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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Mohamad Ansari, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Ansari: The October 27, 2015, Senate Record, providing a full transcription of the proceedings, was sent to the University Archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

May I hear a motion to accept?

Senators: So moved.

Chair Ansari: Second?

Senators: Second.

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

Senators: Aye.

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

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Ansari: The Senate Curriculum Report of November 17, 2015, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETING OF NOVEMBER 17, 2015

Chair Ansari: Minutes from the November 17, 2015 Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Ansari: I would like to thank Senator Dennis Gouran for serving as Parliamentarian in place of Senator Backer, who is not able to be with us today.

President Barron has accepted with modifications the Advisory/Consultative Report on HR25. The President’s letter will be posted on the Senate website as part of the September 2015 Senate Agenda.

All senators using Mediasite, please use the “ask a question box” to send a message that you have successfully connected to the live feed so that we may add your name to the attendance sheet. As a reminder to senators joining today’s meeting by Mediasite, we are using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate.
Just a reminder that visitors are not permitted to speak during the meeting unless prior permission from the Chair has been granted. We ask that visitors sit in the visitors’ section.

The Senate calendar for 2016-17 was approved by Senate Council on November 17. The calendar appears as Appendix B in the Agenda and is posted on the Senate website. Senators are urged to note the dates on their calendars.

At this time, I would like to invite Senator John Moore, Chair of the Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform, to make remarks on the Special Committee’s survey and upcoming reports.

John Moore, Retired Senator: Thank you. The Special Senate Committee on the Implementation of General Education Reform last spoke to you on September 15. At that time, we asked for your help with a survey we were about to conduct. The survey concerned the committee's draft of proposed revisions of the descriptions of the General Education foundations-- formerly skills-- and knowledge domains. Let me tell you the results.

The survey was sent to 2,638 individuals, and 803 replied-- a response rate of 31%. The survey invited recipients to comment on each of the proposed new criteria for each of the seven categories of General Education requirements. They are quantification, writing and speaking, arts, humanities, health and wellness, natural sciences, and social and behavioral sciences.

The overall response was very strongly positive. For each of the proposed new criteria, there were three choices. One—“keep as worded.” Summing the data across responses to all criteria, 82% said yes, keep as worded.

Choice number two was “keep and reword.” Summing the data across all questions, it received a response of roughly 14%. Choice number three was “delete and remove.” It received a response of roughly 4%.

Thus, 96% of the replies approved of the proposed domain revisions, either as is or suggested changes in the wording. At the same time, many of you provided written suggestions. We incorporated many of them in the final text, which will soon be distributed as part of the committee's upcoming draft of a Legislative Report. Thus we now have a fresh set of domain criteria ready for you to vote on later this year. Then if approved, these updated statements will be used starting this summer to propose new and existing courses for the integrative studies requirements.

I have given only a brief glance at the survey here. As we promised in September, a copy of the survey text plus the data from the survey results will soon be on the Senate website, where you can see seven pages of charts with numerical responses for each proposed criterion for each of the seven general education categories. We will be pleased to send you an email copy of the survey text sooner if you so desire.

We have two more favors to ask of you. In January we will send you a preliminary draft of our report for discussion during a planned forensic session at the January plenary meeting. This preliminary draft in our
Forensic Report will address key concepts in the implementation of the new integrative studies requirement concepts such as linked courses, interdomain courses, move three, et cetera.

Please read these materials in the January agenda with care. Your comments and suggestions will then be considered as the committee prepares a Legislative Report that you, as senators, will vote on. We are aiming for that vote to occur at the March 15 plenary meeting. Again, we are asking that you read the report with care and let us know if you have questions or suggestions to improve the report.

Thank you for your continued cooperation in this important undertaking.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, John.

I have appointed a Special Joint Committee on General Education Assessment. The charge letter and membership list have been posted on the Senate website under Special Committees.

I would like to invite Co-Chairs Associate Vice President Jackie Edmondson and Senator Maggie Slattery to make brief remarks on the work of the Special Joint Committee.

Jackie Edmondson, Associate Vice President and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education: The Special Joint Committee on General Education Assessment thanks Chair Ansari for this opportunity to bring you up to date on this new committee charged by Chair Ansari and Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, Dr. Rob Pangborn. The committee is chaired--as Dr. Ansari said--by Senator Maggie Slattery and me. The charge for this committee is to build a collaborative process for ongoing assessment of General Education that includes institutional, program, and student level evaluations. The findings will inform curricular changes to guarantee that students have access to high quality General Education experiences. The analysis will also determine whether students are meeting the stated objectives across majors, colleges, and campuses.

At present we are focused on the following questions: which General Education courses are students taking? Which General Education courses are available by location? Are there gaps in course availability that need to be addressed? Are changes necessary to our curricular processes so that more purposeful plans are made for General Education offerings? Do students have access by design to General Education courses that involve the breadth of the seven learning objectives the Senate approved last April, and are students meeting the learning objectives through their General Education courses?

We are committed to the following general principles as we engage in the work of General Education Assessment and bringing a Legislative Report to the University Faculty Senate. General Education assessment should include ongoing institutional review and analysis to ensure that students have access to courses that support General Education learning objectives and domain goals. General Education assessment should respect the ways of knowing that are inherent in the various disciplines and domains that are represented in Penn State's General Education Curriculum and, as such, must involve faculty with disciplinary expertise in the process. General Education assessment should be aligned with the goals of General Education to ensure that our assessments are valid.

We wish to thank you in advance for your input and support as we develop our processes and preliminary findings. And we look forward to submitting our Legislative Report in the spring. Thank you.
Chair Ansari: Thank you, Jackie and Maggie.

Senator Keith Shapiro has requested time to present the interactive website of the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force. The website is intended to enhance engagement. Three minutes has been allocated for Keith’s comments.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: I thank Chair Ansari for allowing me time to address you today. I'm here representing the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force. The Task Force Chair, Larry Backer, was unable to be here today. The Task Force has created a new website at diversity.psu.edu. The purpose of the website is to share information about the work of the Task Force and to help the Penn State community be engaged in an open dialogue about diversity and diversity-related issues. To more effectively accomplish this, we are seeking input from you for the following questions:

One-- how can this site best provide the Penn State community with information regarding important issues of diversity? Two-- what would be the best way for members of our community to make their own meaningful contributions to the site? You can provide this input either through the blog portion of the site or by sending email directly to Larry Backer at LCB11@psu.edu or to me, Keith Shapiro, at KDS3@psu.edu. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Keith.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Eric Barron reviewed the implementation of four recommendations as part of the revision to Policy AD 85. He spoke about a recent meeting, where issues regarding the relationship between free speech and diversity were addressed, and the variation in the ways various institutions respond to incidents. He also mentioned micro-aggression and the variation in how comments are perceived by various individuals. He wants to involve various groups, including the University Faculty Senate, in developing a program that would determine in advance the methods or procedures for addressing any incidents that might occur in the future. He responded to one question regarding the participation of faculty in the development of strategic planning goals.

COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

Provost Jones reviewed the progress that has been made to date in the development of the University Strategic Plan, and provided a timeline for completion and release of the final plan, which will occur after final approval by the University Board of Trustees. He addressed several questions on topics including the new College Net system for optimization of classroom use, 2-factor authentication, and unfettered participation of faculty in department head interviews. He addressed other questions regarding the appropriateness of deans encouraging faculty to sign open letters or petitions to the public and being involved in activism, and the relationship between the University’s commitment to affordability and the new Common Schedule.
FORENSIC BUSINESS

Chair Ansari: We have a Forensic Report from Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations, which appears in Appendix C in today's agenda. Committee chairs Michael Bérubé and Roger Egolf will make brief remarks.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: Good afternoon. I'm going to be brief in introducing this report. It's pretty self-explanatory in what the questions are. I just want to mention that I had asked my committee to go back to their campuses and have some forensic sessions or question surveys sent out to the Fixed-Term faculty, primarily Fixed-Term 1 and Fixed-Term Multiyear. A few also surveyed Fixed-Term 2 faculty on the issues that were most important for our committees to address in an upcoming Advisory/Consultative Report.

By far the most important topics seem to be issues of consistency and fairness across the University on how policies on ranks and promotion and the availability to move from Fixed-Term 1 to Fixed-Term Multiyear, from Instructor to Senior Instructor, et cetera, are handled across the University. That there should be policies created that are University-wide that govern how much time, for example, it takes to get promoted. Or how promotion requests are reviewed, how the ability to move from Fixed-Term 1 to Fixed-Term Multiyear, or possibly in certain budgetary cases going from Fixed-Term Multiyear down to Fixed-Term 1 are handled. It seems to me from what our survey results have said that by far the most important thing for the Fixed-Term Faculty at this University is consistency and fairness.

Michael Bérubé: First of all, yes, I think that's exactly right. We're totally on the same page. I just wanted to say a few words about the document itself. Because I know that some of you in this room have seen portions of it before. You may have written it.

If you carbon-14 date the report, you'll find it's a sort of palimpsest of about five or six other reports extending back to 2004, which is depressing in and of itself. We have an IRC report here from 2012, another IRC report from 2014 that quotes another report from 2004. We have the whole report of 2013. We have a proposal from the College of Engineering from 2015. We also have a draft written by Annie Taylor-- I give credit where credit is due-- that didn't have any official status, but I incorporated that, too, because it was very smart about the relation of Fixed-Term hiring to the World Campus as well.

To Roger's comments, I just want to add, I think that this question of equity and fairness across the campuses has festered for long enough. If we tried this, I think, 10 years ago-- I say we. I was not in Senate then, but we tried apparently to create a system of promotion and ranks, and we were turned back.

The rank that was then created was Professor of Practice. As we note in the report, since that time there have only been 13 Professors of Practice. I think it's self-evident that that was an inadequate response to the realities of faculty labor and employment throughout Penn State. We're going to try to give it another shot with your help.

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

Dawn Blasko, Erie: I don't really have a question but more like a comment. I was here 10 years ago, and on IRC, so thank you for quoting us. We've been working on it a long time.
What we did do, however, is we talked about creating a best practices report. The benefit of a best practices is that you have sort of what would be the ideal way of doing things that you can encourage people toward. The problem with making specific procedures is that the idea of having Fixed-Term Faculty in a lot of academic units is to have some flexibility to when trends are up, be able to hire someone and get them in the classroom and teach. When trends change, to be able to move them from place to place, and that flexibility, I think, if you ask most administrators, is why we have a lot of Fixed-Term Faculty.

Now I'll put my other hat on as a faculty advocate, not an administrator, and I'll say that those faculty have to be treated well. They have to be treated fairly. They have to have notice. They have to understand the process and procedures. Those processes and procedures have to be fair. If a Fixed-Term faculty's contract is not going to be renewed, they need to know far enough ahead of time, so that they can go out and look for a job. If it is going to be renewed, they need to know what the opportunities are for promotion. They need to know what the opportunities are for moving to a different level of contract years.

What has happened sometimes is-- I remember one case where five-year contracts got changed to three-year contracts, and faculty didn't know until they were in their third year, so it just came out of the blue.

These are the kinds of things we want to avoid. Generally I'm very positive to see this issue come back up again. I think we can do a lot of good. I think we can help make the lives of a lot of Fixed-Term Faculty much more relevant and productive. Thank you.

Michael Bérubé: I want to speak to both. First about the flexibility. I can pretty much assure you that whatever we come up with in the Advisory/Consultative will not leave flexibility right out of the system.

Let's say, for example, we come up with something. Since HR 20-01 already provides a path for people with five years or more service to be promoted, well what if we built in-- just as a proposal-- that when you're promoted, you don't just get a small salary bump and you get a new title, but you are now eligible for multi-year contracts. That still leaves plenty of people in one-year contracts. It leaves plenty of flexibility throughout every campus.

I know that after 2008 so much collapsed, but we did not entirely. We had some belt tightening, but we did not have furloughs. We had pay freezes. We had hiring freezes.

A lot of campuses were much harder hit. A lot of our Fixed-Term Faculty went from multi-year contracts to single-year contracts. I think it's time to revisit that, especially for people who are here-- who have made an institutional commit for being here 5, 10, 20, 25 years, where it's clear they have institutional memory, institutional commitment, and would benefit from a multi-year contract.

As far as fairness goes, my own concern in this-- and this comes out of my own experience in English. Literally the first semester I got here was a case involving the demotion of two Fixed-Term faculty from FT 1 to FT 2. I can't pass on the justice of that decision. I wasn't here when it was made. I know they were very different circumstances.

What I do know is that it was made by one person, and our Bylaws allowed that. Throughout the College of Liberal Arts there's a wide-- never mind colleges outside Liberal Arts-- a wide diversity of what can be
done procedurally in cases like that. I would like as much as possible that those decisions be taken out of one person's hands-- the unit head-- and dispersed among a committee largely elected, partly appointed, Fixed-Term representatives that would not guarantee fairness in all circumstances-- that can't be done-- but will reduce significantly the amount of caprice in ad hoc decision making.

Roger Egolf: I'd like to make one follow-up also.

Chair Ansari: Sure. Go ahead, please.

Roger Egolf: When I talked about consistency, one aspect that came up over and over again in the various surveys and question sessions at the various campuses was the perceived unfairness of the fact that the University has a five-year requirement to go from Instructor to Senior Instructor or Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. At University College there is an eight-year minimum time period, which doesn't seem to exist at other places. Also it was felt that within University College for budgetary reasons, there is a limited number of promotions available across the 14 campuses, that promotion doesn't happen at a rate that would be justified by merit to the same extent that it does at other units.

We haven't done an exhaustive study to test this hypothesis, but if it is indeed true, and it seems anecdotally that it is, a big part of it may be the constraints of budget at the smaller campuses. Maybe a budget model change needs to be put in place so that the administrators in those units have the flexibility to make the promotions that are warranted.

Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences: Very good. First of all, I just want to thank you so much for taking this very important topic on. I want to reiterate some of the comments that have been made and just add a little story behind them.

Indeed, we need flexibility and as an administrator, I completely appreciate that, but I also know that I've been at the University for 22 years. I spent 18 of them as a Fixed-Term faculty member, renewed year after year.

It's a little stressful when for 18 years you're always on a one-year contract. There's a big difference between temporary funds and permanent funds. It's not an easy thing of just, “Oh, I'll just give her a multi-year contract.” There have to be permanent dollars behind that, that are usually very hard to come by.

The other issue that is close to my heart-- and I should mention that I have many Fixed-Term Faculty who work within our institute now in Earth and Mineral Sciences who have been in the exact same position; 18 years as one-year Fixed-Term Faculty. The other issue that we have all struggled with is the very first question you raised, which is a viable promotion pathway.

Not only did the Hall report illustrate very well that the pathways are different in every college. Despite what the HR policies might say, the reality is that every college handles them differently. In my college-- which I adore-- but it's just the reality of my college-- the pathway for someone who is not going to be just a one-time Instructor is Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and that's it.

I've been in my college since 2002. I was brought in as a Lecturer. I was promoted to Senior Lecturer. I'm 48 years old. If I stay there till I retire, I will never be able to go higher than Senior Lecturer. I'll have
received one promotion, because there's no pathway for someone like me. And there are many of me in our colleges.

**Michael Bérubé:** There certainly are. And I'm glad there are many of you, but I'm also glad there's you.

About the pathways—HR 23 also for tenure and promotion leaves it entirely open. It's a sort of fill in the blanks kind of procedure to be determined unit by unit. Because you can't do a one-size-fits-all.

I think a point should be made for Fixed-Term Faculty. The real catch for me is the last clause of Question 4 acknowledging and accommodating the needs and practices of individual campuses and colleges.

I have the names before me. This is actually a report that came out of Liberal Arts. It's a best practices document that suggests three tiers.

They want the title Distinguished Lecturer ahead of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Distinguished Lecture. I personally don't— I think the title issue is a non-issue. Some places want the word “clinical”. Some places want the word “practice”. Some places want the word “wizard”.

I won't say which, but what matters to me is the procedure, not the title. What matters to me is a path to promotion that recognizes people beyond what we now have as senior rank.

Finally, I think to go back to your first comment, I think it is under-recognized except by the department heads who actually have to do the work, what kind of bureaucracy is involved in renewing contracts year after year after year. After a certain point, after 18 years, it should be able to say, you have the job for a couple of years now.

**Rosemarie Petrilla, Hazleton:** I am a full time, Fixed-Term Faculty, Multi-year. I'm a physical therapist. I've been part of this University now for 24 years.

I started as an FT faculty. I'm a program coordinator of the Physical Therapist Assistant Program at Hazleton, and I love my job.

I started out— I was in the right place at the right time. I said, “Oh, if you ever need help in the lab, I'd love to help.” And I started out as an FT 2.

It turned into an FT 1. I started as an interim program coordinator twice, and then they were going to close the program. I said, “Oh no, I have eight years invested in that. Let me take a crack at this program coordinator.”

When the program wasn't doing so well, we had a 30% pass rate. Then I said, “Oh no, I have too much time invested, let's take this over.” Enrollment was bad, and now we have 108 students and enrollment at the campus of 700.

So you know, I've been supported tremendously all the way through. I want all FT 1’s to be supported all the way through like I was. I've had an excellent experience, but I'm going to speak frankly about some things.
When they were going to close the program, I said, “Oh, my goodness, I’d better get on strategic planning. I want to find out if somebody's going to do that.”

Somebody heard me. I've been on strategic planning, by the way, ever since. I said, “Give me a shot for a year to turn it around.” We had 100% pass rate the next year, so I had to learn something about curriculum, and everybody at that campus supported me, and we turned that around.

I then chaired strategic planning for the next five-year program, I served once, I went up for Senior Instructor. I did all the things I needed to do. I chaired Faculty Senate, and when I went up for my Senior Instructor, I went to my DA, who's no longer here-- I just want to preface that-- and she said to me, “You're too young.” I said “What?” I said, “I did this.”

She said, “You're too young.” I said, “What do you mean I'm too young?” All my mentors before me said to me, they were waiting. They were almost ready to retire, and they were waiting their turn to be promoted.

At first I was mad, and I said, “Oh, this isn't right. What should I do about this?” I didn't do anything. I waited my turn, and it didn't take that long.

I waited a year or two.

My DA was being honest, but that's the reality of the situation. That's why I want everybody to hear today that people who are deserving are waiting. There is a pile up of deserving people waiting to get promoted, so there's that issue.

Then I can't tell you-- because I have good enrollment, and I have a three-year contract. This is the other hard thing to hear. When an issue comes up on campus, my phone rings, and they say to me-- just like today, because when I was talking to everybody last night at the meeting, I said, “Are you going to say what you need to say tomorrow?” They said, “No, I'm too afraid.” I said, “Why? I've always had the support at my campus at Hazleton.” I've said what I've always needed to say. I want everybody to have the chance to say what they feel like they need to say, because great things can happen if you're supported.”

They call me up and say, “Can you say this, Rose?” I've always felt comfortable to say what I needed to say. I have good enrollment in my program, and I'm a multi-year contract.

Carolyn Mahan, Altoona: As Roger said, we were asked as a committee to go back to our campuses and to solicit feedback on these issues. Most of the comments from our faculty have already been made here today. Just two other comments I want to make, though.

There is a need for consistency within the contracts and using the contracts upon which a Fixed-Term Faculty is hired as the basis for their promotion. There seems to be among some faculty a disconnect between if they were hired for teaching, are they just being evaluated on their teaching? Or is there sometimes a need to do research as well?

The other issue that some faculty have mentioned is the idea of having the word “Professor” somewhere in their title. I think titles do matter to some-- not to be the same perhaps as the tenure track, but things
like-- we mentioned Professor of Practice, but maybe Professor of Instruction. The title “Professor” is meaningful within the academy.

Finally, serving on IRC last year, we did a survey of the other Big Ten schools to look at their policies and procedures for Fixed-Term Faculty. All of the Big Ten schools that we could find-- all of them with the exception of Ohio State and Penn State-- had policies and procedures for their Fixed-Term Faculty very easy to find, and they were related to promotion with clear guidelines set.

**Sinfree Makoni, Liberal Arts:** There are two issues I'd like to raise. One of them is the issue about Fixed-Term appointments for international students and international scholars.

If you are a Fixed-Term 1 and you are an international scholar, because of the issues about visas, it may take about six months before the visa is issued. If you are in a one-year contract, what it means is you spend the first six months waiting for confirmation for your visa; after that you spend the next six months, you don't even know whether your contact is going to be renewed. That's a double zero situation, and to some extent I think it's unfair.

Then the second issue, which is that I think in some cases you have departments where a majority of the students are taught by Fixed-Term contractors, and if they don't know whether their positions are going to be renewed, it means they are with a department that is not clear where it is going to go, when a majority of your staff are Fixed-Term appointees. The conclusion I'm drawing is this.

It's not only a question of being unfair to the Fixed-Term contractors, but it's also being unfair to the students, if a majority of your students are taught by Fixed-Term appointees who don't even know whether their appointment are going to be renewed.

**Michael Bérubé:** Amen. All I can say in mitigation if anything, when I first got introduced to this question, it was not even with the Fixed-Term Faculty. It was with straight up adjuncts-- people who don't even have offices, people who may not have a parking space, people who don't have access to the library, and the disservice done to students by that kind of hiring is palpable and immediate. I think you're bringing up something more subtle but every bit as palpable.

I just want to get back for one second to the question of titles, because it does touch on, I think, one of the reasons that our last efforts at this failed. The concern was that-- let's see if I can find the right language--the change would devalue the efforts that tenured faculty have made in working through the tenure process.

As a person whose title is Full Professor, I can say that what I have with tenure is due process and expectation of continued employment with termination for cause. That doesn't go away if someone on Fixed-Term has the title Professor any more than my marriage is threatened by gay marriage; it's just not materially important to me.

I encourage the rest of you who are tenured or tenure line to adopt that attitude. The title of people in the Fixed-Term ranks does not impinge upon your actual due process rights in any way.

**Stephen Snyder, Berks:** Fixed-Term Senior Lecturer. I forget how many years, but I would say that 18 years is not about budget. That's about management. I would also say that perhaps it's mismanagement.
My comments are mostly related to the idea of title, rank, promotion. We have a very significant percentage of our faculty workforce that is an unstable workforce. Rank doesn't mean a whole lot without stability. Rank doesn't mean a whole lot without standing.

Rosemarie Petrilla: The other comment I wanted to make was when we did the research of the Big Ten, not all FT 1’s are created equal. We have FT 1’s that are clinicians, FT 1’s that are researchers, and FT 1’s like myself that have to do research. We have to be scholarly. We have to teach, and we have to do service.

When I was promoted as a Program Coordinator, my scholarship was purposeful. My service was purposeful for my role, and it was very successful, and it led me to success in my position and for my students and for my program. I was recognized for that, and I'm not sure that that is the case for everyone.

I have heard and by sitting on IRC where other faculty as FTs were denied promotion because they have a full teaching load, but they didn't do formal research. Is that necessary for their role? It's not clear. I think we need to clarify that. It needs to be purposeful for what their role is in the institution and at their unit.

Michael Bérubé: I think that also goes to the question of making sure this is not one-size-fits-all. What I've been finding-- what you want is an evaluation for what I want. I think what we want is an evaluation process that recognizes FT faculty labor for what it is. Right?

Even though we have great incorporation of FT labor in service, including in this room, what I've seen in some places is a creeping service mission that starts now to look very much like a tenure track position, and then you start asking about research as well. I really do not-- as they say in Ghostbusters-- want to cross the streams. I do not want more creeping obligations on FT faculty because of this process.

I do know that in the College of Education they're serving on dissertation committees. In some colleges they are helping run departments. That kind of service needs to be credited and professionalized and rewarded professionally for the kind of service it is.

Kimberly Blockett, Brandywine: I just want to make a comment that first of all, I'm very happy that this is paying very specific attention to the ways in which Fixed-Term faculty members are affected by ad hoc decisions often made by one person. I've seen that happen in some significant ways on our campus. Everyone has commented on the effect on students; the effect on the Fixed-Term Faculty themselves.

I also want to talk about the effect on departments and units and the colleagues. To give an example, I'm in English, we had a very important faculty member, who when we got a new chancellor-- not our current chancellor-- was fired.

It was our HR policy on that campus that those decisions to not renew-- I shouldn't say fired, not renewed-- right? Contract not renewed. They aren't told until, I believe, it's in April. That was what the HR recommended to our administration.

It was not renewed not for anything that the person did. It was simply a budgetary decision, and because it was a new chancellor, the new chancellor didn't consult with anyone about need or anything, and then said, after the fact, “Oh, I guess I made a mistake; sorry about that.”
Because of that, our one remaining FT 1 person had an opportunity to go for an administrative position. As much as we needed that person in English, we encouraged that person to move forward, because we felt she would have more job stability.

In effect we lost two people in our tiny little English department. One because that person was not renewed and then second we tried to protect the remaining FT 1 and encourage that person to move into a job, meaning that we then lost one other body. It does affect our ability to deliver programs, to deliver a curriculum. There's no stability whatsoever for anyone, not just the FT 1’s who are affected, but also their colleagues.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. We have two minutes. I would like to take two questions. The senator over there, please? You'll be next.

**Nancy Welsh, Dickinson Law:** I'm also on the committee and was asked to talk with folks in my location. I want to support the importance of consistency and fairness, which Roger began with, but also the importance of transparency. We within our committee have talked about our understanding of various rules and policies that exist but then have been unable to locate them in writing anywhere that's accessible to everyone within the University. Transparency, so that people know what the rules are, what the policies are, what reasonable expectations generally are, even if there's flexibility that's built into individual contracts. It's really important.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Nancy. One more final question over here, please.

**Rajarajan Subramanian, Harrisburg:** We actually have a pretty good system for promotion for the FT Lecturers to Senior level Lecturer. That happens after five years. If you qualify for that, you have the promotion.

But beyond that we don't have anything. There are people with 20 years, 25 years of experience, in the same capacity. I know there are feelings and sometimes from the campuses, the research is somewhat difficult, because we don't get the master's and PhD students, and we do manage with the undergraduate students.

Even though we have tenure track, just not equal to the University Park campus here. Sometimes these tenure track positions are just like committed to full time, I mean, the Fixed-Term positions. They are like tenure track, and suddenly someone is hired as a Fixed-Term. It's being maintained for some time.

I don't know why it has to go that way, but still, I think that there should be some consistency in promotions and further seeing light at the end of the tunnel for the Fixed-Terms.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. That concludes our report. Thank you, Michael. Thank you, Roger.

We have a forensic report from the Special Joint Committee on First-Year Students' Well Being and Safety, which appears as Appendix D in today's agenda. Committee Chair Dennis Gouran will make a few remarks, and I will then open the floor for discussion.

**Dennis Gouran:** The Joint Special committee on First-Year Students' Well Being and Safety emerged in response to the Task Force on Sexual Assault and Harassment's recommendation number 13, which
specifically called for the creation and implementation of various educational experiences that reflect 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 well-being and safety with an emphasis on building positive relationships and preventing sexual misconduct and misuse.

The committee came into existence by appointment of the Chair of the Senate in May, had its charge session in June, and beyond that has had five meetings, not including the charge meeting in which we met momentarily after the charge about the work ahead. As I said, we have since had five meetings of the committee and the sixth one is scheduled for next Thursday in the afternoon, starting about 12:30 and, I think, finishing up at two.

The committee up to this point has been grappling with the question of the goals that it should be pursuing in response to the creation of legislative initiatives and the criteria by which we would judge the appropriateness and probable effectiveness of such initiatives that have come down the pike thus far. We are not at the point in our work where I'd say these are the agreed-upon goals. These are the agreed-upon criteria by which to judge-- as I said-- the appropriateness and probably effectiveness of initiatives that we'll be presenting at a later point in the spring semester.

Just to give you a flavor of the kind of discussion that has occurred on that front, one goal that has been mentioned is the creation of greater awareness of and sensitivity to problems relating to the well-being and safety of first-year undergraduate students. Another-- equipping such students with pertinent information for addressing problems relating to their well-being and safety should they encounter them. And yet another-- actively engaging students in the acquisition of attendant knowledge and skills via alternative curricular and co-curricular means.

Insofar as criteria are concerned, we have started a discussion of several at this point. I anticipate that we'll try to finish up the discussion of goals and criteria in that meeting on next Thursday. At this point, we've been discussing as criteria, feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and an ability to assess, compatibility with measures in place, non-duplication of measures in place, clarity of relationship to the goals of the initiatives, and ethical defensibility.

We have also made an effort during our relatively brief existence to run down what measures are already in place to satisfy this criteria of non-duplication of effort. Also, we have taken a look at what in the existing curriculum-- system wide, as best we can assess at this point-- are components of the curriculum that in one way or another address these two major concerns for which the committee was created. We started with the assumption that there would be a forensic session. We have reached that point. We think that it is now time to hear from those in this room and those they represent concerning several questions.

If it turns out that time runs out on us, I have no objection to anyone contacting me with comments that you didn't have the opportunity to make. I am in the directory. My email address is G as in my last name, eight as in the number, V as in Victor at psu.edu. Please feel free between now and next Thursday, or whenever it occurs to you, to offer input that you may not have come prepared to present today, as an afterthought, you feel would be a good idea worthy of our consideration.

I think I can take these in serial order rather than presenting all three. I would like to spend a portion of time, roughly a third of what's left here, for hearing what you have to say about the suggestions for exploring curricular and co-curricular learning pathways that promote well-being and safety of
undergraduate students in their first-year at Penn State. I would like to emphasize again that people in this room represent staff, students, and members of the faculty who have varying degrees, I'm sure, of experience with the kinds of issues that this committee was created to address.

Rajarajan Subramanian, Harrisburg: My experience with this is from University of Florida where I graduated. They used to have Friday night to promote the local kind of entertainment and experiences other than sending the students to the bars and get into trouble. That kind of an attitude can be promoted. Thanks.

Dennis Gouran: All right. What suggestions do members of Senate have for exploring curricular and co-curricular learning pathways that promote the well-being and safety of undergraduate students beyond the first-year at Penn State?

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: I'm serving on this committee right now, and I served on the previous Presidential Task Force. I just wanted to point out some things from our current experience on the committee and previous experience.

At Penn State as you all may well know-- there are some courses. There are some co-curricular learning pathways. In fact, in the Presidential Task Force report, you will see that particularly with the co-curricular learning experiences that at University Park and at many other campus locations, that there are various workshops, et cetera that are presented. One of the biggest problems, though, that we have found was that there was little coordination, consistency-- which seems to be an important word today-- lack of- - evaluation, et cetera, and that they were hit and miss.

From the Presidential Task Force work that was done, the research using focus groups and then some interviews; surveys, we found that the majority of our students haven't been availed of opportunities to look at these issues of wellness and safety. As has been mentioned before, students-- a minority of students-- may seek out those opportunities. The majority aren't attending these classes or these workshops.

The issue is just to give one example of safety, statistics are very clear that about 20% of our Penn State students are going to be faced with an attempted or completed sexual assault. Women, men, doesn't matter their sexual orientation, et cetera. That is a vast majority of our students-- not a majority but a large group of our students-- that are involved in sexual assault experience, let alone, other students that are affected indirectly by these things.

Just to point out what these questions are looking at are that we do know that we have some classes. We do know we have some co-curricular opportunities, but we have no consistency. We have no ways right now that our students-- no matter who they are, what campus they are, et cetera-- will all have the opportunity to have learning experiences around wellness and safety.

Andrew Ahr, Student Senator, Arts and Architecture: I'm glad to see that question two is being asked. Because while I understand that the first-year experience is critical to begin the discussions, I don't think that should be the end to the discussions. In some ways, I think that it would be in the benefit of this committee to come up with a strategic plan for a student's well-being and safety throughout their whole time here at Penn State. I think topics such as sexual assault prevention, mental health, diversity, and financial literacy are areas that our students are weak in.
Day after day my constituents come to me asking for the Academic Affairs Committee to advocate for seminars, workshops, and other means of gaining this information. You mentioned the idea of a required course. That's a tricky subject, because not everyone will be happy with having something forced upon them. I know senators are never happy when they're forced to do things as well.

At times it is the best means for getting the information and resources we need across. The University Park Undergraduate Association would love to have more of these conversations. I know our President sits on it, but if your committee would like to come and talk to the Academic Affairs Committee on that, we would love to engage in that dialogue and bring any more input we can. Thank you.

Jamie Myers, Education: Since this is kind of a request to share ideas in a brainstorming manner, there may already exist--but if not, your committee might consider recommendations of financial support for student groups, such as University Park Undergraduate Association or Commonwealth Senators Association. I don't know their exact name, but providing them with support--financial--to run seminars and workshops from the students kind of organizing those at different campuses and being able to implement such activities.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Dennis, I think in the interest of time, we will go to the third question.

Dennis Gouran: The third question--what suggestions do members of the Senate have for exploring a multi-disciplinary approach to at-risk safety net initiatives for undergraduate students in their first-year at Penn State and beyond?

Jennifer Klein, Student Senator, Liberal Arts: My point is sort of twofold. I brought this up at the Executive Board to the College of Liberal Arts Student Government when we were talking about ways to sort of address the well-being and safety of our students--not only in terms of promoting good behaviors regarding alcohol or sexual engagement, things like that--but also there was real concern for promoting an understanding of the symptoms of particular mental health issues, such as depression or anxiety. These are issues that sort of come about in college. Sometimes students don't recognize what exactly is happening to them. Understanding that--maybe giving that in a first year seminar, something like that, I think would really help students--promote their understanding of mental health.

Furthermore, if we are going to be really promoting the resources available at Penn State, then I would encourage this Task Force to look into the fact--are these resources available? More students are going to be seeking them out. Is there enough funding at CAPS to support that? So hand in hand with the conversation regarding the curricular approaches and learning pathways needs to be how can we better promote the resources and fund the resources? Because right now CAPS, I know, is severely understaffed.

Patricia Hinchey, Worthington Scranton: I speak from a background of a great deal of involvement and teaching of first-year seminars. While I understand we all have information that students need, the reality is in most first-year seminar-like courses, students don't believe us that they need to know the information, especially when we are delivering it to them one way. I would encourage the folks doing this to think in terms of format where student interest at a particular moment guides the sequencing and discussion of particular topics. Certainly you can ask, are any of you concerned about a friend? Are any of you finding that you're not getting your work done? Did any of you miss an assignment? Rather than week one, time management. Week two, mental health. That kind of approach just washes over students,
if they continue to attend the class, which in my experience is-- tie points to it and they'll come, but otherwise not encouraging.

**Madeline Fortin, Student Senator, Business:** I think along with that point-- I think there could be more of a push within our first-year students, specifically with their RA-- what you said about kind of pushing this information at them. If there were some sort of program that could be involved within the residents dormitories and everything, talking about making sure your roommate gets home, making sure that you're not leaving them out if you were to go out on the weekends, making sure that both of you are getting enough sleep, kind of touch on those mental health things, but also safety on campus, around town. Then also making sure you're-- even just simple things-- that your dorm room is locked before you go to bed or before you leave.

I think that, coming from your RA, and if your whole floor could kind of get involved in this and just looking out for each other, that this could definitely help the first-year students. Then also what Andrew was saying about continuing this push throughout. I know that a lot of students do move off campus their second year.

If this could be an initiative for their first year, they could get this initial information. I know there are programs set up like this for NSO; we go through those situational practices. I think that there could definitely be more room for your RA and for you collectively as a floor to kind of work with each other and keep the safety of first-year students more in mind.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. We have two more minutes. Are there any more questions, comments?

**Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development:** Sitting here today it just strikes me that we heard from John Moore about General Education and things that are happening there. We know that we just recently had a new Title IX coordinator that was hired. We're going to hear about engaged scholarship.

It always strikes me that it's so important that we come together and just heard about UPUA and an invitation to speak with them more-- that I know by sitting on this committee that I should be challenged to make sure that we are reaching out and coordinating with the important other initiatives that are going on here that really impinge on student well-being and safety throughout their years.

**Dawn Blasko, Erie:** Just a comment that reiterated what we've been hearing here today and that is that we heard from the President and from other people about first-year summer programs where students can get discount tuition, and they can start getting involved. There's the LEAP program. There's a number of other ones.

Those are excellent ways to integrate some of this stuff, because you're working closely with faculty and learning about the University environment. The first-year seminars provide an opportunity, although I agree they're not always carried out very well, and I think that's important.

The other thing is, as we work on our revision of General Education, we have the opportunity to build linked and iCourses. I would just urge everybody here to think about ways to integrate these topics into these courses that you might be building that could become part of General Education. Thank you.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Dennis.
UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Ansari: Please remember that parliamentary procedure requires all motions to be submitted to the chair in writing. If needed, the Senate staff can provide you with paper and pencil.

We'll use clickers for voting today. Senators should have received the clicker before entering the auditorium. Please raise your hand if you need a clicker.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revision of the Standing Rules (Rules of Procedure), Article I, Section 2
Committee Chair Patricia Hinchey

Chair Ansari: We have four legislative reports from the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules. The first report appears as Appendix E. This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second. Committee Chair Patricia Hinchey will respond to questions.

Patricia Hinchey, Worthington Scranton: All four of the legislative reports come from discussions, ideas, issues that bubbled up last spring, through the summer, and into fall. We've spent a couple of months coming up with our best thinking and wording. So that's what we have for you today.

Article I, section 2 has to do with a change to the order on our agenda. We propose adding formally to the language what we are doing informally now, that is, inviting the Provost to address us as academic leader of the university. And as a spirit of increasing transparency ensures stronger shared governance, we would like to make official that the Provost has a role here and to have him available to the faculty for their direct questions.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. The floor is open for debate. Any questions? Hearing none, are we ready to vote?

To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 128 accept, and 7 reject.

Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 4
Committee Chair Patricia Hinchey

Chair Ansari: The second legislative report is from Committees and Rules, appears as Appendix F. The report, again, is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second.

Patricia Hinchey: Thank you for that last vote. This proposal has to do with what is commonly known as the six-year rule, which provides that folks serve on a standing committee for only six years. They chair them for three years in the interest of helping senators become multi-faceted, multi-informed should they serve long terms on the Senate.

This is a product of experience. Since we reduced the number of senators, and since many of the committees have specific requirements-- one faculty or two faculty from column A and one from column B and one from column C. With fewer senators-- since we've reduced the number of senators we have-- it
sometimes becomes very difficult to meet all of those membership requirements. And sometimes it involves meeting those requirements, sometimes involves pulling someone whose experience would be really valuable in one place at a particular moment in time.

The rules have forced the chairs to move people when it probably has not in been the best interest of conducting Senate business wisely. This proposal says-- and we worked hard on the language to control it. It says, pretty much in exceptional circumstances when there's really, really, really good reason, the chair can make an exception to those rules, provided that the majority of the -- 2/3, I think it says-- majority of CC&R approves.

We're trying to strengthen that to say, it really must be extraordinary. We're not going to slip into bending the rules all the time.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Is there discussion?

Jamie Myers, English: Is there a reason why Committee on Committees and Rules chose the seventh rather than just additional? I didn't see anything in there that gave a rationale why you're only going to be able to have a 2/3 vote on a one more additional year, rather than just additional years.

Patricia Hinchey: Yes, there was a reason. Because “additional” left it open we felt to an eighth year, a ninth year, or a 10th year. And that clearly is not what we're after. We're after one exception, which we felt would pretty much give folks time to work things out.

We didn't want it to be routine. We want it to be truly an exception. One time. That was the rationale.

Chair Ansari: Any other questions? Are we ready to vote? To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 125 accept, and 15 reject. The report passes.

Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 7 (University Athletics Representatives)
Committee Chair Patricia Hinchey

Chair Ansari: The third report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix G. This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second.

Patricia Hinchey: Thank you for your confidence. The next proposal deals with the Faculty Athletic Representative, which I'm sure you are aware is an exceedingly important post in the University, a very important part of what we do. In fact, it is such an important role that this proposal suggests that the person who is entering it for the first time would do well to spend a year becoming familiar with the responsibilities of the job.

We propose to create a Faculty Athletic Representative Elect position, so that someone who might be nominated or run for this position would spend one year in training with the person whose term is ending before beginning their full term as Faculty Athletic Representative. We're calling it Faculty Athletic Representative Elect position.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Is there discussion? To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 136 accept, and 4 reject. The report passes.
Revision to Standing Rules, Article III, Section 9 (University Faculty Ombudsperson)
Committee Chair Patricia Hinchey

Chair Ansari: The last legislative report from Committees and Rules appears as Appendix H. This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second.

Patricia Hinchey: Thank you again for your vote of confidence in our work. This proposal is parallel to the last one. The same thing is true of the Ombudsperson who serves a vital role in our work. Therefore we proposed establishing a similar position called Ombudsperson-Elect to spend one year overlap in training with the last year of the existing Ombudsperson's turn would be an overlap of year of training with the person coming into the job as Ombudsperson, so that they enter the job with a background of knowledge ready to go.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Is there discussion? To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 134 accept, and 2 reject. The report passes.

SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LIONPATH
Change to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal)
Committee Chair David Babb

Chair Ansari: We have one legislative report from the Special Senate Committee on Implementation of LionPATH, which appears as Appendix I. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. I would like to offer my deepest appreciation to Senator David Babb, Chair, and the other members of this special committee for all their efforts which started in June and culminated in this final legislative report. Let's give them a big hand. With special thanks, David will respond to questions.

David Babb, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I just wanted to say thank you also to all our committee members during the summer and also all the ancillary committees that supported us. We appreciate that work. This last report is simply just cleaning up language.

Chair Ansari: Is there discussion? Are we ready to vote? To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 139 accept, and 3 reject. The report passes.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR AFFAIRS
Revisions to Senate Policy 42-82 (Acquisition of Credits) Accredited U.S. Institutions
Committee Chair Margaret Slattery

Chair Ansari: Our final legislative report is from Curricular Affairs. This report appears as Appendix J. This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second. Committee chair Maggie Slattery will respond to questions.

Maggie Slattery, Engineering: Thank you. This report was initially started to clean up the language in 42-82, removing references to 800-level courses, which in our standard numbering scheme are only graduate-level courses. It was inappropriate to have those numbers in this policy. In the process of the vetting this report through Senate Council, it came to our attention that we needed to add an additional statement accommodating the possibility-- but not necessarily the guarantee-- of having credits
transferred from non-accredited institutions. This is something that we heard that we needed to accommodate from Middle States.

This report-- the text that's in bold reflects that, and that was given to us on recommendation from Dr. Pangborn's office in Undergraduate Education. Those are the reasons for this report.

**Jamie Myers, Education:** It is that bold part that you just referred to that allows the evaluation of courses from other college level work not of the six regional accrediting commissions. I'm a little bit nervous about the ambiguity in the “may” and the way you just said it, too-- that it allows the possibility that those credits might be evaluated. How does a student know?

If one student brings in credits from one and they're told, “No, we're not going to evaluate yours.” Another student brings in credits from another one. “Yes, we will evaluate yours.” I'm a little bit uncomfortable with that ambiguity.

I'm supportive of expanding the evaluation of credit beyond the six accrediting bodies, but I think there's too much ambiguity in there. I'd rather see the word “will” where it says “may.” I'd like to hear your comment.

**Maggie Slattery:** My understanding is that there is a process that ACUE has put together that would be evaluating these courses from the institute in addition to the content of the course but from the institution it comes from. Perhaps Dr. Pangborn could speak to that, or I'm not sure who-- because that would actually be an implementation part for all Senate policies as you know. There's an implementation process that ACUE does.

**Chair Ansari:** Vice President Pangborn?

**Maggie Slattery:** Sorry to put you on the spot like that.

**Robert Pangborn:** I think the “may” refers to the fact that credits transferred from any institution, including those that are accredited, are not always accepted for credit at Penn State. It depends on the kind of course. If it's a remedial or developmental kind of work, or vocational kinds of courses, even coming from an accredited institution, we would not accept it. That “may” refers to the credits, not to the fact that we would not accept a transcript from those institutions.

**Maggie Slattery:** The “may” language also aligns with the first sentence in that paragraph that credits may be accepted from colleges and universities.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. Other questions or comments?

**Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley:** Did I hear you say that this is a requirement of Middle States to do this?

**Maggie Slattery:** It was a recommendation by Middle States that we expand the possibility of transfer credits to come from institutions. I'm sorry, it's a requirement.
Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other questions or comments? Are we ready to vote? To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 141 accept, and 2 reject. The report passes.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
Revision of the Tenure Clock for the Penn State College of Medicine
Committee Chair Michael Bérubé

Chair Ansari: We have one Advisory/Consultative Report from Faculty Affairs. The report appears as Appendix K. This was brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second. Dr. Craig Hillemeier, Chief Executive Officer, Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, has requested the privilege of the floor. I am pleased to welcome Dr. Hillemeier to the podium to address the Senate for five minutes. Dr. Hillemeier?

Dr. Craig Hillemeier, Chief Executive Officer, Medicine: This will just take a couple of minutes. I appreciate the opportunity to tell you why I think it's important that we consider this exception for the College of Medicine in terms of increasing the tenure clock from seven years to 10 years. Over the last six years, we've had a decrease in members of the tenured faculty of the College of Medicine from about 33% to about 23%.

We feel that there are instances in which we are losing out to our competition because of the seven-year tenure clock. Our financial structure at the College of Medicine forces us to place a higher emphasis on external funding prior to the achievement of tenure. A seven-year tenure clock makes it difficult and in fact almost a Catch-22 for some individuals to achieve and to show that independence of extramural funding before achieving the tenure designation. Many of our junior faculty-- especially on the clinical side in the College of Medicine, but also for some on the basic science side-- receive K awards from the NIH, which are mentored awards for five years and don't really count as independent extramural funding and place them at a significant disadvantage in terms of achieving tenure.

If you look at our peers in the Big Ten, 9 of 13 Colleges of Medicine in the Big Ten have tenure clocks greater than or equal to eight years. Clearly those that we aspire to be, such as the Northwestern’s, Ohio State’s, and Michigan’s, all have significantly longer tenure clocks than seven years. On the basic science side, 7 in 13 in the Big Ten have tenure clocks of 8 years or greater.

In the mid-Atlantic region, 8 of 10 Colleges of Medicine have tenure clocks of greater than or equal to 8 years in the clinical sciences and 6 of 10 in the basic sciences. In summary, I think that the College of Medicine is somewhat disadvantaged in terms of its ability to allow individuals to have longer time to achieve tenure. I think that it's a more fair and equitable practice for people who are practicing in the College of Medicine to have an extension of the tenure clock from 7 years to 10 years.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Dr. Hillemeier. Committee Chair Michael Bérubé will respond to questions.

John Boehmer, Medicine: I do think that this is important for a number of faculty members at the College of Medicine. The bar is relatively high. The demands of what we do in some ways goes beyond. For example, clinical faculty do have clinical duties.
In order to attain tenure it's a big challenge. The additional time would put us more in line with our peers, make us more competitive, and hopefully increase the amount of scholarly output that we have. I want to thank Dr. Hillemeier for coming; demonstrating the importance of this. I also want to strongly endorse this.

**Ann Ouyang, Medicine:** I just wanted to say that this was presented to the Faculty Organization and strongly supported by the faculty.

**Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley:** How does this affect the people that are currently on the tenure track, say, midstream? Are they being extended the same ability to have the longer clock that people who are about to be hired have?

**Michael Bérubé:** I'm only smiling because it's a question I hadn't thought of. They should. I mean, if we put this-- if we pass this now-- I mean the equity issues before us.

The only counterargument I've heard is that if you set a different tenure clock for different colleges, then what happens when Engineering says “x”? Well, I actually don't believe in slippery slope arguments unless I can actually see an actual slippery slope from where I'm standing.

**Roger Egolf:** I do support this. I just wondered how it affected them.

**Michael Bérubé:** It might be grandfathered in. It seems to me it would make sense to. I don't know whether that affects the grants already in process or whether it affects faculty mentoring already in process. But it seems to me that the case is so compelling that it seems best to put it in practice as soon as possible.

**Chair Ansari:** Perhaps when the President considers implementation, he can accept with modifications that those colleagues can be on this policy, if it is approved by the Senate today. Other discussion or comments?

**Michael Bérubé:** Especially since it's a faculty retention issue, among other things.

**Chair Ansari:** Are we ready to vote? To accept, press A. To reject, press B. With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 115 accept, and 6 reject. The report is approved. Thank you, Michael.

**INFORMATIONAL REPORTS**

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS**


**SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

*Report on Faculty Partners Program*, Appendix M.  
[http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/december-8-2015-agenda/appendix-m/](http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/december-8-2015-agenda/appendix-m/)
COUNCIL ON ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

Engaged Scholarship Update, Appendix N.
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/december-8-2015-agenda/appendix-n/

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS-NONE

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

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

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari: Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor, please say aye. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until January 26, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.
The following Senators were noted as having attended the December 8, 2015 Senate Meeting.

Abdalla, Charles
Abramowich, Kathryn
Adewumi, Michael
Aebli, Fred
Ahr, Andrew
Andelin, Steven
Ansari, Mohamad
Asbury, John
Aurand, Harold
Aynardi, Martha
Azemi, Asad
Babb, David
Bagby, John
Barney, Paul
Barron, Eric
Bartolacci, Michael
Bascom, Rebecca
Bechtel-Wherry, Lori
Bérubé, Michael
Blasko, Dawn
Blockett, Kimberly
Boehmer, John
Borromeo, Renee
Bowen, Blannie
Bower, Robin
Brennan, Mark
Bridges, K. Robert
Brigger, Clark
Brown, Raymonde
Brown, Thomas
Bruno, Michael
Brunsden, Victor
Casteel, Mark
Chletsos, Joseph
Clements, Ann
Cockroft, Kevin
Coleman-Kelly, Mary Dean
Connolly-Ahern, Colleen
Conti, Delia
Copeland, Ann
Davis, Dwight
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Dendle, Peter
Desai, Madhuri
Dessel, Andy
Douds, Anne
Duffey, Michele
Duschl, Richard
Eberle, Karen
Eberle, Peter
Ebken, Diane
Eckert, Jill
Eckhardt, Caroline
Eggebeen, David
Egolf, Roger
Enama, Joseph
Falk, Daniel
Finke, Erinn
Forest, Chris
Fortin, Madeline
Freiberg, Andrew
Friedenberg, Marc
Frisco, Michelle
Furfaro, Joyce
Garrett, Bradley
Geisinger, Samantha
Gilchrist, Ian
Gingrich, Dennis
Gouran, Dennis
Griswold, Anna
Haigh, Michel
Han, David
Hanes, Madlyn
Harrison, Terry
Harwell, Kevin
Hayford, Harold
Henry, John
Hickerson, Benjamin
High, Kane
Hinchey, Patricia
Hodgdon, Kathleen
Hswe, Patricia
Hufnagel, Pamela
Jaap, James
Jablokow, Kathryn
Jayakar, Krishna
Jett, Dennis
Jones, Nicholas
Jurs, Peter
Kalavar, Jyotsna
Kass, Lawrence
Keiler, Kenneth
Kelly, William
Kennedy-Phillips, Lance
Kenyon, William
Khalilollahi, Amir
King, Elizabeth
Koch, Patricia
Krajsa, Michael
Krasilnikov, Andrey
Kremer, Gul
Kubat, Robert
Kulda, Gretchen
Kulikowich, Jonna
Lagoa, Constantino
LaJeunesse, Todd
Laman, Jeffrey
Lasher, William
Lawlor, Timothy
Levine, Martha
Linn, Suzanna
Litzky, Barrie
Loeb, Robert
Lynn, Valerie Ann
Mahan, Carolyn
Makoni, Sinfree
Mangel, Lisa
Manning, Keefe
Marano, Matthew
Marko, Frantisek
Marsico, Salvatore
Meloy, Margaret
Messner, John
Meyers, Craig
Miles, James
Miller, Emily
Moore, John
Muscarella, Chris
Myers, Jamie
Nasereddin, Mahdi
Nelatury, Sudarshan
Nelson, Keith
Nelson, Kimberlyn
Neves, Rogerio
Ofosu, Willie
Oh, Eric
Ouyang, Ann
Ozment, Judith
Page, Nikita
Pangborn, Robert
Pannaman, Joshua
Patzkowsky, Mark
Pauley, Laura
Pearson, Nicholas
Petrilla, Rosemarie
Pierce, Mari Beth
Plummer, Julia
Poole, Thomas
Posey, Lisa
Prins, Esther
Radovic, Ljubisa
Ranjbar, Azita
Ray, Chester
Regan, John
Ricketts, Christina
Robinett, Richard
Robinson, Cynthia
Rowland, Nicholas
Ruiz, James
Scott, Geoffrey
Seymour, Elizabeth
Shannon, Robert
Shapiro, Keith
Sharma, Amit
Shockley, Alex
Sigurdsson, Steinn
Silko-Meyer, Jennifer
Sims, Damon
Singer, Richard
Slattery, Margaret
Smith, David
Smithwick, Erica
Snyder, Stephen
Song, Jim
Stern, Daniel
Strauss, James
Subramanian, Rajarajan
Sutton, Jane
Szczygiel, Bonj
Taylor, Ann
Troester, Rodney
Vrana, Kent
Wagner, Johanna
Walken, Eric
Webster, Nicole
Weidemann, Craig
Welsh, Nancy
Wenner, William
Whitehurst, Marcus
Wilburne, Jane
Wilson, Matthew
Woessner, Matthew
Wolfe, Douglas
Yarnal, Brenton
Yarnal, Careen

Elected        163
Students       16
Ex Officio     6
Appointed      10
Total          195