Force Report  Appendix L
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Intercollegiate Athletics

Report on Faculty Partners Program  Appendix M
[5 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Council on Engaged Scholarship

Engaged Scholarship Update  Appendix N
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

K. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

L. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY
The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 26, 2016, 1:30 p.m., Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

All members of the University Faculty Senate are asked to sit in their assigned seats for each Senate meeting. The assignment of seats is made to enable the Senate Chair to distinguish members from visitors and to be able to recognize members appropriately. Senators are reminded to wait for the microphone and identify themselves and their voting unit before speaking on the floor. Members of the University community, who are not Senators, may not speak at a Senate meeting unless they request and are granted the privilege of the floor from the Senate Chair at least five days in advance of the meeting.
COMMUNICATION TO THE SENATE

DATE: November 18, 2015

TO: Mohamad A. Ansari, Chair, University Faculty Senate

FROM: Margaret Slattery, Chair, Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

The Senate Curriculum Report dated November 17, 2015 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, Curriculum Coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before December 17, 2015.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web and may be found at: http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/
## 2016-2017 SENATE CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Reports and Curriculum Proposals Due</th>
<th>Senate Council Meetings and Curriculum Report Publication Date</th>
<th>Senate Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 5, 2016</td>
<td>August 23, 2016</td>
<td>September 6, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2016</td>
<td>October 4, 2016</td>
<td>October 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2016</td>
<td>November 15, 2016</td>
<td>December 6, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16, 2016</td>
<td>January 10, 2017</td>
<td>January 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2017</td>
<td>February 21, 2017</td>
<td>March 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2017</td>
<td>April 4, 2017</td>
<td>April 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 27, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to a 2012 report of the Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations (IRC), the total number of full-time faculty at Penn State has grown significantly over the past 10 years, from 4,695 in 2004 to 6,012 in 2010. A closer look at the data reveals that the proportion of full-time faculty who hold non-tenure track positions has outpaced the number holding tenure-track positions. The report further indicates that “in 2010 only 62% of full-time faculty had a standing appointment…. This represents a 25% decrease in the past 18 years in the proportion of full-time faculty who have a standing appointment at Penn State” (p. 3). This trend is attributed in the IRC report to tightening financial constraints on the University, a need for greater hiring flexibility by departments and colleges, and/or changing expectations for tenure-track faculty (for example, standing faculty buy-outs) (p. 8).

The increase in the proportion of non-tenure track faculty also appears to be related to the growing number of professionally-focused programs across the University, including through Penn State World Campus, that require teaching faculty with substantial professional experience. As the University strives to meet its strategic goals of offering more professional credentials, such as the Master of Professional Studies (MPS), and of increasing its 13,000 World Campus learners to 45,000 in the next decade, and as program offerings become more diverse and enrollments rise, more faculty have been and will be needed across the University to maintain the high quality of a Penn State education.

Penn State is not alone in its increasing reliance on full-time, non-tenure track faculty. We are part of a seismic national shift away from tenured and tenure-track positions: Whereas in 1970 almost three-quarters of American college faculty were tenured or tenure-eligible, now three-quarters of faculty members are made up of variously “contingent” ranks that have no access to tenure. Those on yearly contracts have no meaningful job security, and they know that their academic freedom and their continued employment can be challenged by any student, parent, colleague, staff member, administrator, alumnus, or random commentator. Penn State is therefore facing an equity issue regarding the academic freedom of its contingent faculty, and needs to explore whether the expanding numbers of fixed-term faculty (hereafter, FT) pose substantial challenges to the institution’s academic mission and to ideals of professionalism and shared governance.

Background Information:
The 2007 Faculty Senate Proposal for the Review and Promotion of FT Faculty

In 2007, the University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs submitted an Advisory and Consultative Report titled “Revision of Policy HR-21 Definition of Academic Ranks” for Senate
consideration. The report proposed the addition of three non-tenure-line ranks to Penn State faculty ranks:

- Assistant Professor of Practice
- Associate Professor of Practice
- Professor of Practice

These new ranks were intended to enable academic units to clearly distinguish ranks for tenured/tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-line teaching faculty in two cases. First, these ranks would provide a suitable appointment for individuals who bring exceptional professional experience to the University but may not have a Ph.D. (or similar terminal degree). Second, these ranks would provide a suitable appointment and a promotion path that acknowledges the accomplishments of non-tenure-line faculty whose work focuses primarily on teaching and who have Ph.D. credentials (or similar terminal degree).

The advisory and consultative report recognized a growth the number of University courses and programs that require the hiring of full-time, fixed-term faculty:

> The College of Medicine, School of Nursing, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, and College of Communications, among others, have appointed (or seek to appoint) persons whose exceptional professional experience is core to teaching innovation and scholarship of teaching in their unit. They are appointed primarily to teach, are not evaluated on their research productivity, and are not appointed in tenure-line positions. To attract and retain the best faculty members, academic programs have found it necessary to use professorial ranks in appointing these persons, perhaps wanting to qualify these ranks with additions such as “Professor of Practice” or “Clinical Professor.” The recently planned School of International Affairs may also wish to make similar appointments as they seek to bring the perspectives of world leaders into the curriculum. (Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, 2007, p. 2)

When the report was presented to the full Senate at its March 20, 2007 meeting, Subcommittee Chair Zachary Irwin included in his introductory remarks the following background information:

> We concluded that in some cases because of professional achievement, individuals with terminal degrees should also be considered for professorial rank, in particular this notion of professor of practice ranks. It turned out that similar institutions already do have professor of practice. Sometimes they call this a clinical or adjunct professor of practice; but the pattern seems to be fairly similar. What it involves are programs typically in criminal justice, in colleges of schools of law, medicine, and I suspect in our planned School for International Studies. All of these have need for this particular rank. Finally, it is our hope in this particular legislation that it will be understood as nothing that is going to alter or change existing ranks or reassign some kind of appointment. We are looking forward to a change that we think will add some much needed flexibility to different units of the institution and should be seriously and positively considered.

(Senate Record, 20 March, 2007)
After discussion on the floor at the Faculty Senate plenary session, the Advisory and Consultative Report was brought to a vote and passed. The report was then sent to President Graham Spanier for his approval and implementation.

On April 20, 2007, President Spanier issued a memo to then-Senate Chair Joanna Floros with his response. Despite the endorsement of the recommendations by the full Senate in its vote on March 20th, Dr. Spanier stated that he was accepting the Senate’s recommendations only in part. He agreed to the creation of the rank of Professor of Practice, but not Assistant Professor of Practice or Associate Professor of Practice. Dr. Spanier also stipulated that he would only make the Professor of Practice rank available to deans and chancellors “to use in a narrowly defined manner” (Spanier to Floros, 2007, p. 1) that would require University leadership approval. Dr. Spanier added that the Professor of Practice rank would carry a general expectation that the individual “would have accumulated a decade or more of high level and leadership experience in the private or public sectors outside the academy” (p. 1).

This has subsequently been communicated by the University’s central administration to mean that the Professor of Practice rank is reserved for individuals with extraordinarily high qualifications, for example, one who has served at a very high level of government or business, such as an undersecretary of a federal agency, a former diplomat, the CEO of a major company, the former director of an internationally recognized NGO, etc. It has further been communicated that this rank is not to be used in promotion; it is only available to new University hires.

In providing a rationale for his decision in his April 2007 memo to Joanna Floros, Senate Chair, Dr. Spanier stated:

> Although many faculty are ambivalent about granting professorial titles to fixed-term or non-tenure-line faculty, many other faculty do believe the change would de-value the efforts they have made in working through the tenure process and the academic ranks, accumulating strong records in multiple dimensions of teaching, research, and service. In this case, I believe we should defer to the perspective of this latter group of faculty. (Spanier to Floros, p. 2)

Neither stipulation is in keeping with the Senate-approved recommendations of March 20, 2007, which were intended to provide a promotional path for non-tenure-line teaching faculty. There is no evidence that the 2007 report sought to create a path for conversion of FT lines to tenured positions, nor is there any evidence that tenured faculty regard such a hypothetical path as a devaluation of their own work.

As of the publication of a University Faculty Senate report in April 2012, only 13 individuals held the Professor of Practice rank at Penn State (Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, 2012), a testament to the extremely limited impact of then-President Spanier’s decision.

Reports on FT Faculty since 2007
In 2012, the University Faculty Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations (IRC) produced an Informational Report titled “Trends and Patterns in the Use of Full- and Part-time Fixed-Term Faculty.” IRC coordinated with the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment to synthesize and analyze data that would illustrate trends in faculty employment status at Penn State. In their report, they looked at the number of standing, full-time faculty (98% of whom are tenure-line), the number of fixed-term, full-time faculty (100% of whom are non-tenure-line), and the number of fixed-term, part-time faculty. Their analysis included data from the University Park and Commonwealth Campuses. It did not include data from Penn State’s professional schools or the World Campus.

Their analysis (summarized in Table 1) revealed a 15% proportional decline in the number of standing, full-time faculty members at University Park, while at the same time the proportion of fixed-term, full-time faculty at University Park grew at a rate of 15%. The number of fixed-term, part-time faculty at University Park grew 5% over the same time period. At the Commonwealth Campuses, the proportional number of standing, full-time faculty members decreased by 4%, while at the same time the proposal of number of fixed-term, full-time faculty grew at a rate of 4%. The number of fixed-term, part-time faculty at the Commonwealth Campuses grew 6% over the same time period.

Table 1: Percent Change in Type of Faculty Lines, 2004-2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University Park</th>
<th>Commonwealth Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing, full-time faculty</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-term, full-time faculty</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-term, part-time faculty</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*source: 2012 IRC Report

The 2012 “Trends and Patterns” report concluded, “the teaching role of Standing Faculty at the University was eroding as units began relying on Fixed-Term Faculty to shoulder an increasingly larger share of Student Credit Hours” (p. 1). This is what concerns us now: the relative increase in non-tenure-line positions compared to tenure-line positions.

The increase assumes even greater importance if we contemplate the planned growth in online courses administered by the World Campus. In 2012-13, therefore, the Penn State Online Steering Committee charged an Executive Subcommittee for Outstanding Online Teaching and Learning. Chaired by Dean of the College of IST, David Hall, the committee was tasked “to assess and address issues related to the quality of online teaching and learning” (Hall 2013, p. 1).

---

Hall’s report underscored the need to add more faculty if the University is to meet its goal of 25,000 World Campus students while maintaining Penn State quality in teaching and learning. The report stated:

> It is likely that a mix of faculty will be needed including: i) tenured and tenure track faculty whose teaching focus will include both resident and online courses, ii) tenured and tenure track faculty focused primarily on online teaching (with recognition for outstanding online teaching in the P&T process), iii) Fixed Term (FT) and Multi-Year Fixed Term (MYFT) faculty focused primarily on teaching, iv) use of existing faculty who would teach online courses “off load” for extra compensation, and v) practitioner faculty from industry and government areas who may teach occasionally or on a regular (but very part time) basis. (p. 5)

The report further emphasized, “The subcommittee notes that it is important to ensure common standards for assessment, evaluation, and promotion of each of these faculty roles” (p. 5). The 2013 Hall report called for a full review of HR21, stating,

> It is recommended that the hierarchy of titles for fixed term faculty (including FT1) faculty (e.g., lecturer, senior lecturer, clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, etc.) be reviewed across academic units and standardized. We note that it may not be feasible to have only a single set of titles. For example, there may be a need to create three hierarchies: one for research focused faculty (e.g., research associate, senior research associate, and senior scientist), one for teaching focused faculty (e.g., lecturer, senior lecturer, and teaching professor or alternatively, assistant lecturer, associate lecturer, and lecturer), and a third track for faculty that is reserved for faculty performing in a clinical type of role (e.g., clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor). (p. 5)

In 2014, IRC followed up with an Advisory and Consultative Report that presented, with a sense of urgency, ten years of Faculty Senate attention to the steady growth of FT faculty as a proportion of all faculty:

> We summarize the questions raised a decade ago by this (IRC) committee and we voice with great frustration that these questions have yet to be answered in a straight-forward manner by the Administration. From the spring 2004 IRC report:

> Penn State needs to ask itself what the implications of a two-tiered faculty system are for the students, faculty, the larger academic community, and other stakeholders within the university.

> What’s really driving the changes?

> What is the impact of different incentive structures on the quality of education and the quality of new knowledge generated?
Is there an effect on academic rigor and standards?

In the age of budget-driven decisions, do the benefits of increased savings and flexibility in the use of fixed-term faculty outweigh the costs of decreased attachment, voice, and the generation and preservation of the integrity of knowledge production based on the guarantee of intellectual freedom? ²

These questions have largely remained unanswered, despite the reality that since they were originally asked the fraction of standing faculty as compared to fixed term faculty has steadily declined. Over the last 20 years, this decline has become significant. For the past decade and longer, the IRC and the FAC have tracked, benchmarked, cited external references, and have openly discussed nearly all of the potential consequences of a lower fraction of standing faculty on the Senate floor. All of these reports are a matter of record. The lack of action in response to these repeated requests to the Administration has produced a form of de facto policy. (pp. 3-4)

In June 2015, the College of Engineering received a committee report on “Fixed-Term Faculty Career Management Guidelines” from a committee charged by Dean Amr Elnashai and chaired by Phillip Savage. That report proposed multiple career tracks for fixed-term faculty members: a Teaching Track, a Research Track, a Professor of Practice Track, and an Engineering Professor Track, each with definitions and requirements for entry-level rank, intermediate rank, and highest rank. The report also laid out procedures for performance reviews, salary increases, and promotions in all tracks—and noted that it “recommends the use of academic ranks (principal lecturer, assistant and associate professor of practice, and engineering professor ranks) that are not currently listed in HR21” (pp. 9-10).

Even more recently, in August, Inside Higher Ed reported that Northwestern’s recently adopted system for reviews and promotion of non-tenure-track faculty has met with significant success:

A year after Northwestern University’s Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences introduced new titles for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members, along with longer contracts and clearer paths to promotion, proponents say the system has helped them recruit quality teachers and attracted outside interest.

“We wanted clearer paths to promotion and a set of titles that confers respect,” said Monica Russel y Rodriguez, an associate dean at Weinberg who helped design the new ranks. “I’ve been pleased– I think this was a good concept.”

Formerly various ranks of lecturer, Weinberg’s full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are now “professors of instruction” at the assistant, associate and full levels.

² See “Trends and Patterns in the Use of Full and Part-time Fixed-Term Faculty” available at: http://senate.psu.edu/agenda/apr27-04agn/Apr2704agn.htm#appendixj
Proponents say the titles better communicate to those within Northwestern that this is a career path, and to those outside of Northwestern exactly what the job entails.  

Finally, an additional comparison can be found within our own institution. Penn State’s Applied Research Lab (ARL) has a 50-year history of treating non-tenure track faculty equitably. ARL research faculty have a career pathway (Research Associate to Senior Research Associate to Senior Scientist) that mirrors the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor. Faculty in these ranks do not have tenure, but they do have a “standing” position, and it is assumed that the positions are permanent (assuming budget stability). Within this 50-year practice at ARL, such positions have only been terminated a few times.

In addition to the permanence of these faculty lines, there is a formal, prescribed process for promotion (based on publications, grants received, contributions to the profession, etc.) that is very similar to the P&T review process: candidates assemble a dossier, obtain internal and external letters of recommendation, and an internal ARL promotion committee reviews the materials. At the Senior Scientist level, these dossiers are sent to the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. Moreover, these ARL faculty can obtain graduate faculty status (via a cooperating academic unit) and serve on graduate committees.

QUESTIONS

How can we best develop and then stabilize viable promotion pathways for FT faculty throughout Penn State?

How should we address the conversion of many multi-year (FTM) contracts to annual contracts?

How can we restore FTM positions wherever possible?

How can we reduce, if not eliminate altogether, the degree of arbitrariness and ad hoc decision making in FT appointments, renewals, and non-renewals, while acknowledging and accommodating the needs and practices of individual campuses and colleges?

---

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

- Harold W. Aurand
- David M. Babb
- Michael Bérubé
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS
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SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS’ WELL-BEING AND SAFETY

Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning Pathways to Promote the Well-Being and Safety of First-Year Undergraduate Students

(Forensic)

Introduction

On July 2, 2014, President Eric Barron announced his appointment of the Task Force on Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment. Its Report was completed and presented to the President, on January 23, 2015. On February 16, 2015, President Barron made public his acceptance of the Report. The President’s acceptance, moreover, extended to all eighteen of the recommendations the Task Force made as a result of its six-month long inquiry. Of these, Recommendation 13, the one most centrally applicable to the reason for requesting a Forensic Session, read as follows: “The Task Force recommends the creation and implementation of various educational experiences that reflect their [students’] evolving developmental needs during the course of their college experience, including a required course for all first-year students that explores issues of student wellbeing and safety, with an emphasis on building positive relationships and preventing sexual misconduct and alcohol misuse.”

From this recommendation emerged the creation of the Joint Committee on First-Year Students’ Well-Being and Safety. Membership for the Committee was by invitation from AY 2015-16 Chair of the University Faculty Senate Mohamad Ansari. He met with and charged the seventeen members on June 18, 2015.

Charge

Beyond those matters specifically addressed in Recommendation 13 above, the charge entailed the following expectations: (1) exploring “issues of Financial literacy, diversity and inclusion, and business of life”; (2) consulting and maintaining “liaison with University Faculty Senate Committees on Curricular Affairs, Student Life, and Undergraduate Education”; and (3) forwarding “reports, prior to submission to the Senate Council, to the” said University Faculty Senate Standing Committee “for consultation.” Such activity, moreover, is to be undertaken within the overarching directive of developing “a curricular or co-curricular ‘learning pathway’ with respect to educational programming for first-year students.” The charge further obligated the members to “[p]repare [a] Forensic Report for the University Faculty Senate Plenary meeting of December 8, 2015” and a “Legislative Report for the Senate Plenary meeting of March 15, 2016.”

In advance of the Forensic Session, the members of the Committee will have continued with the: (1) specification of goals and objectives that legislative actions to be recommended should address; (2) identifying specific strategies, tactics, and initiatives for achieving the goals and objectives; (3) identifying measures that serve the goals and objectives; and (4) considering other initiatives, as yet to be identified, emerging from discussion with members of the University
Faculty Senate. Of value in pursuing the latter task will be input from members of the full Senate in the December 8, 2015 Plenary Session in response to the questions that follow.

**Rationale and Questions**

**Rationale**

Since the Task-Force’s Recommendation 13 specifically calls for the “creation and implementation of various educational experiences,” and the development of such experiences will fall upon the Penn State Faculty and staff throughout the system, input from that community, as well as Student Senators and Administrators having Senate membership, is vital to the work of the Joint Special Committee on First-Year Students’ Well-Being and Safety. Therefore, the following questions are being posed for response by members of the University Faculty Senate in its Plenary Session of December 8, 2015:

**Questions**

1. What suggestions do members of the Senate have for exploring curricular and co-curricular learning pathways that promote well-being and safety of undergraduate students in their first year at Penn State?
2. What suggestions do members of the Senate have for exploring curricular and co-curricular learning pathways that promote the well-being and safety of undergraduate students beyond their first year at Penn State?
3. What suggestions do members of the Senate have for exploring a multidisciplinary approach to at-risk safety-net initiatives for undergraduate students in their first year at Penn State and beyond?

**SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS’ WELL-BEING AND SAFETY**
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revision of the Standing Rules (Rules of Procedure), Article I, Section 2

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

The Standing Rules (Rules of Procedure), Article I, Section 2 mandates the order of business on the Senate agenda for the plenary sessions. That order includes comments by the President of the University. As the chief academic officer of the university, the Provost has a key role in shared governance and interacts in many ways with the University Faculty Senate, through its committee structure and through administrative functions of the Office of the University Faculty Senate. Availing the Provost the opportunity to address the Senate during its plenary sessions would strengthen the spirit of shared governance and provide Senators a consistent opportunity to discuss issues with the Provost, and to get his/her perspective on topics first-hand. When we consider that there are only six Senate plenary sessions each year, Senators have limited opportunities to interact formally with the Senior Administration.

The proposed revision to the Standing Rules would add Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost to the order of business for regular meetings of the Senate, currently held six times per year.

The proposed revision is in bold.

SECTION 2

The order of business at each regular meeting of the Senate shall be as follows:

(a) minutes of the preceding meeting
(b) communications to the Senate
(c) report of the Senate Council
(d) announcements by the Chair
(e) comments by the President of the University
(f) comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University
(fg) forensic business
(gh) unfinished legislative business

(hi) legislative reports

(ij) advisory/consultative reports

(jk) informational reports

(kl) new legislative business

(m) comments and recommendations for the good of the University.

The order of business may be changed by the Senate Council prior to any meeting. Any or all items in this Section may be suspended at any regular meeting of the Senate by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the members present, and at any special meeting by decision of the Chair.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

• Mohamad A. Ansari
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 4

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

Standing Rules, Article II, Section 4 limits the number of consecutive years that a Senator may a) serve on a committee (6 years) and b) chair that committee (3 years). Senate Standing Committee rosters are established annually in May by the Committee on Committees and Rules.

Some of the Senate Standing Committees rely on having members who have experience in the work of the committee. One example is Curricular Affairs, which reviews several hundreds of course and program proposals each year. The ‘institutional memory’ of experienced members on that committee facilitates the work of the committee. The March 15, 2011 Legislative Report "Revision to Senate Constitution, Article II, Section 4 (Membership)" that changed the Senate Representation Model to a fixed size of 200 Senators has had unintended adverse consequences on the staffing of such committees, especially when a committee must have representation from either all units or specific units. The issue is exacerbated in the case of small units that may have only two or three Senators. In those cases, an experienced Senator might need to be assigned to a committee other than the one on which he or she can provide the best input, solely because that Senator has served for six years on that committee.

A similar argument regarding experience pertains to Senators who chair committees, for which extensive experience in the work of the committee is of great value.

The proposed amendment would accommodate unit representation while providing flexibility to the Committee on Committees and Rules to retain, when deemed appropriate, seasoned Senators who have served either for six consecutive years as a member or for three consecutive years as chair of Senate committees such as Curricular Affairs. The Committee on Committees and Rules proposes the following revision to this section of the Standing Rules to provide flexibility in appointing Senators as members and chairs of committees, to serve better the needs of the Faculty Senate.

The proposed changes are in bold.
Section 4

Except for the Committee on Committees and Rules all committee positions held by elected faculty Senators are normally tenable for two years ending on May 31 and beginning on June 1. Administrative and Student Senator positions are tenable for one year, unless otherwise specified. In any given year the Committee on Committees and Rules may assign Senators one year terms of membership on a committee in order to balance membership. As far as practicable at least half of any committee’s elected faculty membership should extend for two years. Under normal circumstances, no Senator may serve longer than six consecutive years on a given committee nor more than three consecutive years as its chair. **However, under extenuating circumstances the Committee on Committees and Rules may allow, by a two-thirds vote in the affirmative, a Senator to serve a seventh consecutive year as a committee member, or a fourth consecutive year as the committee chair.**

Committee chairs are selected annually by the Committee on Committees and Rules in consultation with the Senate Chair.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 7 (University Faculty Athletics Representatives)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

The Faculty Athletics Representative for University Park serves an important consultative role requiring extensive experience and expertise in university athletics. The Committee on Committee and Rules believes that a year of experience with the role would help new representatives prepare to assume sole responsibility for the position. Therefore, the Committee proposes to establish the position Faculty Athletics Representative-Elect for University Park, whose first year of service would overlap with the final year of the incumbent’s service.

The proposed change appears in bold.

Section 7

Faculty Athletics Representatives

(a) The Faculty Athletics Representative for University Park shall be appointed by the President following nomination by the Committee on Committees and Rules of the Faculty Senate. The representative shall be a tenured full Professor at University Park with a full-time faculty appointment.

(1) The term of appointment shall be five years and is renewable. Reappointment by the President requires prior endorsement by the Committee on Committees and Rules of the Faculty Senate.

The election for Faculty Athletic Representative at University Park will be held in the fourth year of the incumbent representative’s term. If the incumbent is re-elected and re-appointed, that person will complete the fifth year of his or her existing term and then begin a new, five-year term as Faculty Athletic Representative. If a new Faculty Athletic Representative is elected and appointed for the subsequent term, that person will serve one year as Faculty Athletic Person Elect, concurrent with the last year of the incumbent representative’s term, and
then serve five years as Faculty Athletics Representative.

(2) The Faculty Athletics Representative for University Park shall serve under the direction of the President and represent the faculty in all matters related to varsity athletics at University Park. The representative shall serve as an ex officio member of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and as the primary liaison between the Athletic Director and the Faculty Senate. Under the direction of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and in accord with Policies and Procedures for Students, Section 67-00, and in compliance with Big Ten and NCAA rules, the representative will act on behalf of the University faculty to certify eligibility for competition and financial aid; approve minor exceptions to 67-00 normal progress and GPA policies; approve waivers for outside competition; assist student athletes in pursuing and receiving academic awards; review proposed NCAA and Big Ten legislation and assist in developing an institutional position on such matters; review forms and documents related to compliance with 67-00, Big Ten, and NCAA rules; administer the NCAA Coaching Certification examination; facilitate research and data collection related to intercollegiate athletics, in general, and the academic status of student athletes, specifically; assist in preparing waivers related to NCAA and Big Ten rules; consult with the President, Athletic Director, and faculty regarding any matters related to the general status of intercollegiate athletics; participate in investigations of possible rule infractions; and represent Penn State at NCAA, Big Ten, and other appropriate meetings or conventions. After consultation with the chair of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Faculty Athletics Representative may approve minor exceptions to committee-approved University Park intercollegiate athletic schedules. The representative will also report to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics all University Park varsity athletic schedules prior to the beginning of the sport season and schedule changes as they occur, all excused class absences for athletic teams each semester, and academic eligibility of athletes for both grade-point deficiency and normal progress each semester.

(3) The Faculty Athletics Representative will present to the Senate annually a summary of the year’s activities.

(4) He/she will also advise Faculty Athletics Representatives at campuses other than University Park, as appropriate.

(b) Faculty Athletics Representatives (other than University Park) shall be appointed by the chancellor of each campus that participates in any National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) programs following nomination by the campus faculty organization, to act for the faculty of that campus. The Penn State University Athletic Conference (PSUAC) should use the same process to appoint a Faculty Athletics Representative for all Penn State locations that participate in two-year intercollegiate athletic associations. The Faculty Athletics Representatives shall be tenured full-time Penn State faculty members from their respective campuses.
(1) The term of appointment shall be five years (renewable) and reviewed by the appropriate administrative officers in consultation with the committees or faculty organizations at the end of each term.

(2) The Faculty Athletics Representatives shall act for their respective faculties in accord with Academic Policies and Procedures for Undergraduate Students, Section 67-00, and present a summary of activities annually to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. The Faculty Athletics Representatives also serve as ex-officio members of the extra-senatorial Committee on Campus Athletics. The Faculty Athletics Representatives shall also serve, under the direction of the appropriate administrative officers of their campus, as the representative to the appropriate intercollegiate athletic associations.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 9 (University Faculty Ombudsperson)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

According to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article III, Section 9, the duties of the University Faculty Ombudsperson include coordinating training of campus and unit ombudspersons, disseminating information to them, and reporting to Senate Council on the activities of ombudspersons. In addition, the University Faculty Ombudsperson is asked periodically to handle a case, for example, if there is a conflict of interest between the unit ombudsperson and the faculty members or administrators involved in the case.

A recommendation in the 2013-2014 University Ombudsperson Report submitted by Deborah Atwater is to “Consider electing the University Faculty Ombudsperson to serve as Ombudsperson–Elect for a year followed by a term of office for three years.” This overlap in terms would enable the Ombudsperson-Elect to acquire a good grasp of university policies and other aspects of the position. Upon consultation with Deborah Atwater, Immediate Past University Faculty Ombudsperson, and Pamela Hufnagel, University Faculty Ombudsperson, it was determined that a one-year term as Ombudsperson-Elect followed by a four year term as Ombudsperson would fulfill the intent of this change to Section 9. The Ombudsperson-Elect position would be initiated on July 1, 2018, and Senate Council would hold the first election for Ombudsperson-Elect in the spring of 2018.

The proposed language appears in bold. Deletions are indicated by strike-throughs.

Section 9

University Faculty Ombudsperson and Ombudsperson-Elect:

(a) Eligibility: Current or emeritus faculty member

(b) Term: Four years, no term limit

(c) Duties: The University Faculty Ombudsperson shall coordinate the training of all college and campus ombudspersons; shall provide for the appropriate dissemination of information among the various college and campus ombudspersons; and shall be the University-level contact for the various college and campus ombudspersons. The University Faculty Ombudsperson shall report periodically to the Senate Council and shall maintain liaison with the Office of the University Provost, the Office of Human Resources and the Office of the University Faculty Senate. The University Faculty Ombudsperson shall have no appeal function.
Election: By the Senate Council for a term of four years (renewable). While University Faculty Ombudsperson, the incumbent may not serve on the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, or the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

The election for Ombudsperson will be held in the third year of the incumbent Ombudsperson’s term. If the incumbent is re-elected, that person will complete the fourth year of his or her existing term and then begin a new, four-year term as Ombudsperson. If a new Ombudsperson is elected, that person will serve one year as Ombudsperson-Elect, concurrent with the last year of the incumbent Ombudsperson’s term, and then serve four years as Ombudsperson.

(d) Restrictions: The University Faculty Ombudsperson or Ombudsperson-Elect may not serve on the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, or the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

(e) Duties: The University Faculty Ombudsperson shall coordinate the training of all college and campus ombudspersons; shall provide for the appropriate dissemination of information among the various college and campus ombudspersons; and shall be the University-level contact for the various college and campus ombudspersons. The University Faculty Ombudsperson shall report periodically to the Senate Council and shall maintain liaison with the Office of the University Provost, the Office of Human Resources and the Office of the University Faculty Senate. The University Faculty Ombudsperson shall have no appeal function.

The Ombudsperson-Elect shall have no formal role or responsibility, other than to acquire a thorough understanding of university policies that pertain to faculty rights and responsibilities and promotion and tenure, and other aspects of the position.
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Change to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal)

(Religious)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

RATIONALE:

Given approval of Policies 34-89 and 47-80, late drop credits are no longer used. Instead, the number of attempts at a course is limited. The change to this policy updates language to conform to this new approach.

CURRENT POLICY:

54-90 Academic Renewal
Students, including those who have been academically warned, suspended, or dismissed, may request approval for Academic Renewal and Re-enrollment if:

- They have a cumulative grade-point average less than 2.00 and
- They have been absent from Penn State for at least four calendar years during which they have not been enrolled in any Penn State credit courses.

If Academic Renewal is granted:

- The student’s cumulative average will start over at 0.00.
- All prior courses and grades remain unchanged on the student’s academic record.
- The notation of Academic Renewal will be recorded on the student’s transcript.
- Courses passed with a grade of “C” or better during the earlier enrollment and approved by the dean of the college may be used to fulfill graduation requirements.
- The number of late drop credits available to the student will be reset to the number provided by policy 34-89.

RECOMMENDATION:

54-90 Academic Renewal
Students, including those who have been academically warned, suspended, or dismissed, may request approval for Academic Renewal and Re-enrollment if:
They have a cumulative grade-point average less than 2.00 and
They have been absent from Penn State for at least four calendar years during which they have not been enrolled in any Penn State credit courses.

If Academic Renewal is granted:

• The student’s cumulative average will start over at 0.00.
• All prior courses and grades remain unchanged on the student’s academic record.
• The notation of Academic Renewal will be recorded on the student’s transcript.
• Courses passed with a grade of “C” or better during the earlier enrollment and approved by the dean of the college may be used to fulfill graduation requirements.
• The number of late drop credits available to the student will be reset to the number provided by policy 34-89.
• Courses taken prior to Academic Renewal will not count towards the repeated courses limit as specified in Policy 47-80.

The committee wishes to thank the members of the Project LionPATH Academic Advisors Advisory Committee and the members of the Senate Committees: SCCA, Undergraduate Education, and ARSSA for their recommendations and consultation.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Revisions to Senate Policy 42-82 (Acquisition of Credits) Accredited U.S. Institutions

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate (and development of procedures if applicable)

INTRODUCTION
The Penn State University rules governing ‘Acquisition of Credits’ are described under the collected Faculty Senate policies 42-00 and include detailed statements about ‘transfer credits’ under Policy 42-82. This policy describes how such credits from ‘Accredited U.S. Institutions’ are to be treated. That policy was slightly revised on April 28, 2015, to provide a quantifiable measure of overlap to help define more robustly the degree to which transfer courses must be ‘substantially equivalent’ to an existing Penn State class in order to be evaluated as a direct transfer. This update left references to 800-level courses, which are otherwise defined as only to be used for graduate level courses.

The proposed language appears in bold. Deletions are indicated by strike-throughs.

RATIONALE
Revision of Policy 42-82 in April 2015 did not include modification of the reference to 800-level courses, which is inconsistent with the current course numbering system.

RECOMMENDATION
1. Remove the last sentence from item 2, since it is repeated in item 3.
2. Replace reference to the 800-level courses to 400-level courses in item 3.

REVISED POLICY

42-82 (Acquisition of Credit) Accredited U.S. Institutions
Credits may be accepted from colleges and universities that are accredited by any of the six regional accrediting commissions in the United States. College-level coursework completed at colleges/universities licensed by state boards of education to award associate degrees or higher, but that are not members of one of the six regional accrediting associations, may be eligible for credit by validation.

1. Evaluation Criteria. Course work completed at an accredited college or university may be evaluated for transfer credit if passed with a grade equivalent to A, B, or C at this University and useful to the candidate’s program of study at this University. Course work completed on a pass-fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis normally cannot be evaluated for transfer credit.
2. Specific Credits. When a candidate has satisfactorily completed, at another accredited institution, course work that is substantially equivalent (at least 80% the same) to a specific course at this University, credit is granted in the University course, except for 400-series courses. For course work that is equivalent to 400-series courses, general credits, as described in item 3, below, may be granted. Credit granted for course work that is equivalent to 800-level courses may be applied only toward completion of requirements for a college or major in accordance with the policies established by that college, but not to General Education as defined in Appendix A.1.

3. General Credits. When a candidate has satisfactorily completed, at another accredited institution, course work that is not substantially equivalent to a specific course at this University, general credits may be granted in the general field of study covered by that course. General credits may be assigned in cases where it is not possible to assign a University course number because of a difference in the number of credits involved. If appropriate, general credits may be used to fulfill degree requirements in any area. These general credits may be applied to the candidate’s program of study in accordance with the policies established by the college of enrollment. Credit granted for course work that is equivalent to 800-level courses may be applied only toward completion of requirements for a college or major in accordance with the policies established by that college, but not to General Education as defined in Appendix A.1.

4. Credit Conversion. Courses at this University carry semester hours of credit. Courses evaluated for transfer from colleges and universities with different credit systems, such as quarter hours of credit, units, and course units, are converted to semester hours of credit.

5. Grades. Credits are transferred, but grade points are not. Grades earned at other colleges and universities are not used in calculating a candidate’s grade-point average while attending this University.

EFFECTIVE DATE
Upon approval by the Senate and revision of any relevant AAPPM policies by the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education.
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Revision of the Tenure Clock for the Penn State College of Medicine

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the President

Introduction

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs was charged for the 2015-2016 academic year to evaluate the viability of an optional Tenure Clock Extension in the College of Medicine (COM). This charge included the request that we benchmark against our peers in the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC; Big 10 universities, plus the University of Chicago) institutions and if the committee supports the extension, to prepare a draft revision to HR23. After careful review and consideration of this policy, the Committee submits this Advisory/Consultative Report.

Rationale

The rationale for the change is derived from a number of trends. These include decreases in the percentage of COM faculty on the tenure-line despite increases in the total number COM. In addition, a major factor is the increased difficulty of obtaining R01 grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the primary source of funds for COM faculty.

Peer COMs have already adjusted their tenure clocks to align with the decreased likelihood of obtaining large NIH grants by the end of the 5th year. As a result, Penn State’s COM is at a disadvantage in recruiting and retaining highly qualified faculty. These faculty are more likely to go to another COM where they will have a greater chance of successfully achieving tenure.

Benchmarking Peer Institutions

Tables 1 and 2 provide benchmarking data for CIC peers and other institutions in the region that could be seen as local competitors for faculty. The probationary period includes the year during which the review takes place and a terminal year for those who do not receive tenure (see HR-23).
Table 1. Probationary Periods in Colleges of Medicine for CIC institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Medicine</th>
<th>Basic science faculty</th>
<th>Clinical faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Indiana*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota*</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska*</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probation period differs from other Colleges for both basic science and clinical faculty
** Probation period differs from other Colleges in their University System for clinical faculty only

Table 2. Probationary Periods in Colleges of Medicine in the region surrounding Penn State’s COM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Medicine</th>
<th>Basic science faculty</th>
<th>Clinical faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University*</td>
<td>9 (other colleges 7)</td>
<td>Tenure not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probation period differs from other Colleges for both basic science and clinical faculty
** Probation period differs from other Colleges in their University System for clinical faculty only
Recommendations to changes in Policy HR23. Note that additions are in bold. There are no deletions

III REVIEW PROCEDURES

FREQUENCY OF REVIEWS:

Prior to formal consideration of a faculty member for tenure and promotion, evaluations should be conducted by the initial review committees. In the case of tenure, these reviews shall be conducted in the second year and no less often than biennially thereafter. At the College of Medicine, these reviews shall be conducted in the third year and no less often than every third year thereafter. Normally, tenure reviews will be conducted in the second and fourth years of the provisional appointment period. At the College of Medicine, normally tenure reviews will be conducted in the third and sixth years of the provisional appointment period. For second and fourth year reviews and for the third and sixth year reviews at the College of Medicine, the college dean shall be required to write evaluative letters that are shared with candidates and may be addressed directly to them. The dean's letter will then be included in the dossiers submitted for subsequent tenure reviews. The department head or other appropriate administrative officer should discuss the results of the second and fourth year reviews, or the third and sixth year reviews at the College of Medicine, including the dean's letter, directly with the candidate. In cases where a faculty member receives a negative fourth year review, or a negative sixth year review at the College of Medicine, but without notice of termination, and in other cases where it is deemed advisable, a special fifth year tenure review, or a special seventh or eighth year review at the College of Medicine may be requested by the faculty member, the department head or the unit's equivalent administrative officer, campus chancellor, or dean of the college or University Libraries. A tenure review shall take place in every instance during the sixth-year period, or during the ninth-year period at the College of Medicine. All reviews of faculty whose tenure is with a college at a location different from the college of residence should include consultation with the department head. The Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses has the overall responsibility to coordinate the procedural aspects of the review process for the campuses.

IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

TENURE STATUS AND NOTIFICATION:

4. Each standing appointment of an eligible person to the full-time regular rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, librarian, associate librarian and assistant librarian shall be provisional, as defined in Section IV.5, until notification in writing of change of status is sent to the appointee by the appropriate academic officer of the University.
For a faculty member on a standing appointment who is serving on a provisional basis, such notification shall be made prior to the expiration of the sixth year, or ninth year at the College of Medicine, and shall indicate that the faculty member will have permanent tenure at the expiration of the sixth year, or ninth year at the College of Medicine, or will be terminated at the expiration of the seventh year provisional period, or tenth year provisional period at the College of Medicine. When continuing faculty are awarded tenure, tenure status should be effective July 1 immediately following the decision. Those who are not awarded tenure in their sixth year, or ninth year at the College of Medicine, will be given written notice that University employment will terminate at the end of their seventh year, or tenth year at the College of Medicine. In the extraordinary circumstance that a faculty member is, through inadvertence, not notified of his or her status prior to the end of the sixth year, or ninth year at the College of Medicine, such notice shall be given at the end of the seventh year, or tenth year at the College of Medicine, in accordance with the standards of notice specified in Section IV.8A (3).

Failure to notify the faculty member of his or her status prior to the end of the seventh year (or tenth year at the College of Medicine) shall result in an automatic grant of tenure.

A faculty member who is awarded tenure shall thereafter be terminated only for adequate cause or under circumstances described in Section IV.10. The traditional privilege of academic freedom applies equally to all faculty members regardless of tenure status.

PROVISIONAL OR PRE-TENURE PERIOD:

5. The provisional appointment period in the University shall be seven years, or ten years at the College of Medicine. However, up to and including the equivalent of three years of professional service at other accredited institutions of higher learning, or in an earlier appointment at The Pennsylvania State University, may be applied toward this seven year provisional period, or ten year provisional period at the College of Medicine. (See also HRG17)

Credit toward tenure for previous service at another university should be granted only after careful consideration and should not exceed three years. More years of credit toward tenure may be granted in extraordinary cases.

A faculty member who is promoted to the rank of assistant professor or assistant librarian (or above) may, with his or her concurrence, and at the discretion of the appropriate administrative officer, be given up to four years maximum provisional status credit for time spent as an instructor or assistant librarian at this University.

With regard to promotion, decisions to promote should be based on performance and scholarly achievement in the light of the general criteria (see Section II) rather than by time in rank.
An initial appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor may be made with grant of tenure, with the approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost and the President of the University in accord with University guidelines that prescribe immediate tenure reviews.

Under exceptional circumstances, the provisional period of a faculty member may be less than seven years, or ten years for Faculty in the College of Medicine, subject to the concurrence of the Executive Vice President and Provost and the President. University guidelines are in place that describe procedures for nominating candidates for review for early tenure.
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Appendix

Tenure Clock Proposal for the Penn State College of Medicine

Request for Change in Tenure Probation period for College of Medicine

Introduction
Recruitment and retention of the best faculty is critical to the academic environment and reputation of the College of Medicine. The current tenure probation clock puts us at a recruiting disadvantage compared to academic health centers in the region (Table 1). The changing funding environment and the requirements for achieving significant independent funding for research to achieve tenure has presented a problem for retention of excellent faculty that may be on the cusp of securing independent funding but without guarantee in this funding environment. This is a significant problem for the College that has invested significantly in the start-up for faculty.

National Trends
The trend in U.S. medical schools has been toward longer tenure clocks and greater flexibility in tenure policy (Bunton and Corrice 2011; Bunton and Mallon 2007). Many other medical schools, including those in the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC; Big 10 universities, plus the University of Chicago), have longer tenure clocks than Penn State and more flexibility in choosing a track and switching between tracks (see Table 2). According to the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), in 2008, 50% of all U.S. medical schools had tenure probationary periods of 8 years or more for clinical faculty, and 44% had clocks longer than 8 years for basic science faculty.

The request for extension of the tenure probation clock with the possibility for being proposed for tenure at an earlier time, when appropriate, is supported by the faculty at the College of Medicine. It is felt to be important to improve the ability of the College of Medicine to recruit and retain the best Basic Science and Physician Science faculty to improve the academic reputation of the College of Medicine.

Current Tenure Policy and Environment at Penn State
Penn State’s tenure policy (HR-23) requires the final tenure review during the faculty member’s 6th academic year, based on a dossier documenting performance during the first 5 years. If tenure is denied at the 6th-year tenure review, the faculty member is terminated with one year’s notice (year 7 is the terminal year). Faculty members may apply for one-year stays of the tenure clock if they qualify under specific circumstances (i.e., birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, family illness).

At the Penn State College of Medicine (COM), most faculty members on the tenure track are either basic scientists or physician-scientists. To qualify for tenure, these faculty members are expected to have demonstrated excellent performance in at least two mission areas (of which research is one) and the potential for further scholarly achievement as independent investigators in their respective disciplines. The latter is interpreted in the COM as a record of sustained peer-reviewed publications and evidence of external funding to support the faculty member’s research program (preferably an R-series grant from NIH or its equivalent).
In the COM, as in many other medical schools, tenure does not guarantee full salary (Bunton 2010). According to the Penn State College of Medicine Academic Compensation Plan (2014), tenured faculty members are expected to support at least 50% of their 12-month effort from extramural sources. Therefore, tenure is not likely to be awarded to a faculty member who has not demonstrated the potential to achieve this external funding benchmark. This financial model (see section B) and the fact that the College of Medicine is separate from any undergraduate Colleges in the University limits salary coverage for teaching and places a greater requirement for extramurally funded research.

The funding situation at NIH is increasingly challenging: pay levels are declining, few grants are funded on the first submission, and the average age of investigators receiving the first R01 is 42.6 (http://tinyurl.com/NIH-AvgAgePIs). In this context, it is not realistic to expect evidence of major scholarship in biomedicine, or evidence of the promise of sustained external funding, within just 5-6 academic years of appointment to the faculty of the COM.

Penn State’s 7-year tenure clock also is not consistent with the timing of NIH K-awards, which provide support and protected time (75% effort) for junior faculty members’ mentored research career development for 2 - 5 years. K-awards include both institutional training grants, such as the CTSI KL2 program and the BIRCWH K12 program, and individual K-award training grants. Because it can take several years to obtain a K-award, the faculty member likely will still be “in training” on the K-award at the time of the 6th-year tenure review. Having a K-award alone may not be interpreted by P&T Committees as evidence of potential independence as an investigator because, nationally, fewer than half of individual K-award recipients go on to receive R01s (Jagsi et al. 2009).

Because faculty members who are denied tenure may not remain on the Penn State faculty, the COM loses its investment in the individual’s career development. Often these investments are considerable, including establishing a laboratory, hiring support staff, or providing other research start-up funds. In the COM, it is not unusual for start-up packages to be $500,000 or more. With the need for evidence of high potential for independent funding for tenure approval, many faculty (particularly physician scientists) are not at a stage in their research careers to achieve this by 5 years, as described above, and this presents a significant retention issue for the College.

Tenure Track Trends in Penn State’s COM
The COM tenure track is shrinking in actual numbers and as a percentage of the total COM faculty (see Table 3). The percentage of faculty members on the tenure track declined from 33% to 23% between AY 2008-09 and AY 2014-15. During the same time frame, 25% of COM candidates for 6th-year tenure have been denied tenure, whereas the University 6th-year denial rate is approximately 10% (Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs 2012). Among those denied tenure in the COM, 12 were basic scientists and 2 were physicians. While Table 3 may suggest that the denial rate has improved over the past 4 years, the number of faculty on the tenure track is shrinking and this is partly because of concern with the likelihood of successfully achieving tenure.

Since AY 2011-12, the COM has permitted tenure-track faculty members in good standing to voluntarily switch from the tenure track to fixed-term positions, with approval of the department chair and Dean. To date, 12 faculty members have opted to switch: 5 basic scientists and 7 physician-scientists. Over the same time period, only 5% of newly hired assistant professors in the COM have been appointed on the tenure track (23 out of 468 hires).
Unique Financial Relationship between the College of Medicine and Penn State
The College of Medicine has a unique and multifaceted financial relationship with the parent University. Unlike the other Colleges that rely on central university offices and administrative functions to run operations, the College of Medicine has a relatively independent financial relationship with the University. The College of Medicine retains tuition fees, indirect research funding and some direct financial support from the University that is likely to be significantly reduced over the coming years. The University owns the land and super-structure of the buildings on our campus and the Hershey Medical Center owns the clinical equipment and internal finishes of the buildings but not the buildings themselves. The Medical Center agrees to borrow needed funds for these facility improvements and equipment form the University and not from commercial banks. The rates are set by the University and may be at rates higher than available on the market. The College of Medicine has significant external sources of funding, mainly from the Medical center and clinical operations. It should be noted that there is increasing external pressures that are likely to reduce the clinical revenue, and this puts extra pressure on any faculty who are involved in clinical activity. This includes physician scientists with some clinical effort.

While it is recognized that there should be objective criteria for tenure, the awarding of tenure incurs a financial obligation and therefore the decisions to award tenure have to be made with the expectation that the faculty member can continue to successfully sustain research funding.

Separation of Promotion and Tenure
While there is provision for separation of promotion and tenure in the current policy,(HR-23), it is uncommon for promotion and tenure not to be linked. However there is clear precedent for this in the School of Law where there is an expectation of promotion to Associate Professor at 4 years and a tenure decision and promotion to the rank of Full Professor at 6 years. We do not propose using the School of Law system, but we do intend to entertain nominations for promotion to Associate Professor prior to the tenure decision for those faculty members who meet the criteria for promotion.

Tenure Clocks in Other Colleges of Medicine
The trend in U.S. medical schools has been toward longer tenure clocks and greater flexibility in tenure policy. According to the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), in 2008, 50% of all U.S. medical schools had tenure probationary periods of 8 years or more for clinical faculty, and 44% had clocks longer than 8 years for basic science faculty. In recognition of the special needs of medical schools, at some universities the medical school has a longer tenure clock than the rest of the University – for example, Duke, Northwestern, Ohio State, Vanderbilt, and Pittsburgh (Indiana University 2008).

Tenure clocks in medical schools in our geographic region are generally longer than at Penn State, which means that the COM competes for faculty members with medical schools that have more flexible tenure policies (see Table 1). Anecdotally, COM department chairs report being at a competitive disadvantage in recruiting top candidates for junior faculty positions, especially for physician-scientists.

Table 4 shows the tenure clocks in the top ten U.S. medical schools ranked on research by U.S. News and World Report in 2014. These tenure clocks are indicative of “best practices” for a research-intense institution. Only one school on this list (University of Washington) has the same tenure clock as Penn State. Harvard University, which was rated number one, has an 11-year probationary period for basic science faculty and an indefinite probationary period for clinical faculty; Stanford, which was rated number two, has a traditional 7-year probationary
period for basic scientists but 8 years for clinicians; and Johns Hopkins University, which was rated number three, has indefinite probationary periods for both groups of faculty.

Some medical schools (e.g., 4 in the top ten medical schools based on the research ranking) have longer tenure probationary periods for clinical faculty members than for basic scientists, based on the rationale that basic scientists, having advanced training in research, need less time than clinicians to develop their research and achieve tenure. At the COM, however, there is support for continuing to have a uniform tenure clock for both clinical and basic science faculty because (1) all faculty members are dealing with the same external funding environment, and (2) COM data show that both basic scientists and clinicians are leaving the tenure track voluntarily and experiencing tenure denials (see Table 3).

COM Proposal

In sum, for faculty members in the COM, Penn State’s 7-year tenure clock is not conducive to making tenure decisions that adequately reflect faculty member’s development of scholarship and ability to sustain research funding in the biomedical sciences. The basic problem is that it takes more than 5-6 years to produce substantial scholarship in biomedicine and to establish oneself as an independent investigator. Leading research medical schools generally have a longer tenure clock than Penn State. As other medical schools in our region generally have longer tenure clocks than Penn State, the COM is at a competitive disadvantage in faculty recruitment and retention.

Following discussions with the COM Faculty Organization, Executive Council, and COM Faculty Senators, the COM proposes the following:

- **Lengthen the tenure clock at the COM to an optional 10 years (inclusive of the terminal year), for all faculty (basic science and clinical faculty), with provisional tenure reviews in the 3rd and 6th years and the final tenure review during the 9th year.** Lengthening the tenure clock by 3 years (from 7 to 10 years, inclusive of the terminal year) would enhance the COM’s competitiveness for tenure-track faculty, would increase the amount of time faculty members have to demonstrate a track record for successful funding, and would enable K-award recipients to complete their training periods prior to the final tenure review. Under the new tenure clock, criteria for promotion and tenure would remain the same. Similarly, current options in HR-23 for termination after provisional tenure reviews, for promotion nominations prior to the final tenure review, and for applying for early tenure reviews would remain.

- **Grant the COM local control over decisions affecting timing of the tenure clock for individual faculty members,** as the COM would have a different tenure clock than the University. These decisions would include: (1) “Stay of tenure clock” requests, and (2) Requests to be considered for early tenure reviews. Currently, these require the Provost’s approval but could be reviewed for final approval by the Dean of the COM.

For questions contact Carol Weisman, PhD, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, cweisman@psu.edu, or Ann Ouyang, MD, Associate Dean for Faculty and Professional Development, aouyang@hmc.psu.edu
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Table 1. Probationary Periods in Colleges of Medicine in the region surrounding Penn State’s COM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Medicine</th>
<th>Basic science faculty</th>
<th>Clinical faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University*</td>
<td>9 (other colleges 7)</td>
<td>Tenure not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probation period differs from other Colleges for both basic science and clinical faculty
** Probation period differs from other Colleges in their University System for clinical faculty only

Table 2. Probationary Periods in Colleges of Medicine for CIC institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Medicine</th>
<th>Basic science faculty</th>
<th>Clinical faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Indiana*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota*</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska*</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probation period differs from other Colleges for both basic science and clinical faculty
** Probation period differs from other Colleges in their University System for clinical faculty only
Data source: 2008 Faculty Personnel Policies Survey of the Association of American Medical Colleges. The survey questions were: “Please specify the maximum number of years generally covered by the probationary period for basic science faculty members on a tenure-eligible track, including the terminal year;” and “Please specify the maximum number of years covered by the probationary period for the majority of clinical faculty members on a tenure-eligible track, including the terminal year.”
In addition the Office of Faculty and Professional Development reviewed the online tenure policies of those Universities with both a School of Medicine and Schools who are part of a larger University System that is comprised or more than Health-professional related schools.

Table 3. Trends in Tenure Track Faculty, College of Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of COM faculty on tenure track or tenured *</td>
<td>29% (311/1089)</td>
<td>27% (304/1139)</td>
<td>25% (290/1175)</td>
<td>23% (277/1207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of tenure track/tenured faculty who are basic scientists</td>
<td>50% (155/311)</td>
<td>51% (154/304)</td>
<td>53% (155/290)</td>
<td>53% (148/277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of tenure track with tenure</td>
<td>76% (236/311)</td>
<td>78% (236/304)</td>
<td>80% (231/290)</td>
<td>83% (231/277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of new assistant professor hires appointed on tenure track</td>
<td>4% (4/94)</td>
<td>4% (5/120)</td>
<td>4% (6/132)</td>
<td>7% (8/122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 6th-year tenure cases denied **</td>
<td>40% (4/10)</td>
<td>20% (1/5)</td>
<td>10% (1/10)</td>
<td>0% (0/9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of non-tenured faculty switching from tenure track to fixed-term track prior to 6th-year tenure review ***</td>
<td>3% (2/75)</td>
<td>4% (3/68)</td>
<td>8% (5/59)</td>
<td>4% (2/46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The COM Integrated Faculty Database (IFL) includes all COM faculty members, including those employed by the University and those employed by the Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center. The IFL was established in AY 2011-12; detailed tracking is available only since that academic year.
* The percentage of faculty on the tenure track or tenured was 33% in 2009.
** The 6th-year tenure denial rate was 25% over the past 7 years (AY 2008-09 through 2014-15). In addition, 2 basic scientists were denied tenure after 2nd or 4th-year provisional tenure reviews during this same time period. All denials were at the College level.
*** Seven cases were MDs; 5 were PhDs or other doctorate.
Table 4. Tenure Clocks in Top Ten Medical Schools for 2015.
Ranked in 2015 on research activity (based on 8 indicators, including NIH total dollar grants awarded and grants per faculty member) by *U.S. News and World Report: Best Medical Schools: Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Medicine</th>
<th>Basic science faculty</th>
<th>Clinical faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California San Francisco</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Pennsylvania**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington U in St. Louis***</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale***</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia**</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 (if &gt;20% clinical effort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke**</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probation period differs for both basic science and clinical faculty
** Probation period differs from other schools in their University System for clinical faculty only
*** Every college is allowed to decide promotion and tenure path
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

Communication and Culture: Follow-up Report to Communications Subcommittee of the 2013-2014 Health Care Task Force Report

(Informational)

Introduction

This report is presented as a follow-up on the Health Care Task Force Report of April 29, 2014. Specific recommendations were made by the task force in their report, and in the eighteen months since the report was presented, progress has been made in several areas identified in the report. The Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits, in conjunction with the Penn State Benefits Office, has looked at each recommendation to ascertain areas that are progressing well, areas that are in beginning stages, and areas that are yet to be addressed. This report is presented in an effort to give our Faculty Senate membership a complete and transparent view of the administration’s efforts to improve the process of procuring health benefits packages and dispensing information to employees.

Information

The following information is presented to delineate progress toward each section of the original Health Care Task Force Report of April 29, 2014. Original text is presented in italics, followed by responses provided by Penn State’s Benefits Office and the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits.

I. Communication of Context and Constraints.

First and foremost, it is important for Penn State to address clearly and forthrightly the reasoning behind any proposed health care initiative. It can do so by clearly outlining the larger policy context and the resulting constraints faced by the University. Examples of such communication include:

A. An explication of the Affordable Care Act, including aspects that could benefit employees’ health, and its impact on Penn State.
B. The demographic and health characteristics of Penn State employees with implications for health care expenditures.
C. Regional competition among health care providers to offer services to Penn State employees.
D. Competitive practices among providers in different parts of the state, creating the need for diversity of plans within the Penn State system.
E. An outline of the health economics at Penn State, including a discussion of the wage-benefit trade-off.
F. The rationale behind the cost-containment strategy adopted by the senior leadership.
G. The constraints imposed by the 10-year contract with Highmark.
H. Evidentiary basis for emphasizing wellness—do the insurers mandate it or does PSU have evidence to suggest that wellness programs are indeed beneficial to employers and employees?

Response:

- Following the wellness initiative, the President created the Health Care Advisory Committee (HCAC) in the summer of 2014 to review and provide advice on the items listed above. The Committee has been reviewing challenges the University faces related to the sustainability of a competitive and cost-effective medical program and the impact that inaction could have on the ability for administration to offer affordable medical benefits that attract and retain faculty and staff. Information from the Health Care Advisory Committee is being shared regularly with the Faculty Senate Benefits Committee and the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits. The discussion of this information within both committees provides education and helps ensure transparency and two-way communication throughout the decision-making process regarding health care benefits.
- The Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits (JCIB) reviewed the 2014 annual Highmark Cost Analysis Report to explore the health characteristics of Penn State employees enrolled in health plans and evaluate how the plan offerings support appropriate care at the best cost, including programs that have been implemented to support members with specific risk conditions.
- This review showed that the plans offered through the third party administrator, Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield, provide in-network care across the university system for close to 99% of the care costs incurred by members, and the negotiation of allowable costs reduces by almost 50% the full cost of provider charges.
- The JCIB, in collaboration with the Benefits Office, presented its annual report on benefits changes to the University Faculty Senate on October 27, 2015, in which a detailed table of health care costs demonstrated the changes from 2013 to 2014 in various items, including total care costs, administrative contributions, employee contributions, and contributions per member per year by both the university and the employee.
- The contract with Highmark for third party administration of the plans continues through the 2017 plan year, and the process for selecting a third party administrator for subsequent years is being planned in consultation with JCIB and the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits.
- The current Highmark plans offer many wellness features and discounts that JCIB is currently reviewing for the scope of engagement by members across the university system.

II. Communications to Improve Transparency and Consultation in Decision-Making.
An essential feature of an effective communication policy is improving the transparency of the administration’s decision-making process and providing the faculty and staff with opportunities to shape and test programs before they are rolled out as a “done deal.” The following actions would fall under this category.
A. A flow chart explaining how Penn State makes decisions affecting its employees, along with the time-line for consultations and approval. Presumably, the Office of Human Resources (OHR) goes through a planning cycle before launching any major initiative, keeping in mind the various deadlines for consulting with the Senate benefits committee informing the Board of Trustees, and so on. At the earliest possible phase of this cycle, the University community should be made aware of the movement of the proposed initiative through these various steps.

B. Active efforts to seek input from all stakeholders at critical stages. A reasonable period of time should be set aside for input from faculty and staff so that meaningful changes can be made to policy in response. The goals should not be to simply obtain “buy in” from employees, but give them an opportunity to shape the proposal so that they have a sense of ownership.

C. Greater involvement of elected representatives of employees. The Faculty Senate Benefits Committee is our best structured, standing group for reviewing policy changes.

D. Pre-policy town-hall meetings, both physical and virtual, and other mechanisms for people to ask questions, voice concerns and make suggestions. For example some Colleges are holding town-hall meetings to discuss the upcoming Gen Ed reform. OHR could do the same thing during the initial stages of planning employee-related initiatives.

E. Gauging community reactions to potential policy directions, through blogs and other social media (e.g. the recent initiative by the Gen Ed taskforce at gened.psu.edu).

F. Assessing support in the community for specific policy options with the aid of employee focus groups and other research methods when there are clear choices to be made.

G. Timing the rollout of initiatives to occur during the middle of Fall and Spring semesters (when they are likely to be noticed by most people), not during summers or holidays.

Response:

- The Office of Human Resources added a new position to the staff, a Manager of Marketing & Communications, to develop and execute a strategy to provide regular communications throughout the calendar year and use various media to ensure a broad reach.

- The JCIB regularly reviews proposed changes to benefits, and discusses the basis for any proposed change to health plan features. The JCIB is composed of representatives from all stakeholder groups in the university, including the Benefits Office, the Faculty Senate, the Staff Advisory Council, the retirees, and the unionized employees of the Teamsters Local Union No. 8, and Office and Professional Employees International Union (OPEIU) Healthcare Pennsylvania. The agendas and the minutes of the JCIB are published on the University Faculty Senate website beginning 2015-16.

- The HCAC is comprised of faculty, staff and administrators who have expertise in the health care field or who have direct responsibility for health-care related work for the University. Members include health care practitioners; academic experts in the
disciplines of health care and insurance; and administrative representatives for human resources, budget and finance. The HCAC meets monthly and serves in an advisory capacity for administrative decisions regarding health care for University employees.

- There have been two town-hall meetings (June 2 and September 30, 2015) in which Provost Nick Jones and David Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business, have presented information on a variety of topics, including health care benefits, and answered questions from faculty and staff. The meetings were presented to a live audience at University Park and live-streamed so that employees from other campuses could participate.

- The University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits presented a forensic report, “Health Insurance Plans: An Overview of Issues,” to the Senate in October, 27, 2015. The report posed questions to the Senate regarding factors considered in choosing a health care plan, the types of information that are most helpful to employees when making decisions regarding health care plans, and recommendations for the dissemination of information from the Benefits Office. Responses from senators are being shared with OHR and will be discussed in Faculty Benefits committee meetings.

### III. Building a Culture of Open, Honest and Frequent Communications.

HR communications relating to the welfare of employees and their communities ought to reflect the spirit of dialogue and be part of a culture of openness in information exchange rather than shrouded in secrecy. Suggestions include:

A. Year-round communications about the benefits-related issues instead of being focused around a short period in the fall.

B. Constant/frequent communications. Silence on the part of the administration can breed suspicion and doubt, leading to rumors and conspiracy theories.

C. Two-way communication forums are sorely needed in the Penn State community, so that employees can not only hear back from the administration but also be exposed to the voices of fellow Penn Staters.

D. Better communication vehicles about HR matters, e.g., the monthly ITS newsletter, that have the flavor of water-cooler conversations about matters of common welfare and serve to build a sense of community.

E. More detailed information about the expenses and management of health care and retirement plans, e.g., details of “revenue sharing” and rational for high “expense ratio” of funds offered in the health saving accounts (HSAs).

F. Tips to employees about how to navigate through the maze of the health care system, just as there are tips about leading a healthy lifestyle.

G. PSU News media and press releases should reflect views of faculty and staff, not just those of the administration.

### Response:

- In the summer of 2014, information was placed on the OHR website regarding the termination of the Highmark-UPMC contract. The effects on employees and a link to a state-sponsored website were included. In addition, communications were provided...
directly to the campuses’ Human Resources Representatives for distribution, as well as mailing to individuals directly affected.

- An eight-article series has been running in Penn State Today since May, 2015. Dates and topics are listed below:
  - May 18 – Understanding your benefits: How does health care work?
  - June 1 – Understanding your benefits: Some key terms to help with plan selection
  - June 21 – Understanding your benefits: Penn State’s PPO Blue and PPO Savings Plans
  - July 23 – Understanding your benefits: More details of Penn State’s health plans
  - Aug. 17 – Understanding your benefits: Special health management programs available
  - Sept. 18—Ways to put pre-tax dollars aside for medical care
  - Oct. 5 –Understanding your benefits: Is the PPO Savings plan right for you?
  - Oct. 19 --Understanding Your Benefits: Using the Highmark website to your advantage

- The two town-hall meetings (June 2 and September 30, 2015) in which Provost Nick Jones and David Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business, presented updates and stood for questions have presented opportunities for faculty and staff at University Park and other locations to ask questions regarding health care benefits.

- The University Faculty Senate committee on Faculty Benefits presented a forensics report to the Senate on October 27 in which senators could examine the PPO Blue and PPO Savings Plans and discuss desired information to support employee decision-making between the two plans.

- The Office of Human Resources (OHR) has made significant efforts to inform employees about Open Enrollment for 2016. Specific events are listed below:
  - July 27 – Unit/departmental HR representatives were emailed schedule for Benefits Open Enrollment (BOE) live-webinars
  - Sept. 15 – HR reps received a BOE update during monthly meeting
  - Sept. 17 –BOE announcement was emailed, and BOE microsite, openenrollment.psu.edu, went live
  - Sept. 25 – Scrolling website banner was placed on OHR website ohr.psu.edu, directing to microsite
  - Sept. 28 – Oct. 2 – HR reps received second reminder of live webinars and log-in instructions
  - Oct. 2 – Postcard-reminder for e-magazine mailed to employees
  - Oct. 2—E-magazine opened on employee benefits web site
  - Oct. 5 – Penn State Today article - Benefits Open Enrollment is Nov. 2-20, emphasize the transition to a paperless delivery system for BOE, with the benefits e-booklet and dedicated microsite, saving money and providing a direct-electronic link to benefits website.
  - Oct. 5- Nov. 19 – Eleven different times/dates scheduled for employees to join a live-webinar for 2016 BOE.
  - Oct. 12 – Penn State Today article - Live-webinar’s for 2016 BOE. Emphasizing the live-webinar schedule, topics covered, etc.
  - Monday, Nov. 2 – Penn State Today article - 2016 BOE has begun and runs through November 20.
Monday, Nov. 9 – Penn State Today article - 2016 BOE is underway. Visit the microsite!

Monday, Nov. 16 – Penn State Today article - Reminder that 2016 BOE ends Friday, Nov. 20!

January 2016 – home mailing regarding tax savings opportunities (planned)

- The JCIB, in collaboration with the Benefits Office, presented its annual report on benefits changes to the University Faculty Senate on October 27, 2015, in which a detailed table of health care costs detailed the changes from 2013 to 2014 in various items, including total care costs, administrative contributions, employee contributions, and contributions per member per year by both the university and the employee.

- The Benefits website contains tools to assist in the evaluation of health care plan choices in which employees can examine their particular individual situations in selecting plans and options.

IV. Recognizing Individual Sensitivity and Respecting Personal Privacy.

HR must communicate that employees have an absolute right to privacy of their personal information, which means they have a real choice in determining who has access to it and who does not. Of course, information is routinely collected in the natural course of patient diagnosis, treatment and payment by insurers and health care providers, and this information is clearly protected by HIPAA privacy rules. And, while employees may be comfortable with HR handling certain kinds of sensitive information, such as salaries for example, they may not want to share most other aspects of their personal life with their employer. Penn State must respect individual freedom in all health-related decision-making and make every effort to provide employees with the most current information to aid that decision.

A. Employees should be given choice and an opportunity to consent before their personal health information is collected by Penn State for administrative purposes. If employees opt out of the use of this data, however, it could make analysis (for purposes of changing plans, or reducing costs, for example) difficult to implement. A firewall, or handling of the data outside the University through an entity that satisfies the HIPAA privacy requirements, might be an acceptable alternative.

B. Motives for collecting personal health data about employees should be made explicit.

C. Given major security breaches of confidential information at the highest levels of government and corporate sectors, Penn State must understand that it is of paramount importance to protect the security of the private information collected about its employees.

D. Employees should not be asked to part with their privacy for a price/fee.

E. Employees should not be asked to pay a price for protecting their privacy.

F. Employees should be given opportunities to customize their health care choices, i.e. self-tailoring, rather than being asked to reveal information about themselves for the system to personalize their choices for them, i.e., system-tailoring. Some employees are upset about WebMD automatically issuing health warnings and diagnoses based on private and/or incorrect/outdated information imported from
other systems (biometric data or pharmaceutical records, for example). Employees should be provided options for specifying the nature of collation of information from the various systems.

G. Be aggressive in protecting employees’ rights to privacy of their health information by employing claims-based data whenever possible. For example, PSU could obtain data on utilization of preventive visits or services directly from Highmark rather than requiring enrollees to undertake a wellness survey and undergo biometric screening.

Response:

- Human Resources provided the following response related to all of the above items in an effort to provide employees with a clear understanding of the employee’s rights to privacy and the employer’s role in maintaining that privacy. “All personal health information is protected by HIPAA privacy rules and HR recognizes the importance of maintaining security and privacy of personal information. HR does not have access to any personal health information, including claims information, and is bound by strict confidentiality policies for sensitive information, such as salaries, that is used for business purposes.”

- All plans and relationships with relevant third party wellness vendors to encourage wellness by incentives related to annual health screening activities and verification have been cancelled by the University as reported in the JCIB minutes of October 27, 2015.

- The surcharge for health care premiums for smoking attestation remains in place; however, a third choice is being provided with the 2016 open enrollment process in which employees can choose not to answer the question without penalty of the surcharge, thus asserting this choice in personal behavior as a matter of their own privacy.

- The JCIB has reviewed the 2014 Highmark Annual Cost Analysis report to examine the patterns of member utilization of health care services, and regularly discusses how that information might support various wellness initiative proposals. The minutes of their meeting are published on the University Faculty Senate website beginning with the 2015-16 senate year.

V. Communications to Build Credibility.

Given the negative reaction to last year’s rollout of the health initiative and the fallout from it, Penn State must work hard to regain the trust of its faculty and staff. The following should be key guidelines governing all communications between the administration and the employees.

A. Embrace a culture of participation. All major decisions should be based on input from the relevant stakeholders.

B. Practice shared governance. Compositions of committees and taskforces should involve actual stakeholders and ought not to be driven by administrators in a top-down fashion.

C. Make use of the disciplinary expertise of our faculty when we design new programs. For example, faculty experts could have helped the University by
bringing to bear the scholarly body of literature on wellness programs before the University adopted Highmark’s preventive-health plan.

D. Embrace principles of fairness and equity. For example, the administration should go out of its way to explain why salary-based indexing of health care costs is fair to employees in all salary bands.

E. Embrace principle of equality. Any and all instances of differential treatment of employees (e.g., health care cost differences based on their smoking status or the employment status of spouses) ought to be explicitly addressed by the administration.

F. Fully disclose how employee data are being used and will be used in the future.

G. Provide real choice to stakeholders and explain the rationale for incentives. For example, incentivizing employees to choose one health plan or provider over another will be seen as limiting choice unless the rationale for the policy is clearly explained.

Response:

- The Health Care Advisory Committee (HCAC) is the first stop for vetting ideas and benefits planning prior to socializing them with the Faculty Senate, other benefits advisory committees, and the President’s Council. A subcommittee of the Health Care Advisory Committee is researching different strategies for health care plan design and cost sharing and will present them to the Faculty Senate and Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits prior to implementation for discussion and agreed-upon revision.
- The JCIB has discussed the rationale for a surcharge on smoking and options for reducing the increased health care costs attributed to the personal choice to smoke. The minutes from JCIB are published on the University Faculty website beginning with the 2015-16 senate year.
- The University Faculty Senate committee on Faculty Benefits presented a forensic report to the senate on October 27, 2015 on the differences between the PPO Blue and PPO Savings health care plans, and provided a forum to discuss the information employees need to make an informed choice between the two plans.

VI. Communications to Demonstrate Goodwill and Collegiality.

Penn State should follow its own dictum of “Take Care of Your Health” by taking care of its employees. The administration needs to consider the “human face” of its employees and express goodwill in ways that serve to boost their morale. Some suggestions:

A. Offer rewards for pursuing wellness rather than punishments for not doing so. Do not try to frame the latter as the former.

B. Actions should convey that PSU is looking out for the welfare of its employees rather than simply pursuing a cost-cutting agenda. Communicating the evidence of benefit (such as improved health outcomes) for specific types of behavior change programs and for clinical preventive services is important for helping employees understand why these activities are offered and incentivized.
C. Provide sufficient lead time, with adequate opportunity for consultations and clarifications, whenever employees are required to sign up for a new initiative (e.g., the dependent verification program in 2013 worked better in part because of the long lead time).

D. Change management protocol for all new initiative should include a trial period before actual implementation and/or a staggered rollout in stages.

E. The language of University communications about employee benefits should be designed to reflect employee’ interests rather than those of our vendors. There was a great deal of resentment last year (2013) about PSU administration and OHR using the “talking points” given to them by Highmark, as if the University was representing the insurance provider rather than its employees.

F. Provide just-in-time information about their choices to help employees see the consequences of their decisions at the time that they make them. For example, several employees were surprised by the steep increase in their premiums this year (2014). This could have been avoided if they were fully informed about the implications of their choices at the time they made them last fall. Of course, the faculty and staff do need to pay attention to the information provided if it is to be useful.

G. Demonstrate its benevolence at every opportunity. The University should communicate the dollar value of the benefits that it provides for employees. For example, more online tools in the Employee self-Service Center could be provided for individual employees to assess the value of the benefits they receive from the University.

Response:

- The Office of Human Resources has taken steps to avoid past misunderstandings and misconceptions and has been practicing transparency and shared governance related to all benefits communications. OHR has made a concerted effort to provide communications that are accurate, frequent, and timely. Information has been provided to employees through a variety of media (Penn State Today, Human Resources Representatives, mass e-mails, HR website and microsite, webinars, home mailers). The University takes seriously its commitment to provide employees with access to information, tools and resources that enable employees to make decisions that best meet their personal and families’ needs. With shared governance comes shared accountability; employees also need to be engaged in managing their own health by taking advantage of the resources available to them.

- Beginning with the 2015-16 senate year, the JCIB reviews each proposed change to any feature of the health care plans and deliberates the basis for that change in health care data and the rationale of that change for benefiting employee health care and wellness. The annual report of the JCIB details the dollar costs and value of the health care plans per employee. The JCIB agendas and minutes are published on the Faculty Senate website beginning with the 2015-16 senate year.
In sum, the taskforce calls for a major shift in the nature, tone and structure of communications between the administration and the employees at Penn State with respect to health benefits both in planning and implementation of major initiatives. The culture of behind-the-scenes orchestration of such important initiatives should be replaced with a culture of open and free flow of information and frequent consultation, creating the climate for transparent decision-making and shared governance. Instead of being coercive and punitive, communications about new initiatives should provide greater agency (control and choice) for individual employees in matters relating to their personal welfare. Above all, communications should be seen not as information transmission from the administration to the employees, but as a dialogue between the two.

Discussion and Conclusions

The Health Care Task Force Report of April 29, 2014 presented important and relevant information regarding concerns for better communications surrounding health benefits. It identified many areas for consideration and improvement regarding transparency in health benefits decisions made by Penn State University. Since the time of the report, the University administration, and in particular the Office of Human Resources, has made considerable efforts to improve communications with faculty and staff. OHR has significantly increased the numbers and types of communications available to employees. Articles in Penn State Today and materials and tools on the OHR website have been developed to help demystify health care options and answer questions employees might have about their choices. Town hall meetings have been held with senior administrators, affording opportunities for questions and answers. Webinars have been scheduled to disseminate information about the Open Enrollment period and available options.

There have also been efforts made to improve two-way communication with faculty and staff and to include faculty in the process of choosing and adapting health care benefits plans for the University. OHR works with several committees that include faculty representation and are focused on health benefits (University Senate Faculty Benefits Committee, Health Care Advisory Committee, Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits). These sincere efforts to improve faculty involvement in health care benefits decisions and to offer substantially more information to employees are noted and appreciated.

It is essential that employees avail themselves of the many opportunities to learn about benefits options including the OHR and Open Enrollment websites, articles in Penn State Today, town hall meetings, and webinars. There has been an underlying climate of uncertainty and apprehension surrounding health benefits, which stems from a variety of informational sources, within and outside the University. Some sources are decidedly more reliable than others. For this reason it is critical that the Office of Human Resources continues to provide timely and accurate information, as appropriate, to employees throughout the process of identifying new or eliminating old health care plans and options. The two-way communications discussed in the Health Care Task Force report presents opportunities for both administration and faculty. Administrators must continue their efforts to be transparent in their decision-making processes, and faculty must actively read, listen and participate in communications and events that impact health care benefits for Penn State employees.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Report on Faculty Partners Program

(Informational)

I. Introduction

The Faculty Partner Program (FPP) at University Park, a joint venture between the University Faculty Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (IAC) and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, began in 2013. The goal of the FPP is to provide a partnership between academic and athletics units at Penn State through increased contact and collaboration between faculty members, athletic coaches and student-athletes. Specifically the FPP aims to do the following:

1. Enhance the relationship and communication among faculty, coaches and student-athletes.
2. Increase understanding of the athletic and academic “worlds” and challenges that student-athletes navigate.
3. Build a greater sense of community and collaboration between coaches and faculty.
4. Create opportunities for coaches to learn more about the academic environment in which students and faculty operate.
5. Establish an environment where student-athletes can interact with faculty members in a more informal way.
6. Create an opportunity for faculty to help student-athletes prepare for life beyond sport.
7. Provide coaches with a faculty contact who “really knows the program” to assist in on-campus recruiting efforts.
8. Create an environment where coaches and faculty can gain a greater appreciation of student-athletes beyond the scope of the classroom and/or the playing field.

Since the inception of the FPP in 2013, the program has grown such that all 31 PSU sport teams have a faculty partner. Note that men’s and women’s swimming and diving, and men’s and women’s indoor/outdoor track and field/cross country each have one partner.

2. Training

Faculty partners are recruited by the Faculty Athletics Representative, members of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, coaches, and student athletes. Several faculty partners have been with their team since 2013. All faculty partners go through mandatory covered persons training and sign the
Intercollegiate Athletics Code of Conduct document, the purposes of which are to make sure NCAA and Penn State compliance policies are presented and discussed to avoid any violations (e.g., faculty cannot make any coaching suggestions or provide coaches with insight into a student-athlete’s grade or academic status).

3. Program Administration

From an administration-of-program perspective, past FPP activities have included joint meetings with faculty partners and coaches, a survey on best practices, and occasional correspondence with coaches and faculty partners to check in and see how things are going. In the fall of 2015, the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and the Faculty Athletics Representative hosted a breakfast for faculty partners and coaches to discuss best practices and ideas for continued or new collaboration. The focus for the discussions was defined by the opening queries:

1. How can faculty partners play a role in the career development of student-athletes?
2. What are ways student-athletes can maximize their experience while at Penn State in terms of career development?
3. How can faculty partners help students make most out of their academic experience while being a student-athlete?

There was a great deal of enthusiasm and creative discussion around these questions. In addition to the basic activities of faculty partners attending some practices and competitions and traveling to one away competition (with approval of the sport administrator), other examples of ideas generated are as follows:

1. Coach and/or student-athletes visit the faculty member’s research lab or creative space.
2. Coach delivers guest lectures in a class where appropriate.
3. Faculty partners conduct mock interviews with student-athletes at their request and organization of interviews.
4. Faculty partners mentor students in career fields or general guidance.
5. Compile a data base of interested faculty and faculty partners that includes areas of expertise in the service of inviting them in to speak with SAs.
6. Faculty partners encourage SAs to get to know at least one or two faculty members in their departments well. These faculty members will be important in terms of references for graduate school or employment.
7. Faculty partners have meals with first year SAs.
8. Have workshops with SAs that focus on professionalism in the workplace.
9. Include topics of ethics and integrity in conversations.
10. Introduce more faculty members to SAs in an informal setting.

11. Faculty partners serve as resources to coaches on official recruiting visits if requested.

4. The Future

The FPP will continue to be monitored by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, and the Faculty Athletics Representative. Opportunities for regular meetings between coaches and faculty partners to maintain communication will be scheduled.
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This report is presented to the Senate as an update to the ongoing work of the Council on Engaged Scholarship, and a follow up to the Advisory and Consultative report presented at the Senate plenary meeting of April 28, 2014.

Introduction

The Engaged Scholarship Initiative (ESI) began in 2012 with a goal of elevating the role of engaged scholarship in undergraduate education, including providing more opportunities for students to have engaged scholarship experiences. The primary body charged by the University’s leadership with advancing the initiative is the Council on Engaged Scholarship (CoES). The CoES comprises 35 sitting members, including University-wide student, faculty, staff, and administrator representation. Five committees, consisting of 70 individuals, undertake the work of the Council.

Closely related to the work of the Council on Engaged Scholarship and Engaged Scholarship Initiative, the University Faculty Senate has taken leadership in promoting out-of-class academic experiences for Penn State’s undergraduate students. In April 2014, the Senate passed an Advisory/Consultative Report—put forward by a partnership of nine standing committees—that gave the University guidance on how it should proceed with the Engaged Scholarship Initiative. Soon after taking office, President Barron endorsed this report.

At the same time, the President introduced his “Six Imperatives” to frame priorities for the Penn State community and to provide an important basis for the University’s next strategic plan. While each has a unique focus, these imperatives—Access and Affordability, Economic Development and Student Career Success, Student Engagement/Engaged Scholarship, Diversity and Demographics, Technology and Curriculum Delivery, and Excellence—are clearly intertwined, particularly with regard to their impact on student success. “Student Engagement,” defined by President Barron as “out-of-class activities that promote student success,” is a clear example of this interconnectedness.

Penn State defines engaged scholarship, a specific form of student engagement, as “out-of-class academic experiences that complement in-class learning.” Engaged scholarship experiences include, but are not limited to:

- Undergraduate research
- Internships
- Study abroad, study away, and embedded travel courses
- Service-learning and community-based learning
- Capstone courses with an out-of-class component
- Clinical experiences

See: Senate Committees on Curricular Affairs, Educational Equity and Campus Environment, Faculty Affairs, Global Programs, Outreach, Research, Student Life, Undergraduate Education, and University Planning (2015) Engaged Scholarship Report, April 29 (Appendix G).
• Self-directed engaged scholarship

The literature shows that engaged scholarship experiences contribute to academic success, positively impact achievement of key learning outcomes, strengthen interactions with faculty, enhance personal development, and cultivate life-long career success (see Appendix 1). Consequently, the Council on Engaged Scholarship has made the primary goal of the Engaged Scholarship Initiative to provide every undergraduate student with the opportunity to have at least one engaged scholarship experience by 2020.

Various Faculty Senate reports and other anecdotal evidence indicate that approximately 50% of Penn State students participate in engaged scholarship experiences. National studies indicate that traditional-age, white, upper-middle class students from college-educated families tend to participate in engaged scholarship experiences, while first-generation, low-income, underrepresented, and international students are less likely to participate. To meet its 2020 goal, Penn State will thus need to remove the barriers for students who do not participate.

Key Accomplishments to Date

Recent accomplishments of the Council are presented in Appendix 2. In addition to these accomplishments, the 16th annual meeting of the Engagement Scholarship Consortium was coordinated and hosted by Penn State in September 2015, and co-hosted by James Madison and Virginia Tech Universities. Presidents from the three host universities participated in a plenary panel, joining the more than 400 faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community partners from more than 100 institutions and non-profit partners worldwide who attended the conference to participate in the more than 60 paper symposia, workshops, paper sessions, and poster exhibitions.

The two undergraduate student governments (UPUA and CCSG) have also passed resolutions endorsing the Engaged Scholarship Initiative, and students are active members of the Council on Engaged Scholarship and its committees. For the past two summers, engaged scholarship has been a theme in the messages that students and their families new to University Park have heard at New Student Orientation. As a result, within the next two years, the majority of University Park undergraduate students will expect to participate in engaged scholarship as part of their undergraduate experience.

To raise awareness about progress made by the Engaged Scholarship Initiative, to gauge the level of engaged scholarship activities underway across the University, and to determine ways to advance the overall institutionalization of engaged scholarship by aligning the Initiative with ongoing engaged scholarship activities in the colleges and campuses, representatives of Council on Engaged Scholarship have conducted a series of conversations with deans and chancellors. To date, Council representatives have met with all 16 University Park Deans, one Director, the Dean of the College of Medicine, and 12 Commonwealth Campus Chancellors (see Appendix 3 for more information on these visits). Spring 2016 will yield additional campus visits.

---

2 Such experiences would not be led or designed by faculty, but would be approved by a formal process not yet developed.
Future of Engaged Scholarship

As part of a vision of the future of engaged scholarship at Penn State, the Council on Engaged Scholarship developed five goals, each of which is associated with action steps that are specific, measurable, achievable, and realistic for the upcoming year. We describe a few of them below.

1. **Communication.** Elevate the profile of engaged scholarship by communicating opportunities to all stakeholders, generating visibility at local, state, and national levels, and celebrating successes.
   - *Expand* the current website (http://www.engagedscholarship.psu.edu/) to include more information for the stakeholder groups.
   - *Establish* broad parameters of what an engaged scholarship experience is so that academic units can organize, track, and recognize students’ experiences.

2. **Implementation.** Integrate Engaged Scholarship into institutional infrastructure.
   - *Build* an institutional inventory of existing engaged scholarship opportunities that will contain relevant information for users.
   - *Partner* with internal and external networks.

3. **Assessment.** Develop objectives and evidence of achievement for students, the institution, and the community.
   - *Review* the existing literature for assessment instruments already being used to document the impact of different types of engaged scholarship on students.
   - *Create* a plan and timeline for systematically assessing the impact of engaged scholarship on Penn State students.

4. **Finances.** Identify funding to sustain the infrastructure, including internal and external funding sources.
   - *Work* with the Office of Development to build a philanthropic plan for the Engaged Scholarship Initiative.
   - *Develop* strategies to support expanding student, faculty and staff involvement and engaged scholarship opportunities.

5. **Faculty, Staff, & Student Engagement.** Expand the participation of faculty, staff, and students in engaged scholarship programs.
   - *Cultivate* engaged scholarship champions and establish an engaged scholarship community of practice.
   - *Train* engaged scholarship student ambassadors who will represent and explain the initiative to other students.

These and other activities of the Council, as well as activities taking place on the colleges and campuses, will elevate the impact of engaged scholarship at Penn State. The visits with deans and chancellors confirmed that many colleges and campuses have already integrated engaged scholarship into their strategic plans. We also know that engaged scholarship will have significant visibility in the next University capital campaign. Nonetheless, more information is needed to determine current resources already being deployed to support engaged scholarship, plans for expanding these experiences, and—most importantly—additional resources necessary to meet the Council’s primary goal by 2020.

To help Penn State reach the ambitious goal to provide every undergraduate student with the opportunity to have at least one engaged scholarship experience by 2020 and following the April 2014 Advisory and
Consultative recommendations of the Faculty Senate, we must enhance the University’s already robust engaged scholarship culture by creating curricular conditions that ensure each student has this opportunity.

We ask the Senate to consider the following three items:

- **Consideration #1**: Establish a graduation requirement that all students complete an engaged scholarship activity (0-18 credits) during their baccalaureate degree program. Engaged Scholarship experiences could already be included as a requirement for a major, minor, or certificate program, such as clinical work or student teaching. Others could be embedded in an existing course as out-of-class projects or semester-long experiences, such as internships. Others could be co-curricular, and some could even be non-credit bearing. This activity could include, but would not be limited to, one of the following activities: undergraduate research, internship, study abroad, study away, embedded travel courses, service-learning, community-based learning, a capstone course with an out-of-class component, clinical experiences, and self-directed engaged scholarship. The activity could also include a zero-credit option that would allow a student to meet the engaged scholarship requirement through approved experiences. The student transcript would reflect that this requirement has been met.

- **Consideration #2**: Create a Special Senate Committee to establish broad parameters of what an engaged scholarship experience is so that academic units can recognize, organize, and track student experiences. The Special Committee charged with this responsibility could consult with representatives from the Council on Engaged Scholarship, Student Affairs, and other University committees that are working on providing students with out-of-the-classroom experiences.

- **Consideration #3**: Identify and establish reward and recognition strategies for faculty and staff involved in engaged scholarship. It will not be necessary for promotion and tenure policies to change or for all faculty and staff to participate in engaged scholarship. Those that do participate should be recognized for the time and effort it takes to invest in this initiative. The Senate Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations Committees could be appropriate bodies to provide guidelines about recognition of faculty efforts. Appropriate staff guidelines could be addressed through the University Staff Advisory Council.
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Appendix 1. Why Engaged Scholarship Matters

As a student-centered university, engaged scholarship matters to Penn State because these experiences:

- *Contribute to academic success* by increasing retention and completion rates, cultivating career development, and improving satisfaction with college (Astin & Saxe, 1998; Eyler, *et al.*, 2001; Kuh, 2008; Moore, 2013; National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005)

- *Positively impact achievement of key learning outcomes*, including integrative and ethical thinking and social responsibility (Astin, 1997; Astin, *et al.*, 2000; Brownell & Swaner, 2010; Vaz & Quinn, 2014)

- *Strengthen interactions with faculty*, a key factor in college success, especially for historically underrepresented students (Cress, *et al.*, 2010; Finlay & McNair, 2013)

- *Enhance personal development*, including building self-confidence, self-efficacy, intercultural understanding, and developing leadership and communication skills (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Engberg 2013; O’Neill, 2010; Paige *et al.*, 2009)

### Appendix 2. 2014-15 Recent Accomplishments by the Committees of the Council on Engaged Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>2014-15 Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Commonwealth Campus**       | • Began inventory of campus-based engaged scholarship activities through contact with faculty senators, Directors of Student Affairs and Campus Academic Officers, campus visits, and the Office of the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses.  
  • Identified potential engaged scholarship “champions” among campus faculty with the intent to create and support a "community of practice."
| **Faculty & Staff Development** | • Identified rewards, outcomes, and diversity working groups.  
  • Conducted benchmarking to learn about faculty and staff engaged scholarship rewards structures at other universities.                                                                                     |
| **Pilots**                    | • Engaged 1,100 students in 20 courses by addressing real-world problems through assignments and activities derived from the Humanitarian Engineering and Social Entrepreneurship program and delivered pre- and post-assessments to students to assess engagement competencies.  
  • Developed and implemented 21 engaged scholarship modules on innovation, sustainable development, and career pathways in 83 classes with 1,944 students.  
  • Slides were developed for faculty to show in three Gen Ed courses that provided information about research, internships, and education abroad opportunities directly related to course content; total enrollment 2,925.  
| **Exposition & Symposium**    | • Planned and implemented the Engaged Scholarship Expo in November 2014 in partnership with Global Entrepreneurship Week to highlight students’ engaged scholarship experiences. Sixty-two proposals were submitted for selection, 13 were accepted, and 150 students, faculty, and staff attended.  
  • Planned and implemented the Engaged Scholarship Symposium, *Advancing Engaged Scholarship: Practical Strategies for Penn State* in March 2015, which focused on providing easy ways for faculty and staff to integrate engaged scholarship into their work. Twenty-five program submissions were received and seven were accepted. Two faculty from other institutions gave keynote presentations. Two-hundred seventeen faculty (86), staff (113), and students (18) from across the Commonwealth (representatives from 13 campuses including University Park) participated in person (193) or virtually (24).  
| **Recognition & Tracking**    | • Created and revised a draft model for a Penn State “Engaged Scholar Society” that includes requirements for entry and an implementation plan.  
  • Developed a draft model of an online system based on Penn State’s new badging system for advisors to track student participation in engaged scholarship activities and Society requirements.  
| **Marketing & Communications** | • Implemented strategic marketing efforts for the Engaged Scholarship Expo, Symposium, and the recent Engagement Scholarship Consortium Conference in September 2015.                                                                 |

---

5 Civic responsibility, ethical decision-making, multicultural awareness, and systems thinking.
| Philanthropy & Development | • Developed a two-year marketing plan that will elevate awareness and communication of engaged scholarship through a social media plan, brand research and development, and an enhanced website.  
|                           | • Collaborated with development staff to identify strategies to reach prospective donors.  
|                           | • Coordinated a development presentation for committee chairs. |
Appendix 3. Deans and Chancellors Visits by the Council on Engaged Scholarship

Representatives of the Council on Engaged Scholarship have conducted a series of conversations with deans and chancellors. The visits have had three purposes: to inform college and campus leadership about progress made by the Engaged Scholarship Initiative; to gauge the level and types of engaged scholarship activities underway across the University; and to determine ways to align the initiative with ongoing engaged scholarship activities in the colleges and campuses. To date, Council representatives have met with 16 University Park Deans, one Director, the Dean of the College of Medicine, and 12 Commonwealth Campus Chancellors.

The typical structure for conversation with deans and chancellors6 included: (a) a refresher on the Engaged Scholarship Initiative; (b) an update on recent initiative progress; (c) discussion of the unit’s engaged scholarship activities, including reference to engaged scholarship in the unit’s 2020 Strategic Plan; (d) discussion of reciprocity between the unit and Council on Engaged Scholarship; and (e) points of contact to enable further dialog. After the last dean’s meeting, we analyzed meeting notes and unit strategic plans to develop a framework for organizing the wide-ranging material.

This analysis showed that although all units are supportive of engaged scholarship, they are at one of three stages of institutionalization: Developing, Cooperating, and Harmonizing. The few units in the Developing stage all briefly mentioned engaged scholarship in their strategic plans and included high-quality exemplars of engaged scholarship work, but were nonetheless unsure how to further institutionalize engaged scholarship. Discussions with deans and chancellors at these meetings were general, and revolved around the basics of how to inventory, track, assess, expand different types, further educate faculty and staff, and find sustainable community, industry and business, and non-profit partners. Financing, such as human resourcing or costs of different types of engaged scholarship experiences, did not emerge in these conversations.

Most units are in the Cooperating phase. They clearly indicate involvement with engaged scholarship in unit strategic plans, including some evidence of data gathering and an emerging unit-wide and/or departmental structure. Conversations with deans and chancellors were more specific, with targeted requests for assistance on how to: advance and/or improve unit-wide inventorying, assessing, and/or tracking; further facilitate overall unit-wide cohesion; and capitalize on existing work in other units. At several meetings, possibilities for expanding engaged scholarship into distance education were also discussed. Financing, including human resourcing and/or cost efficiency, began to emerge in these conversations, particularly in relation to (a) sharing costs for a new engaged scholarship offerings through cross-unit partnerships, (b) learning more about existing engaged scholarship experiences across units to counter “re-inventing the wheel,” and (c) assigning within-unit engaged scholarship job responsibilities.

A few units are in the Harmonizing phase, where units’ strategic plans translate visions and goals for engaged scholarship into organized objectives and action steps. Conversation with deans and chancellors at these meetings were highly targeted and revolved around statements such as: “We need help with task X”; “We have lots of examples of how we make it work across the unit [e.g., recruitment and student orientation materials, development of a network of faculty champions, or inclusion of engaged scholarship in syllabi] that we are happy to share”; “I’d like you to work with us to increase student involvement with engaged scholarship type X”; and “We need help with marketing engaged scholarship for student recruitment and career development purposes.” Units in the Harmonizing phase recognized that to achieve unit-wide participation would require further within-unit refinement of existing engaged scholarship programs and policies coupled with development of cost-effective resource reallocation.

6 Many college and campus visits included Associate Deans or Directors of Academic Affairs in the conversations.
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, November 17, 2015 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Absent: L. Backer, E. Knodt, D. Wolfe, E. Miller

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ansari called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. on Tuesday, November 17, 2015, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF October 13, 2015

The minutes of the October 13, 2015, meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Ansari welcomed all continuing members and special guests.

Additional announcements by Chair Ansari:

- The Faculty Advisory Committee met this morning with President Barron and Provost Jones and discussed the following topics: Diversity, Inclusion, and Free Speech, Penn State Disability Services, The University Strategic Plan and Inter-collegiate Athletics, Ways in which to better recognizing/honoring those who contribute to the collective good of the University, Update on Commonwealth Campus Budget Models, President's Commissions for Equity: Composition, Training, and Resource Allocation, Now and in the Future, Use of Intercollegiate Athletics logo on Division III apparel, Corporate Sponsorships for the University, The new capital campaign and Emeritus Faculty, Value of Senate service as oppose to other department functions, Updates on the following: Search; Dean, Penn State Law; Chief Information Security Officer, Strategic Plan, Admissions and LionPATH, WorkLion, Graduate Student Town Halls, Canvas.
Chair Ansari announced that there will be an FAC meeting and Senate Council meeting on Tuesday, January 12, 2016.

Executive Vice President and Provost Nick Jones reported the interviews for the Dean of Penn State Law are being scheduled. The search for a Chief Information Security Officer has begun. Many individuals viewed the draft Strategic Plan online, and hundreds of comments were submitted. The Provost indicated the input is being reviewed. The final Town Hall, with graduate students from Earth and Mineral Sciences, was held recently.

Vice President Rob Pangborn reported 27,000 applications for admission have been received to date. Some issues arose with the launch of LionPath, but they were resolved. About 5,500 offers have been made for fall 2016. The Starfish advising system will be coming online soon. He also reported that the transition from ANGEL to Canvas has begun. One feature in ANGEL that is not available in Canvas is the establishment of groups. A separate solution will be implemented for that function, which is heavily used at Penn State.

Vice President and Vice Provost C. Weidemann announced that this is Global Entrepreneur Week. Over 7000 students are participating.

Vice Provost Marcus Whitehurst discussed Penn State’s ranking in a publication, “Diversity in Higher Education.”

Vice Provost Blannie Bowen announced two AD14 reviews are underway.

Vice President Madlyn Hanes reported progress is being made in four searches for campus executives. She also mentioned that Carol Reardon, Penn State Laureate, is visiting all campuses, meeting especially with veterans, in association with Trustee McCombie.

The Senate officers and Executive Director had no comments.

Councilor J. Myers thanked Secretary Pauley for the snack. Councilor Eckhardt mentioned the input received on the survey developed and distributed by the Special Committee on the Implementation of LionPATH. John Moore, Chair of the Special Committee, will be speaking at the Commonwealth Caucus meeting on December 7.

**ACTION ITEMS**

The Penn State Berks P-4 proposal to close the Associate in Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management was approved on a Wilson/Brunsden motion. The Office of Undergraduate Education will be notified of this action.

Revisions to the College of Arts and Architecture constitution were approved. The chair of the unit faculty organization and the College of Arts and Architecture dean will be notified.

Revisions to the Penn State Brandywine constitution were approved. The chair of the unit faculty organization and the Brandywine chancellor will be notified.
Senate Council approved the 2016-2017 Senate Calendar as presented. It was agreed that the Senate Council meeting proposed for June 27, 2017 should be held, so that Council can address any issues that arise.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Vice President for Administration Tom Poole presented an Update on the University’s AD Policies. He described the types and structure of University policies, gave some history on development of policies, and explained the new AD 00 policy, which established the mechanism for developing and reviewing policies. He answered several questions about process and review of policies. He and Provost Jones mentioned that some policies are obsolete and that all policies are being reviewed to remove redundancies and those that are no longer needed and to combine policies, where appropriate.

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Minutes from the October 21, 2015, Graduate Council meetings are posted on the Graduate School website at [http://www.gradschool.psu.edu/gradcouncil/2015-16-graduate-council-meetings/](http://www.gradschool.psu.edu/gradcouncil/2015-16-graduate-council-meetings/). Council liaison Eckhardt had no additions.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR DECEMBER 8, 2015

Forensic Business

The Forensic Report on Professional Ranks, Reviews, and Promotion Paths for Penn State’s Fixed-Term Faculty, submitted by Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations, was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Nousek motion, after correcting one term in the document. Thirty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Forensic Report on Curricular and Co-Curricular Learning Pathways to Promote the Well-Being and Safety of First-Year Undergraduate Students. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Grimes motion. Twenty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Legislative Reports

*Committees and Rules* — Revision of the Standing Rules (Rules of Procedure), Article I, Section 2. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Taylor motion.

*Committees and Rules* — Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 4. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Eckhardt motion.

*Committees and Rules* — Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 7 (University Faculty Athletics Representatives). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Wilson motion.

*Committees and Rules* — Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 9 (University Faculty Ombudsperson). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Aynardi motion.
Curricular Affairs — Revisions to Senate Policy 42-82 (Acquisition of Credits) Accredited U.S. Institutions. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Taylor motion.

Special Senate Committee on the Implementation of LionPath — Change to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Wilson motion.

Advisory/Consultative Reports

Faculty Affairs— Revision of the Tenure Clock for the Penn State College of Medicine. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Wilson motion, with one modification.

Informational Reports

Faculty Benefits — Communication and Culture: Follow-up Report to Communications Subcommittee of the 2013-2014 Health Care Task Force Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Eckhardt motion. Twenty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Intercollegiate Athletics — Report on Faculty Partners Program. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Kuldau motion. Five minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Council on Engaged Scholarship — Engaged Scholarship Update. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Eckhardt motion. Twenty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 8, 2015

The Agenda was approved on a Nousek/ Szczygiel motion.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Daniel R. Hagen
Executive Director
Date: November 23, 2015

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings for December 7 and 8. Please notify the Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

**MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2015**

- **6:30 p.m.** Officers and Chairs Meeting 102 Kern Graduate Building
- **8:15 p.m.** Commonwealth Caucus Meeting 102 Kern Graduate Building

**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2015**

- **8:00 a.m.** Intercollegiate Athletics 502 Keller Building
- **8:30 a.m.** Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid Committees and Rules 201 Kern Graduate Building
  - Curricular Affairs 102 Kern Graduate Building
  - Educational Equity and Campus Environment 315 Grange Building
  - Faculty Affairs 202 Hammond Building
  - Faculty Benefits 519 Elliott Building
  - Intra-University Relations 217 Forest Resources Building
  - Outreach 214 Business Building
  - Research 217 Grange Building
  - Undergraduate Education 110C Chandlee Lab
  - University Planning 324 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Global Programs</td>
<td>412 Boucke Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries, Information Systems,</td>
<td>510A Paterno Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>409H Keller Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Student Senators Caucus and Orientation</td>
<td>114 Kern Graduate Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Commonwealth Caucus Meeting</td>
<td>Boardroom, Nittany Lion Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Faculty Senate</td>
<td>112 Kern Graduate Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: November 23, 2015

To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected campus senators)

From: Galen Grimes and Matthew Woessner, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2015 – 8:15 PM
112 KERN BUILDING
*NOTE LOCATION CHANGE

Gen Ed Implemented. A Discussion of How the New Integrative Studies Courses Will Work

*John Moore, Chair of the Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform

To join the evening caucus meeting by phone or video, please dial 440351 for video or 814-867-5845 and enter the ID# 440351 for phone.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2015 – 11:15 AM
BOARDROOM, NITTANY LION INN

A conversation with President Barron

A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:15 p.m.

Agenda

I. Call to Order
II. Announcements
III. Committee Reports
IV. Other Items of Concern/New Business
V. Adjournment and Lunch