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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 15, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Mohamad A. Ansari, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Ansari: The January 26, 2016 Senate record providing a full transcription of the proceedings was sent to the University Archives and was posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

Hearing none, may I have a motion to accept?

Senators: So moved.

Chair Ansari: Is there a second?

Senators: Second.

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed nay?

The ayes have it; motion carried. The minutes of the January 26 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

The Senate Curriculum Report of February 23, 2016 is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL-MEETING OF FEBRUARY 23, 2016

Chair Ansari: Minutes from the February 23, 2016 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 at the February 23 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Ansari: President Barron has approved the Advisory and Consultative Reports, "Lack of diversity in academic administrative positions", and the "Revision of the Tenure Clock for the Penn State College of Medicine."

Senator Carrie Eckhardt has received the 2015 McKay Donkin Award. The McKay Donkin award was established in 1969 in honor of the late McKay Donkin, who served as Vice President for Finance and Treasurer of the University from 1957 to 1968. The award is presented to the full time member of the
faculty or staff, or the retiree, who has contributed the most to the economic, physical, mental, or social welfare of the faculty for the university. Congratulations, Carrie.

[Applause]

Thank you.

Nickie Schlegel has moved from the position as Senate office manager to a position in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, effective March 1, 2016. We congratulate Nickie on her position and promotion, but we will miss her and thank her for the hard work that she has put for the Senate in the past 15 months. Nickie is graciously helping us today with the meeting. Thank you, Nickie.

[Applause]

Amy Schilling, staff assistant and receptionist, has moved to the Corporate Controller’s office effective February 23, 2016. We will all miss Amy's help with the meeting arrangements and technology.

At the February 23 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following reports on the Senate agenda and website only— the Election Commission's Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2016-17, the Committee on Global Programs' Considerations for Rewards and Recognition of International Engagement of Faculty and Staff, the Committee on Libraries Information Systems and Technology’s Report for Canvas, the Committee on Research’s report on Changes to Research Computing at PSU, and the Committee on University Planning’s Penn State Space Report. These reports will not be discussed at today's meeting. If you have questions or comments about these informational reports, you can email senate@psu.edu. Your questions will be forwarded to the appropriate committee chair for response. The remaining informational reports on the Senate agenda will be discussed today.

All Senators using MediaSite, please use the Ask a Question box to send a message that you have successfully connected to the live feed so that we may add your name to the attendance list as being present. As a reminder to Senators joining today's meeting by MediaSite, we are again using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/facultysenate. Instructions for using this voting system were emailed to all Senators and are posted on the Senate website. For those of you on MediaSite today, please log on into polleverywhere.com now so that you are ready to use that voting system when we vote.

It is now my great pleasure to introduce the university board of trustees chair Keith Masser to address the Senate. Chair Masser.

[Applause]

Keith Masser: Good afternoon and thank you for inviting me to speak to you today. This is my third visit to a University Faculty Senate meeting over the past few years, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak directly to you about issues of importance to our university. Today I would like to share a few significant changes in the board structure and governance policies as they relate to our goals.

To begin, please note that a review of Penn State's governance documents has been an ongoing item on the Penn State Board of Trustees agenda. It is in fact a work in progress. The Charter, Bylaws, and Standing Orders of the University are not static, nor have they been. In fact, the Board has made revisions
or changes to its governing documents more than 20 times in the past 12 years.

Recent revisions have been guided by recommendations provided by the University Faculty Senate Special Committee on University Governance as well as a governance consultant, benchmarking peer institutions, and other sources. Changes include 12 year term limits, which were established for trustees. Committees were restructured, including additional committees and reconfiguring responsibilities. Membership was expanded. Key staff positions were given dual reporting requirements, plus more than a dozen other revisions since 2012.

Many of the changes have been part of a concerted effort to accomplish a few specific goals. Specifically, our first goal has been to better integrate faculty expertise into our governance functions. Our first step was to expand the number of committees. Now there are seven active committees and five subcommittees, as you can see on this slide.

We expanded representation by adding one Academic Trustee to the Board membership. This trustee is elected by the Board after nomination by the University Faculty Senate. We also added a Student Trustee, the Immediate Past President of the Penn State Alumni Association, and three At-Large Trustees.

In addition, we have worked to make committee meetings more productive by inviting faculty, students, and staff to provide relevant background and updates. We'll have found their input and perspective to be thoughtful and very helpful in deliberating decisions.

As you probably know Dr David Han from the College of Medicine is the current faculty trustee, and he'll serve a three year term that began July 1, 2015. David is also a past president of Penn State Alumni Association-- he serves on the Committee on Academic Affairs in Student Life and the Governance Committee.

I'd like to highlight the outstanding service of your colleagues, Roger Egolf and Gul Kremer, as well as that of your chair, Mohamed Ansari, Chair-Elect Jim Strauss, and Secretary Laura Pauley for their committee work. All have contributed enormously to our meetings, and they have enlightened the board on critical academic issues. The trustees recognize how busy faculty members are with academic responsibilities, so we especially appreciate their commitment and collaboration during committee meetings and follow-up discussions.

I also want to extend a special thanks to everyone who has actively worked with the Board through representation in committees and other activities. Your efforts are greatly appreciated and very valuable to the Board.

Moving onto our second goal, which is to provide more focused discussion on academic issues during Board meetings. To encourage open communications among the faculty, administration, and the board, once each semester a meeting is convened with the President, Provost, Vice President for Administration, Chair and Vice Chair of the board, and the Chair and Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate and Secretary of the Senate. This is a new change to the standing orders.

Another new initiative has been to add the provost's report to the public meetings. Nick's experience and knowledge have added another dimension to our discussions. His insights into faculty, research, the
strategic plan, and other academic issues are essential in the work we do to support Penn State's mission of teaching, research, and service. Vice Provost Blannie Bowen has also shared his knowledge and expertise with our trustees, and his presentations are always very well received.

A third and ongoing goal has been to continue to implement best practices in governance. This year, we substituted a Board retreat for the regular January meeting. By all accounts, it was a very positive educational experience for all trustees. The takeaway was a better understanding of best practices, industry standards for governance, and strategies for collaboration.

I'm also pleased that Kathleen Casey, Dan Mead, and Kay Salvino were part of the 32-member University Strategic Planning Council led by Nick Jones. The full Board, as well as the entire university community, was engaged in the plan's review and approval as well.

Evidence that our governance reforms have been effective comes from key external reviewers, most recently Moody's. On February 16, Penn State's rating was upgraded to Aa1 with a stable outlook, and they cited the strong governance and management practice among their reasons.

Middle States also reaffirmed Penn State's accreditation, recognizing 22 significant achievements and aspects worthy of commendation. This is primarily a credit to the faculty and all of your impressive teaching, scholarship, research, and service.

Finally, I want to mention the board's commitment to addressing student access and affordability, even though it's a bit off the topic of today's presentation. Keeping a Penn State education affordable and accessible is our number one priority, and Penn State has made progress toward that goal, due in large measure to the leadership of President Barron. In addition, through philanthropy, past and present Penn State trustees generously stepped up to support Penn State students, contributing generously to the last campaign. Those tens of millions of dollars have gone to student scholarships, faculty endowments, capital improvements, and many other projects designed to enhance the education of Penn State students across the commonwealth.

In addition, the Board has been sensitive to the rising cost of tuition, and we have kept tuition increases to a minimum. In 2013 and 2014, the board approved the lowest increases since 1967. And this past year we voted to freeze tuition and fees for this academic year.

Despite the budget stalemate, we continue to try to build a stronger relationship with our Pennsylvania legislators. As Pennsylvania business leaders and citizens, our trustees are working with our representatives in Harrisburg to align our common goals of creating an educated citizenry, promoting workforce and economic development, and continuing Penn State's land grant mission. As we move forward, we will renew our efforts to cooperate for the benefit of everyone in this state.

In conclusion, I'd like to say that I truly believe that Penn State is strong, stable, and has a bright future ahead. I'm proud to be a Penn State alumnus and to serve as Chair of the Board of Trustees. I hope that provides you with a useful overview of the work of the Board. Thank you for your time and attention. And I'll entertain questions, if any of you have any.

Chair Ansari: Are there any questions for Chair Masser? Please stand and wait to be recognized and also receive the microphone. Give your name and the unit before asking your questions. Are there any
questions for Chair Masser? Hearing none, thank you so much, Sir. I appreciate it.

Keith Masser: Thank you.

[Applause]

Chair Ansari: I'm pleased to recognize Athletic Director Sandy Barbour to address the Senate.

Sandy Barbour: Thank you very much. I appreciate this opportunity. I've been at Penn State about 19 months now. And the only other time that I've had this opportunity was a very gracious welcome from this body. So I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to briefly talk about some of what's going on in Intercollegiate Athletics. I'd like to give a little bit of a retrospective and look at some of the data around four areas-- academic, student development, athletic, and financial-- and then give a little bit of a prospective look by giving you some insight into where the intercollegiate athletic strategic plan is, as it rolls up into and is informed by the university's strategic plan.

So, if we could go with the academics slide first. There are number of data points. And I will just tell you from the beginning that I think we can be better. We've been very, very good, and we've been very good relative to some of the national data, but I actually think we can be even better. And we certainly are aided significantly by our partnership with the Morgan Academic Center and their dedicated director and our counselors and advisors there.

But as you look at the NCAA graduation success rate, it covers a four year average. The most common one you look at looks at a four year average. And these are those students that entered starting in fall of '05 through fall of 2008. An 88% graduation rate for all student athletes. That's in comparison to the 83% overall Division One average. 81% for our football student athletes, 100% for our men's basketball student athletes, and 100% for our women's basketball student athletes.

The second piece of NCAA data is the APR, which is the Academic Percentage Rate. As you can see from the graduation success rate, that data-- 2005 to 2008-- really takes a long time to get into the pipeline. So the NCAA several years ago came up with the APR, which is more of a real-time one-year snapshot. A perfect score is 1,000. In the latest data, we had six of our teams with perfect scores. We had 20 of our teams over 980. And we had three programs receive what is called Program of Distinction recognition from the NCAA, which is being in the top 10% of those programs nationally.

And then finally, the most recent data that we have is our fall 2015 GPAs: 516 student athletes above a 3.0-- 65%. That's a departmental record high since we've been keeping that data. 234 student athletes above a 3.5, 23 of our teams above a 3.0, and a 3.11 overall GPA for intercollegiate athletics.

Again very, very good. But I think we can be better. But that's a testament to our Morgan Center staff, our coaches for who they bring in, and then for all of us-- obviously our faculty and our staff across the campus-- that really provide great support to our student athletes.

The second piece-- from a retrospective standpoint, student athlete development. This is a program that is now housed within Intercollegiate Athletics. It has been traditionally housed in the Morgan Academic Center. But in discussions with the Morgan Academic Center and their leadership, it was important to, I think, all of us for them to have the ability to focus on the academic support and the academic counseling.
So we brought the student development into athletics. And I think that this is a place where we can really continue to bring value and enhance the opportunities and the value for our student athletes.

We've hired Keith Embray, who is now our Assistant Director for Student Development. It encompasses life skills, career development, financial literacy, drug and alcohol education, leadership development, sexual assault education, current topic engagement, social media awareness. And obviously we continue to add to that list as we see needs within our student athlete population.

Also, a part of this, something I think we're very proud of as a community-- certainly I am as your Athletic Director-- community engagement. Over 5,300 hours of annual community service by ICA programs. Millions of dollars of assistance raised on behalf of community organizations by Intercollegiate Athletics, not to mention a few Pink Zone, Coaches Versus Cancer, Uplifting Athletes. Certainly our student athletes participate fully in THON and then local schools, as well as retirement community visits, Make a Wish, etc.

Third, amongst those datapoints-- athletic excellence. I could have made this a number of slides. I chose to highlight a few of the very top. But eighth in the 2015-15 Learfield Directors' Cup looking at overall athletic department excellence. 2014-15 four conference championships. As just a note, we already have five to date, and hoping to add to that five to date for '15-'16.

Last year the one NCAA team title was in volleyball. This year we've had women's soccer. Last year two NCAA individual titles in fencing and wrestling. None to date this year-- we have work to do there. Hopefully, if you have me back next time, we will change that part of the slide. We have a BIG10 best of 22 Big 10 championships and six NCAA championships since 2012.

And then a couple of individuals. Matt Brown this year received the NCAA's Top 10 Award, which is one of the most prestigious that the NCAA has to offer. Carl Nassib was the Lombardi Trophy winner as the best defensive lineman in college football. And then Rocky Rodriguez was the Herman Trophy winner this year in women's soccer, which is the Heisman of women's soccer.

Not to be left out, from a financial standpoint, a very important part of my role as it relates to our Intercollegiate Athletics department, but really looking at focusing on resource production initiatives. Most of you probably have read in the media or heard we're certainly looking at in particular Beaver Stadium, looking at other events that we could host there that could be revenue producing possibilities for us and always looking at cost containment. Difficult-- difficult for all of us as we try to do the fabulous things to bring value to our student athletes.

One of the notes here. We are a 31-program, 800 student athlete department, we are using around the same resources that maybe another institution-- not necessarily in our league, in the Big 10 we tend to have more robust athletic departments, but maybe what we're competing against across the country, it's either the same or less resources, but we are serving more student athletes than a typical athletic program is across the country. For FY '16 we are budgeted at around $123 million expense budget with a concurrent $126 million projected revenue.

And then finally, one of the things that we have done with projected revenues and expense controls down the road in our five-year projection, the first one that I presented to the Board upon my arrival projected a deficit in our net reserves. At the end of five years we've taken that same five years and a year later
projected a net reserve projection. We've gone from about a small 8-figure deficit to a small 8-figure reserve. And that will serve us well as we talk about some things like our Facilities Master Plan.

So that's the look back from a data standpoint. The look forward is through the eyes of our strategic plan. Certainly it's an opportunity to look and freshen our mission, vision, and values, make sure that that fits with and expresses publicly our fit and our integration with the university, provides us a roadmap-- which I think at this point in time where we're headed, we really need to make sure that's clear both internally and publicly.

Our strategic plan will obviously outline our priorities. We need to put our resources-- the money should follow after our priorities. And then reinforces our long-time Penn State Values. I think they've been good, I think they've been really, really good. And my job as the leader there is to make sure that we are doing things that fit our values but we are also doing things that lead to our success from a mission standpoint.

So what I am showing you, what I'm sharing with you, here today is a draft, but in our vision statement, very, very simple. It's about preparing students for a lifetime of impact. And I think that fits quite nicely with this university. It's about making a difference, preparing students and giving them tools to go out and make a difference, not only while they're here, but certainly after that. And it's in recognition of the fact that our student athletes have a platform that not all students have. And we want them to be prepared to use that platform wisely.

The mission, I think, still needs a little bit of work. It's not quite as simple. But it is about partnering with the broader university in serving, supporting, and inspiring not only student athletes but students, using the vehicle of intercollegiate athletics to inspire, providing them resources for success, competition, academics, and community engagement, and character development. And then ICA contributing to the success of Penn State by the expanded engagement opportunities that we have and strengthening the university's identity. Now having said that, obviously athletics has to bring value, has to do things right, has to enhance all that data that I gave you and all those statistics, and do it in a way that brings value to the campus.

The university values, you all have seen them in our strategic plan. And the important part here is that our plan, as you will see, obviously encompasses those. But then we have also added a group of values that we thought were particularly also additionally important to athletics.

Tradition-- building on a legacy of success with honor. Teamwork-- we're better together. Diversity-- multiple talents, one team. You've seen that one before. Transparency-- clarity, communication, and accountability. And then innovation-- creatively and effectively identify solutions for a bright future. These I believe reinforce what Intercollegiate Athletics at Penn State has always been, and then maybe adding some that are a little bit more contemporary.

We'll accomplish these through five strategic goals that I'm going to share with you. The first, not surprisingly, is comprehensive excellence. And as we look at our values, I think these tie-- obviously, the institutional value of excellence and that of teamwork from an athletic standpoint. It encompasses everything we do with student athletes. It's about health and well-being, it's about being best in class, and it's about achieving both athletically and academically. We'll do this through recruitment, educational support, sports science, health and safety, leadership, facilities, career development, just to name a few.
The second goal is the We Are. There might be a number of you-- we held a number of town halls, and I think our faculty and staff were particularly helpful around this one. Because originally the label was brand, and there was some significant reaction to that. But it's about who we are. And so that's why we got away from the word brand, that there had been some reaction to.

And certainly from a We Are standpoint, I think that really speaks to our community. But it's purposefully, strategically, and creatively promotes our story of comprehensive excellence. We'll do this through innovative marketing and branding, ambassador programs, engaging both internal and external audiences, identifying influencers, reinforcing the pride, and through the philanthropic case for support. Tradition comes into this as well as certainly the excellence.

The third strategic goal-- key partnerships and relationships. Secure, enrich, and grow collaborative and constructive relationships and partnerships, both on and off campus. Obviously, this community is a huge part of who we are and of our success. So it's both on and off. This incorporates teamwork, responsibility, diversity from a values perspective. And we'll do this through community outreach, visibility, loyalty and affinity programs, using athletics as a vehicle for campus unification, innovation, constructive solutions, and integration.

The fourth-- culture. This is really internal, departmental. Most of the other ones have been looking outwardly. This one is looking inwardly in intercollegiate athletics around cultivate and sustain a best place to work environment that fosters pride, accomplishment, and team spirit within ICA staff. We'll do this through communication, accountability, assessment, comprehensive compensation strategy, professional development, customer service, and employee recognition programs. And obviously, this takes into consideration teamwork, tradition, and communities from a value perspective.

And then the final strategic goal-- develop a financial model, develop and implement a self-supporting financial plan that provides fiscal sustainability, investment in future growth, and ensures the success of our student athletes. A lot of chatter, a lot of conversation around this, because maybe we're going to have to do things a little bit differently to produce the revenue. But not for revenue sake itself-- it's to produce the resources to then resource our student athlete experience. We'll do this through a comprehensive fundraising program, new business and revenue development, process and procedural efficiencies, budget model, accounting systems, facilities master plan, and shared responsibility.

Next steps-- finalize the draft. We will test it with a number of communities, a number of our constituents, through a final survey. We will then publish the strategic plan, promote the elements-- both internally and externally. And then they will inform all of our work priorities and our budgets moving forward, including dashboards and key performance indicators that we will communicate and report progress on.

So that is the prospective look at how Intercollegiate Athletics will go about its daily lives. Other items of note-- facilities master plan. Again, part of the strategic plan, part of both a student experience standpoint as well as our revenue development. Very important to the conditions for success for our student athletes, for compelling spectator venues. And then resource production for that sustainable financial model, which is one of those goals.

Our Facilities Master Plan will be funded through philanthropy, partnerships-- both campus partnerships
as well as community partnerships-- through ICA capital resources and reserves. And then some portion of it will, we anticipate, be debt serviced.

Two other things I think that are of note. One is the restructuring of the Commonwealth Campus athletics reporting lines. Lots of people have done very, very good work this year on that, and I think that is to the benefit of many, but particularly our Commonwealth Campus' athletic programs and those student athletes.

And then finally, we're starting to have some publicity around the opening of the Morgan Academic Support Center, which will open in the old Greenberg Ice Arena in the summer of 2016. But it's starting to take shape. Very excited about that. And that is about taking what I think was four or five different satellite locations and consolidating them into one, which we think will be of great benefit to our student athlete population as a whole. So with that, Chair. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Are there any questions for Director Barbour? Hearing none, thank you so much.

Sandy Barbour: Thank you.

[Applause]

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Ansari: It is my great pleasure to recognize President Barron.

Eric Barron: Thank you. I've had in my file for a little bit of time, and I should have done this earlier, about a faculty couple who endowed a graduate fellowship in Rural Sociology, Leland Glenna and Esther Prins. And I wanted to just make a comment, not just to thank them personally, but to make the comment about how powerful it is when faculty themselves give back to programs. I love to brag about it. It's a message when you're so vested in this university that you say I wish to support this myself. And so I just wanted to make that comment, thank them personally, but what a powerful message when faculty create graduate fellowships.

I really only want to talk about one thing, although I'll-- as usual-- take questions on anything, and that's the budget. The state budget dominates a lot of our time. You may already have a sense of the sequence that is there, which is essentially for the first six months, unthinkable that there wouldn't be a budget for the state-related institutions. And not just unthinkable-- everybody was on the same page for a budget increase. House, 5%, Senate 5% increase, governor 11% increase. Even without that, we planned on a very conservative mode of a 3% increase.

But it's difficult to imagine an outcome which isn't positive when both chambers say 5% and the governor says 11%. And even when I wandered around the capitol and reporters would say, well, you don't have a budget, that's too bad, but you guys are in a really good place, everybody wants to give you more money. And that would be fine with me.

Well, then the budget is passed and it's blue lined for $6 billion, which basically means not a veto. You
cross out the number and you put a different number there. And so it's blue lined for $6 billion. And lo and behold, resources for us-- like for Ag Extension and the Land Scrip-- are blue lined.

And we go to take the vote on the non-preferred appropriations, which includes the state-related institutions. And it's very important to remember what non-preferred is. Because those two words say you're not as important. But in fact, this is a constitutional issue. We are not an agency of the state. We're independently incorporated under IRS code. And as a consequence, under the Constitution, the state cannot provide us with funds. And so the adjustment is that a 2/3 vote enables the legislature and the governor to pass funds on to Penn State and the other state-related institutions.

So up go the state-related bills. And the Republicans put them forward. And all but one Democrat votes no and we don't achieve a 2/3 majority. So this is the moment where essentially you realize that not only do you not have an appropriation, but you have become a bit of a hostage in the budget process, of the tug of war, of are you going to increase taxes and be able to do more, are you going to be able to address the structural deficit that people argue about what its magnitude is like. And you start to question what is going to happen here. Because you're one of those hostages where everybody loves you and wants to give you more, but at the same time as a hostage you get nothing.

So we became more concerned, because nobody likes to be put in a position like that. I met with all of the leadership-- minority caucus, majority caucus, House, Senate, governor's office, Chief of Staff, conversations with the Secretary for Budget. And in each case, they said we want to give you your money, those people have to change the way they think. And it didn't matter which office I went into. We want to give you your money, those people have to change the way that they're acting, which also left one with the impression that we had a long way to go, when everybody wants to give you money but those people have to be the ones that take action.

And for the first time, legislators mentioned the unthinkable-- and that is that we could get zero. Not a zero increase, zero. And the way this scenario plays out, which is quite tricky, is that since that stalemate was so strong and continuing, it continued in to the time period for which people would get signatures on petitions for the election and would continue into the time of primary season. Because nobody was going to vote for a tax increase with the potential that they would have someone as an opposing candidate who was more anti-tax than they were.

So the betting was that if it made it to the start of primary season that there would be a great deal of hesitation to bring our budget forward because of that. And that would take us to the very last couple of days of May. And then you run the risk, gee, you made it; I guess you didn't need that money after all. And so this becomes the fear that is introduced in this particular process, of having this budget delayed, and delayed, and delayed.

And one other component of this: The Ag Scrip was separated from the non-preferred budget vote a while ago to make sure that it wasn't lost in this whole process of a 2/3 vote. But unfortunately, the statement has been made by the budget officer for the Commonwealth that if there is no state non-preferred opening in a budget that they have no place to put the Ag Scrip Fund. So you have to have that place set by a 2/3 vote to create that before you can place the Ag funds. So even though they're separate and they don't require a 2/3 vote-- they only require a majority vote-- it's too bad. We have no place to put it, because we haven't opened a budget. Now people dispute whether this is true or not. But at any rate, it is what it is, all tied together one and waiting.
What we have been doing is systematically ramping up the messaging on this particular issue. We don't want to talk about things and outcomes that are self-fulfilling and doing harm to this university. And the simple fact of the matter is this is, excuse me, hunting season for faculty. And I don't want to lose any of you.

And so this is something where we have to be very careful that we're not sitting there overreacting to this, because it is unthinkable. It is unthinkable. There is no such thing as a public research university without state support. This would be a new thing. It's unthinkable.

My bet is that the budget will come through. And nonetheless, from our viewpoint we have to worry about it because we are entering primary season without a budget.

So the chancellors and presidents of the state-related have banded together, with a consistent message that went in the budget hearing. Yesterday morning I spent the day at the Patriot-News with the editorial board talking about the outcomes. This morning I spent the day with a Pittsburgh newspaper, the Post-Gazette, talking about what the potential outcomes were.

We have vocalized that the Ag Scrip funds that support a considerable amount of activities in this state in terms of ag extension, master gardener programs, 4-H programs, that these are at risk, that the university is carrying them without an appropriation, that that appropriation is critical to leverage federal funds. And we have plainly told the legislature and the press that we have 1,100 employees at risk.

And the reasoning for this is very simple. We have carried them for this year, but I can't look any parent in the eye and say your tuition dollar is going to support 4-H. I can't do it. And so it has to be clear that these are services within the state and the state needs to step up and fund them. And the risk of loss and harm to agriculture is great if they don't step up and do their job.

We're increasingly being specific about the types of things that may happen. And I will be specific for you. For example, do we go back on our longstanding promise to focus on a majority of in-state students? Or do we sit there and do what many other institutions have done, which is to go majority out-of-state and out-of-country country students because of the revenue difference? Do we take that step? Because it changes what our philosophy is.

Everything is on the table to look at, on the revenue side, on the cutting side. Our approach with deans and other unit heads is if you're about to spend money on something and you walk up to a budget crisis—which again, I think is unthinkable-- don't. And you say, “Why didn't I know that, I wouldn't have spent that money,” then maybe you shouldn't spend it. But if we have searches in process, we need to follow through on them if we can.

And so this is increasingly becoming public that we're taking these types of attitudes. And I'm just giving you this as a heads-up that we are becoming more emphatic and providing more and more pressure with each step of the way as we get closer and closer to these dates, because we can't afford it. But in my view, it's unthinkable. But nonetheless, we have to be smart. Certainly this institution would look very different. And there's no such animal out there-- this is not something that has happened before.

You have a robust financial institution here. And this makes us much more secure than other institutions
that are going through this type of process. But we have to be wise.

Part of the good news is that the Senate has said out loud that they will introduce the bill, the appropriations bill, again, and it probably will occur this week. It is something to watch very closely, because we're going to watch to see if it ends up being bipartisan. If it ends up being bipartisan, this will be a good sign and put more pressure on the governor.

The governor has said that he needs to stand firm, that there's a recurring deficit and it has to be fixed. Otherwise, there will be significant cuts to education. And non-preferred is non-preferred, so, a serious stance that is being taken.

But it is interesting to me that when I was speaking with the Senate leadership a month ago they were saying, we've done our bill, we've done our work, we're not doing any more, it's somebody else's job. And here we're taking a step to introduce a new bill, which is very different than what he said a month ago. Is it an opening? I would tell you that I've been optimistic about eight times.

[Laughter]

And so I am going to work hard to be optimistic again. But this is something to watch very closely. Because I'm a little worried that if it's introduced and it fails that we will go right up to the end of the primary season, and it adds a further risk.

But each step of the way we're trying to ramp up that pressure. Grassroots Network. Today is Farm Day in the capital, and I understand they're not holding back in terms of their dissatisfaction that something so fundamentally important to the economics of Pennsylvania is not being supported.

A lot of partnerships are going on among the state-relateds. So when I did the editorial board meeting this morning in Pittsburgh, I did it with Patrick Gallagher, the Chancellor of Pitt. Very different message with two leaders of universities that don't normally sit there and share the same podium describing how important it is to get this done, and the damage that's being done, and sometimes the quiet damage that's being done through this process.

Well, that's not a particularly happy moment. But I think you deserve to know both the risk and the degree to which we're trying to ramp up our strategy to deal with it. Are there questions?

Mohamed Ansari: Are there any questions for President Barron? Richard?

Richard Singer, Penn State Altoona: Singer, Altoona. By my calculation, we should be bleeding about a million dollars a day. And so my question is, where does that money come from?

Eric Barron: OK. So this institution is very sound. And one of the things that's incorporated in there is having a buffer. And many, many institutions-- many, many leaders-- would tell you the buffer should be of a certain magnitude. Now, a lot of universities just don't have that, especially coming out of a recession. The university has managed to have a decent buffer. I will give you an example of how it is that we have operated to give you a little bit of sense of how it is we sit and how it is we work.

The initiatives for student access and affordability for need-based students that have been launched at the
campuses, as pilot programs and other areas, and Invent Penn State, both came from moving over $200 million out of float into interest-bearing accounts. And those programs are funded based on interest. So we're not taking extra tuition dollars, we're not taking extra charges, it's funded on interest.

What I told the financial managers was, let's make money off of what is fiscally responsible operations of making sure we have a certain amount of money in order to deal with the problems that may emerge. Let's make interest out of it and do good things with it. But I promised that they could have it back in case of a financial emergency. Well guess what, I don't want to give it back. But there is money there. This is part of being, I think, very responsible.

And we have this buffer. It will get tougher and tougher as we go along to have that buffer. And the urge to take some of that money that we're putting to very good use will grow stronger. But I believe this is unthinkable.

Now, we do know that some of our partner universities may not have the money to make it through to the end of the year. Some are looking at borrowing in order to make it at the end of the year, still believing that it will happen. It's much harder to find those funds partway through a year, and we're eight months through the year.

But we have worked and planned to make sure that this is an institution that keeps in the black. And Moody's, as you may have noticed, upgraded us despite the fact that they knew there was a state budget crisis, because we're a very sound financial institution.

Now in saying that, there's an issue. Because that's one-time money, that's not recurring dollars. So what happens, as we go into another cycle of the budget, if they continue to argue, becomes a completely different story. And the decisions that we will make on the revenues and some of the cuts depends on our level of comfort.

But this is a secure university, and you should feel very proud of it. We have places to get money that we don't want to go, but I made the agreement when we took the money out of what is a buffer. I believe in some states they even say if you take your total operating budget you should have at least 10% of it set aside to make sure that if you have some awful thing that happens that you can recover.

Chair Ansari: We have a question.

Eric Barron: Not many universities can do that. Boy, I give a long answer, don't I?

Steinn Sigurdsson, College of Science: Steinn Sigurdsson, College of Science. Is Penn State laying the groundwork for declaring financial exigency at some point?

Eric Barron: Laying the groundwork for what?

Stein Sigurdsson: Declaring financial exigency.

Eric Barron: No, we're not.

Chair Ansari: Other questions? Nick?
Nicholas Rowland, Penn State Altoona: Nick Rowland, at Altoona. A couple weeks ago I was reading about the University Park Undergraduate Association started a letter writing campaign and hand-delivered these letters to leadership in Harrisburg. This is a meeting you were at, I think. This was on March 1st, or 2nd, or something. I think it was a Wednesday. Can you tell us a little bit about how that went.

And also, as faculty members, should we think about ways to mobilize students? Do you think that's appropriate? Do you think that's effective? Just some guidance on that.

Eric Barron: OK. So a lot of people said to me, why didn't we know, why didn't we know? And I've said, well, everybody told us we were getting an increase. The bill that's going to be introduced this week includes a 5% increase. So we may get right there. And so how do you ring alarm bells when everybody wants to give you more money?

But I had in my blog this issue. And the students took it upon themselves to begin to mobilize themselves, which I think is wonderful. And they consulted with Government Affairs.

It is extremely important to me that we are nonpartisan in this and that we are not mobilizing students in any one particular direction, that this is the governor's fault, or this is the House's fault, or this is a segment of the House's fault. And what you see in our history of lobbying is that we always, always lobby for Penn State. We don't say we need to increase taxes so we can get more money. We don't say that our budget should be a higher priority than prisons. We only lobby for Penn State.

And so as long as we're in this mode of lobbying for Penn State-- this is important to me and I urge you to pass this budget-- and you are sending it to House leadership, Senate leadership, governor, both caucuses, however you want to do it, then I'm very comfortable with doing that. If you like, we can ask Government Affairs to perhaps provide some advice on this particular topic so that you get a sense of it more for me. It’s extremely important that it's nonpartisan.

Chair Ansari: Other questions? I hear none. President Barron, I have received two questions for you. The first question has a background and has two parts. It says: Penn State has the second highest facilities and administrative rate of the Big 10 universities. Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, only up to 20% of the overhead is returned to the units. Part A. Returned overhead has been used by the departments for projects such as repair/innovation of buildings, and innovation/upgrade of teaching labs. Is there a plan to increase the amount of overhead refund to the units?

Eric J. Barron: OK. So the key here is that these are audited costs by the federal government, where they say what it is that you are doing and expenditures that fit within this overhead rate. They set the rate, we do not.

Chair Ansari: I see.

Eric J. Barron: So if it is set to precisely recoup costs, then the only way to change what we do is either to take some of those things that are supported on overhead and not do them, or to use tuition dollars to support research. And so it's very hard to budge that. There are many things that can influence that number.
So for example, a downturn in the number of grants and contracts, while keeping the same infrastructure, will have the government end up increasing the rate. Whereas right now, we're seeing research grants and contracts begin to go up. Up last year, a little bit. Up this year, more.

We had a lag in expenditures that occurred as we came out of the recession. And now, it's on its way back. That will end up having an impact on the rates, to drive them down. But otherwise, you'd have to make the decision that you were going to use the tuition dollars to support research enterprises. And I actually believe that the amount transferred to units is 12%, not 20%.

Chair Ansari: 12%. Thank you, Sir. Part B. From a principal investigative point of view, such a large F&A rate means less funds for research. As a way to ameliorate this, would the University consider waiving tuition for students being supported by grants?

Eric J. Barron: So it's real money?

Chair Ansari: Yes.

Eric J. Barron: That's the idea. This is a decision that instead of having dollars generated through tuition, or some other process, it would have to be replaced. So it's another form of subsidy, and it would be a significant dollar amount. It would have to be a decision that, in supporting that research, you were going to take other university resources to do it. So that's a challenge, because it's a big number. And the second question, since I received the question, I have not had a chance to sit down and discuss it. But I will follow up.

Chair Ansari: Absolutely. No problem. Thank you, Sir. I appreciate it.

Eric J. Barron: Thank you.

[Applause]

**COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST**

Mohamad A. Ansari: Item F, Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost. It is my great pleasure to recognize Provost Jones. He's going to present the University's Budget Report which has been reviewed by the University Planning Committee. Provost Jones.

Nicholas Jones, Provost: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to reiterate as I go through this presentation some of the comments that President Barron made. We prepared and submitted this material about 30 days ago. I was actually hoping that in advance of today's meeting, I would pull the whole thing, because the budget impasse had been resolved, and everything was different.

And the content was dramatically revised. But unfortunately, I still have the same presentation that we prepared about a month ago. So I'm going to report today formally about two related topics. First, I'll discuss the status of the university's operating budget for the current 2015-2016 fiscal year. Then, I'll explain our financial appropriation request to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and related budget
planning for the upcoming 2016-17 fiscal year.

I realize that in light of the President's comments, this may seem like I am wandering around in Wonderland. But we have to plan. As you're aware, as you just heard, Penn State's commonwealth appropriations are delayed due to the ongoing budget stalemate in Harrisburg.

More than seven, eight months after the start of the fiscal year, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has not enacted a complete budget for 2015-16, and Penn State's anticipated appropriation, along with those for the other state-related universities, has not been approved.

Because of this lengthy delay and the uncertain path to solving the impasse in Harrisburg, we have entered uncharted territory. Funding from the Ag Scrip Fund for Agricultural Research and Cooperative Extension Programs is also currently not approved.

Needless to say, delay in approving these funds is already having negative impacts on Penn State students, faculty, and staff. So while we are excited about record numbers of student applications, along with strong and relatively stable campus enrollment, we're also cognizant of rising costs in some areas, including general operations and employee health care and retirement.

We worked last year on budget proposals for 2015-16 that included appropriation increases ranging from 3% to 11%. And we ultimately based our budget on the conservative estimate. Three percent was the funding level included in a proposal by the majority party of the General Assembly, and the lowest amount recommended by all parties during state budget deliberations prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

The Board of Trustees approved an operating budget in July of 2015 that assumed the 2015-16 general support appropriation, also known as Education and General or E&G, would include a 3% increase over 2014-15, for a total of approximately $220 million.

Because the appropriation was not and has not yet been finalized, the University budgeted the appropriation at the 2014-15 level of approximately $214 million, and deferred the deployment of additional funds pending the final appropriation.

Governor Wolf's proposed Commonwealth budget for 2015-16 sought an increase of 11% in funds for state-related universities and articulated a two-year plan to fully restore recent appropriation cuts. Throughout the ongoing 2015-16 budget negotiation process, both chambers of the General Assembly supported a 5% increase of Penn State's annual appropriation. As of today, however, there is nothing.

Consistent with the conservative approach of assuming the lowest amount recommended at any stage of the budget process, our 2015-16 operating budget assumes level funding for Ag Research and Cooperative Extension. Penn College approved a budget plan for 2015-16 with an assumption of flat state funding. Therefore, level funding was incorporated into this adjusted plan.

In late December of 2015, however, a framework for the Commonwealth's budget, which relied on additional revenue and pension reform, collapsed. On December 29, Governor Wolf signed an emergency budget to get funds flowing to school districts and human services agencies, but it did not include appropriations for Penn State or the other state-related universities, and the Governor vetoed funding for
Agricultural Research and Cooperative Extension.

The Governor and the General Assembly have consistently expressed support for appropriations to state-related universities. Prior to the Governor's approval of the emergency budget, we had every reason to believe that Penn State's appropriation would be finalized at no less than what was allocated in the prior year.

Now, however, as you heard from the President, the previously unthinkable prospect that the Commonwealth will not provide any level of support in this fiscal year begins to look possible. Although we remain hopeful that Penn State's appropriation will eventually be finalized, and we will continue to advocate publicly and aggressively on the University's behalf about the risks to the Commonwealth of failing to fund the University adequately, we need to make preparations now for budget adjustments that will be necessary under this scenario, as you heard from Eric.

Until there is clarity about the 2015-16 appropriation, we are asking our General Funds units to implement emergency actions, effective immediately, to provide as much budget flexibility as possible. These include significantly curtailing or eliminating travel, including professional development travel, and reviewing and curtailing other expenditures where possible, and placing uncommitted General Funds resources into budgetary reserve.

Many capital projects are also being put on hold. I'll go into more detail on this subject a little later in my presentation. Looking back, before we had to face this uncertainty regarding the state appropriation, several priorities guided the development of our 2015-16 budget. We wanted to keep tuition increases low or flat. We also wanted to stimulate the Pennsylvania economy and student career success, building on the momentum of Invent Penn State and Penn State's $30 million startup investment.

We identified potential expense reductions, and moderated spending priorities, especially important, given the anticipated increases in the costs of employee benefits, including health insurance.

We wanted to fund operating cost increases and selected strategic initiatives, with a special focus on access and affordability in accordance with the new strategic plan. We also want to maintain a competitive position to attract and retain the best talent, who provide the foundation for the high quality of our academic programs.

Now, let's look at how this all fits into Penn State's total institutional budget. This pie chart represents the anticipated sources of Penn State's revenue for the current fiscal year as we planned it. Eighty-one percent of our revenue is generated by three primary activities—teaching, patient care, and research.

This year, hospital and clinical revenues generated by the Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center edged past tuition and fees to represent the largest share of the University's total revenue. Restricted funds, primarily from sponsored research grants and contracts, account for 14% of Penn State's total budget.

Let's now look briefly at the General Funds budget, which encompasses the core academic and teaching-related elements of the University's operation—Education and General, Ag Research and Cooperative Extension, the College of Medicine, and Penn College.
The general funds budget is supported by three sources of revenue-- student tuition and fees at roughly 80% of the total, the now increasingly unlikely state appropriations at 13%, and other sources-- for example, indirect cost recovery and income from short-term investments of operating cash, totaling around 7 1/2%.

This slide shows a simplified version of the E & G operating budget's expense changes for this fiscal year. The total cost increases are $89.3 million; of which $34.4 million are to be covered through budget reductions and other targeted expense cuts.

This amount incorporates funding set aside in prior years to address future employer costs for the State Employees Retirement System. Operating savings from restructuring the post retirement health care liability decreases to earlier projections for the increases in health care and retirement benefits, operational savings.

Scenarios to address the remaining balance have been developed, and decisions will be made once the state appropriation is finalized, if it is finalized.

While some expense changes are not yet finalized, we still moved forward in select targeted areas. First, we provided for modest salary increases, effective July 1, 2015. More than a decade ago, the Board of Trustees adopted a multi-year plan to make Penn State's faculty salaries more competitive relative to our peer institutions in the Big 10 and the Association of American Universities.

To maintain the progress that was made, a salary provided 1 1/2% to 2% compensation adjustments for faculty and staff, distributed based on merit, and to keep up with inflation, plus an additional 1% to address market equity and exceptional merit, and to provide faculty promotional increments and related benefits.

That totals approximately $33.9 million. Next, we have mandatory costs of $12.8 million for the projected increase in the employer's share of health care costs and the subsidy provided for health care insurance for graduate assistants and fellows. Also, we have $13.6 million for the projected increase in the employer contribution for the Pennsylvania State Employees Retirement System.

In the five-year period comprising 2011-12 through 2015-16, increases to the total annual amount required for health care and retirement contributions exceeded $105 million. Next, we have operating costs for finance and business-related operations. This includes $9.1 million for deferred maintenance, capital improvement, maintenance and operation of new facilities, fuel and utilities, property and liability insurances, and audit costs.

Some of these projects remain on hold, along with strategic initiatives, given the still-pending appropriation. Other expense changes included an additional $1.9 million for student activities, facilities, and information technology, $2 million for need-based student aid, and $1.2 million for increases in grants and aid for graduate students. The planned budget reductions totaling $34.5 million include, among other items, deleting slides from presentations.

[Laughter]
Twelve and one half million from funds set aside in prior years to offset the spike in the employer contribution rate for the State Employees Retirement System, $7 million from restructuring post-retirement health care, and $4.2 million from lowering the subsidy for the World Campus, and capping the subsidy to Outreach.

Projects on hold and their estimated costs include $3.9 million in capital improvement funding, and a $1 million increase to address a major maintenance backlog. This next breakdown shows how we have intended to cover the planned expense changes.

It involves a combination of targeted budget reductions, the estimated state appropriation, facilities and administrative cost recovery, investment income, and tuition from prior enrollment, growth, and increases for non-resident and graduate students.

Our number one priority remains a commitment to keeping tuition and fee increases at the lowest possible level without compromising academic quality. Internal re-allocations, targeted budget reductions, strong enrollments, and delaying planned investments in Commonwealth and Penn State priorities, enabled us to have no base tuition increase for Pennsylvania undergraduate students, the lowest increase or non-increase in 40 years.

The non-Pennsylvania resident tuition reflects a 2.84% aggregate base increase. Despite the delayed appropriation, we intend to stick to these numbers. Incidentally, the 21.1 million tuition increase shown on the prior slide does reflect no increase in undergraduate in-state tuition, and the 2.84% increase in undergraduate out of state tuition.

So now, we shift our appropriation request and planning for the 2016-17 fiscal year. This may seem odd, that we're deep into this, when we don't even have an appropriation for this fiscal year. But our appropriation request was still due at the Department of Education last year.

Because 2015-16 appropriation levels have not and still are not finalized, Penn State requested a deadline extension until after the November 2015 Board of Trustees meeting, in anticipation of getting more information about the Commonwealth's budget.

We didn't. Penn State, as well as the University of Pittsburgh and Temple University, requested full restoration of the 2011-12 cuts consistent with earlier statements.

For further context, this chart shows Penn State's appropriation for the past 14 years not adjusted for inflation. The red bars indicate the years in which, subsequent to the initial appropriation, the state rescinded some percentage as part of adjusting the state's finances when tax and other revenues came in under the internally budgeted amounts.

Notice the initial amount of $334.8 million for 2001, 2002, and the 2014-15 amount of $289.3 million. The amount for 2015-16, of course, is still pending. This next chart shows Penn State's annual appropriations adjusted for inflation. You can see the significant decrease in the value of the state appropriation from the years preceding 2010-11 and the years after it.

The small increases in the three prior years were appropriated specifically for either the Pennsylvania College of Technology, or the Ag Scrip Fund. Many of you have seen some version of this next chart,
which tracks the appropriation versus tuition and fees as a percentage of the general fund's budget.

Penn State, like many other public and Land Grant institutions, is clearly relying much more on tuition and fees and enrollment growth to make up for the state's declining share of the cost.

At its meeting in November 2015, the Board of Trustees approved our appropriation request for 2016-17. It includes requesting full restoration of the general support appropriation to the 2010-11 level of approximately $264.3 million.

Also included, a full restoration of the Ag Research and Cooperative Extension funding to the 2010-11 level of $55.2 million, medical assistance funding for the Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, totaling $13.1 million, and a roughly $3 million increase for Penn College, totaling $20.6 million.

Assuming a 5% appropriation increase for this fiscal year, 2015-16, which is now in doubt, full restoration to the 2010-11 amount of $264.3 million would represent a 17.6% year over year increase.

Next, in total as shown here, Penn State's 2016-17 appropriation request in total is for $353.3 million. The starting point for the requested increase in general support assumes that the final 2015-16, this year's appropriation, will include a 5% increase over '14-'15.

Nevertheless, as the current budget stalemate continues, we face growing uncertainty about the appropriation. The far right column shows the amount revealed in February in the governor's Executive Budget. If the Commonwealth provides the requested appropriation, Penn State plans no increase in base tuition for Pennsylvania resident undergraduate students for the second consecutive year.

We would have modest faculty and staff salary increases to maintain competitiveness. Many facilities projects would resume or begin, and funding for more strategic initiatives, innovation, and student aid would become available. The appropriation request that we have made is only the initial step in the process. Members of Penn State's administration anticipate ongoing discussion with elected officials and the governor's office about the value of the Commonwealth's investment in the University and budget estimates for the 2016-17 year will be adjusted and updated as needed.

Pennsylvania's independent fiscal office recently reported that the Commonwealth structural deficit for 2016-17 could approach nearly $2 billion. In that context, and as the 2015-16 budget impasse becomes more protracted, we also need to plan for the possibility that our state support may not be forthcoming for next fiscal year, as the president indicated.

The consequences of the state budget impasse could be temporary, or if ongoing, will have a large negative impact on our institution. While we hope that the Commonwealth will finalize a budget that includes Penn State's appropriation for this fiscal year and next, we still need everyone's assistance to develop solutions that will see the University through this incredibly challenging period of uncertainty. Thank you for your attention. I'd be happy to take questions and comments.

Chair Ansari: Are there any questions for Provost Jones?

Arthur Berg, Hershey: Hi. I'm Arthur Berg from Hersey. I have a little bit of a selfish question. And it's my understanding that the clinical enterprise pays for the academic mission at Hershey, although you put
some numbers in the side. I think that's for the residents and the such.

But we seem to be on lock-down, just like the rest of the University. But it seems that if we don't get funding from the state in the same regard, why would we be on lock-down? I mean, I'm reminded of the comment earlier by the president that you don't want to use tuition dollars to pay for 4-H, but do you want to use College of Medicine dollars to pay 4-H, something like that?

Nicholas Jones: Actually, the opposite is true. There is a flow of funds from the E&G to the College of Medicine, which is also supported by the clinical enterprise. So both the clinical enterprise at Hershey and the E&G budget of the university currently support together the College of Medicine.

And so certainly the contribution from the E&G budget is under threat, or at risk, just like every other component of the E&G budget is.

Arthur Berg: We don't have any numbers in dollars.

Nicholas Jones: We currently contribute $14 million a year to the College of Medicine.

Speaker 1 And that's not the revenue base?

Nicholas Jones: No.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other questions?

Nicholas Jones: I think I totally depressed everybody.

Chair Ansari: There’s one here. Asad, do you have a question?

Asad Azemi, Brandywine: Azemi, Brandywine. Given the uncertainty of the budget that you mentioned, how appropriate it is to keep the tuition 0%, but the chance that we may get less money in the upcoming years, and then we have to bump the tuition a lot more. I mean, would it even make sense to have it a smaller amount going forward and act as a buffer that was mentioned before?

Nicholas Jones: Right. So just to be clear, what I presented here is all hypothetical, and it assumes that we will get an appropriation this year, it will contain a 5% increase over what we got last fiscal year, and the appropriation for next fiscal year will be supported with the balance of the full restoration to the 2011-12 levels. Only under that condition can we afford to do a 0% tuition increase for the second consecutive year. If those conditions are not met, we will need to revise our appropriation request. It's a really good point. But this is based on taking comments that have come out of Harrisburg consistent with what Temple and Pitt are doing at face value, that there is a commitment to full restoration.

Chair Ansari: Are there other questions? Provost Jones, I have received three questions. Number one, while everyone understands that there are different forms of fixed term positions, will the Provost please clarify whether fixed term faculty on the campus hired primarily for teaching, and typically teaching a 4-4 load, or should be routinely required to research and publish?

Nicholas Jones: This sounds remarkably similar to a question that I received in the December meeting.
And I think I'll just reiterate the response that I made there. The vast majority of our Fixed Term 1 faculty contracts are indeed for teaching. But some are for research responsibilities. So I need to set those aside. Or in some cases, a combination thereof.

The terms of appointment should always be laid out in the appointment contract. A faculty member who thinks that they are being asked to deviate from the employment contract should speak with his or her dean or chancellor, involve the ombudsperson in their unit, or go the FR&R channel, if necessary.

Contracts are the order of the day. What it says in the contract is what the expectation is. And if it's different, then there's cause for concern. Sometimes, ads get placed that can be a little odd, simply because particularly in a time, as I've just described of rapidly-changing budget situations, an ad may be placed for a faculty appointment that was originally intended to be something, and then midstream, it needs to change.

Sometimes, the language doesn't change immediately to correct. But what is important ultimately is what the contract language said. And if there are deviations from contract language in the expectations, then those should be raised, at least at first blush, to the dean or chancellor.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Sir. Second question: Is the vast amount of data collected through travel safety network that is not required for foreign travel absolutely necessary to meet legal requirements for export compliance?

**Nicholas Jones:** The Travel Safety Network has two components. We actually pulled two different elements together into the Network to make it actually more of a one stop shopping, and make it more efficient for faculty and staff who have to travel.

One of those components is export compliance. And there are certain regulatory obligations we have to ensure that if people are going out of the country and taking equipment or sensitive items with them, that we keep track of that, and that anything that is done is approved.

And so there is a certain amount of data gathering that needs to be done, questions that need to be asked, to ascertain whether the transport of that particular item is legitimate or not. In addition to the export compliance component, there is also a set of questions that is designed to understand the traveler's intentions while traveling, in terms of where they're going, where they will be staying, and so on, so that we can provide assistance as an institution, should the circumstances for them change from when they left.

And the two probably key examples are civil unrest, or a medical emergency. That information includes items that would be used only for emergency contact. Cell phones may not always work in some locations, particularly if there are problems. We try to help out the US Embassy. I think most of you are aware there is generally an expectation that if you are traveling to another country, that you check in with the US Embassy to let them know you were there.

I was just in London last week. I did not do that. I should have. We try to make that process a little bit easier by having it here, if necessary. And so in that sense, we sort of complement what the State Department does. In addition, when you register at TSA, we also encourage you to take out the HTH insurance. This provides medical assistance should something happen to you while you are traveling, up
to and including a medical evacuation, if there is determined to be necessary.

You have to register for it. It costs about $1 a day. If you need to be evacuated from either an unsafe spot or because you are gravely ill, that could end up costing about $250,000. And this is not theoretical. We have a situation right now with a graduate student who is in South America. That student became very, very ill with a serious viral infection, had to be hospitalized, and is basically being held now until somebody pays $25,000 to secure her release from the hospital.

She can't pay it. Her health insurance doesn't cover it. Her parents can't afford to pay it. The provider of the fellowship that is supporting her work is saying, “That's not our responsibility. “And so, somebody needs to pay that money. Somebody needs to write a check. Frankly, I would much rather prefer to be paying $1 a day to know that she was insured, and all of this would have been taken care of. I can also tell you from personal experience that I had the unfortunate personal circumstance of finding myself in Beijing, China during Tiananmen Square. And back then, in 1989, we had no such support structure and I had a very trying five or six day period in China, trying to get out with little or no help. And I can tell you that had a program like this being available; it would have made my life a whole lot simpler. So I can kind of personally vouch for this.

So in order to provide that sort of support, we do need to get basic information. Believe me, it's emergency contact information. We have no interest in tracking where people are going. We have no interest in giving permission, except if you are requesting to travel to countries that are on State Department Warning lists, approvals are required. And we have a process in place to approve those requests that ultimately end up with me. So I am personally involved in approving those requests. But apart from traveling to those countries on the State Department Warning list, we don't pay any attention to where people are going, what they're doing. We only gather this information should it be necessary in an emergency.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Third question: Frustration levels are quite high due to the problems of LionPATH room schedule, which far exceed the expected challenges of any enterprise system transition. Why was it implemented without any sort of initial trial run?

Nicholas Jones: Well, first, I would probably challenge a little bit the “far exceed” But I will certainly acknowledge and concede that there have been challenges in implementing. This is actually not LionPATH. This is CollegeNET. That's the scheduling system that we have that complements LionPATH, and was necessary in order to implement LionPATH because LionPATH would simply not work with the old system that we used.

Just a little bit of context. We did provide a lot of training for CollegeNET before we went live. Not everybody took that training. Some of the classes and class requests were set up incorrectly. This is on the needs side of the equation.

The classroom attributes were often incomplete or incorrect, resulting in poor matching. In addition to rolling out CollegeNET, we also at the same time implemented a new common course schedule that had been out there hiding, approved some time ago, but not rolled out until the new implementation.

It also came with no priority classroom assignment, which caused things to change that previously had not changed. No rolling of rooms. And as we were leading up to the roll out, I would say that changes to
attributes were constant, is probably the right characterization, almost on a daily basis.

Attributes required for classes and attributes associated with classrooms were being changed and altered, really as people were learning how to use the new system and enter data. So it made it very difficult to do a trial that would stick. That said, there were a lot of test runs done. But there really just wasn't time to do a full-blown trial, maybe because we tried to allow as much time as possible for the data to be uploaded as accurately as possible.

We also had a few other challenges, like we had a whole lot more requests for large classes this year, more than ever before. Not a whole lot has changed from last fall, this fall just past, to next fall. So it seemed on investigation that some of the anticipated class enrollments were being inflated a little bit, looking for larger rooms. That presented a challenge.

There were lots of attempts made to schedule nonstandard classes, which we can accommodate, but into standard time slots. And so that created incompatibility and non-scheduling. I will say that I think I reported last time that we had a 94% success rate in scheduling.

In the 6% were some pretty— the part I didn't say last time was in the 6%, were some pretty large classes that hadn't been successfully scheduled. And so this has taken quite a bit of work to figure out what the problems actually were, what was preventing those classes being scheduled, and addressing some of the resultant frustration.

In case people are not aware, there is plenty of time until August to make adjustments and tweaks. And you can contact the Registrar’s office if there is a real issue with a classroom. Just like before, you can put in a request for change, and that may require a conversation with somebody else to do a room swap.

And a lot of this has been going on, and a lot of the frustration, I think, has been addressed. I can assure you that when we do the Spring run, it will be better, based on what we have learned and the quality of the data has gone up considerably. And next fall will be much, much better. I know I sound like one of the billy goats or something. But this was nowhere in the same league as LionPATH. But this was a big and complex system implementation, and it required a lot of data from our institution, and found that there was a lot of imperfection in the data that we had.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, sir.

[Applause]

**Nicholas Jones:** And if I may say, we do have an institutional strategic plan, in case people hadn't noticed. There was a vote of concurrence at the last Board of Trustees meeting, and the plan was ultimately unanimously supported. So thank you for all of your support in getting us to that point.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. I would like to take a moment to extend my deep appreciation to President Barron and Provost Jones for their really to entertain the questions that I have received from the senators. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

[Applause]
FORENSIC BUSINESS - NONE

Chair Ansari: We now continue with our agenda, Item G, Forensic Business, none.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE

Item H, Unfinished Legislative Business, none.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Item I, Legislative Reports. We will use clickers for voting today. This system provides a precise count for each vote taken. It also allows for confidential voting and gives immediate results.

Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Raise your hand if you need a clicker.

Chair Ansari: Our first Legislative Report is from the Special Senate Committee on the Implementation of the General Education Reform, and it appears as Appendix B in the agenda.

The draft report was shared with the senators prior to the Senate Council meeting of February 23rd, and later was posted on the Senate website. I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to retired Senator John Moore, who chaired this special committee.

John's superb leadership led to the preparation of this report. Due to illness, John is unable to attend this meeting in person. Please join me in applauding John for his yeoman's effort that led to the fulfillment of the job.

[Applause]

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Senators Caroline Eckhardt and Maggie Slattery, Acting Co-chairs, and Senator Matthew Wilson, committee member, will introduce the report. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. If there are no objections, each recommendation will be discussed and voted upon separately. Are there any objections? Thank you. Hearing none, please. Dr. Eckhardt.

Caroline Eckhardt, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you, Chair Ansari. The Senate last heard from this committee in January, when John Moore brought the committee's forensic report forward to seek input on several key questions before our legislative report will be finalized.

Along with John, the three of us helped to present that forensic report in January. As you heard, John has been ill. Maggie and I have been sitting in for him to help bring the project to completion. It was nearly complete when he was taken ill. We wish him the best during his recovery. We're glad that Matthew can, again, join us today.

Our committee is not a Standing Committee, but a Special Committee appointed by Chair Ansari last June to propose how you implement the new six-credit General Education Integrative Studies requirement, with two pathways, linked and interdomain courses that the Senate passed last April.
As you'll see, we are now bringing to the Senate a detailed proposal for implementing that legislation from April 2015. While students now take coursework in each of five knowledge domains--Arts, Humanities, Health and Wellness, Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences--Integrated Studies courses will advance our students' abilities to make connections between and among knowledge domains.

A few key points to keep in mind are that integrative studies will be incorporated within the existing 30-credit baccalaureate requirement in the General Education knowledge domains. No additional credits are being added to the degree. Also, many existing courses, as well as new courses, may have the potential to become Integrative Studies courses.

Further, in recognition of the many different ways in which a university educates students, our curricular richness and diversity is one of our great strengths. We are proposing a model for implementing Integrative Studies that includes several types of flexibility.

You'll be hearing about them. It's definitely not a one-size fits all. Our legislative report today incorporates Senators' comments from the January forensic session, and many other consultations. And I'd like to thank all the members of the committee, and the many, many other faculty, staff, students, and colleagues who contributed ideas during this process.

To give an overview of what is coming, this Legislative Report, which is Appendix B in your Senate Agenda, includes seven recommendations, as briefly listed here. Thank you. I'm watching the slides carefully now. A handout is available today. There were, I think, three handouts as we came in.

This is the one that says Appendix B in the upper right-hand corner. A hand-out is available today that reprints just the recommendations themselves, without the introductory material, or the rationale for each section, or the appendices. You can follow along on the handout, or within the full report itself, if you have it.

We will be projecting part or all of each recommendation on the screen as well. Before beginning discussion of the recommendations--

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Dr. Eckhardt. I have been asked for Acting Co-chairs Eckhardt and Slattery to recognize UPUA representative, Emily Miller. Emily?

**Emily Miller, University Park Undergraduate Association:** Thank you. Emily Miller, UPUA. I just have a statement. On behalf of the University Park Undergraduate Association and the University Faculty Senate Student Caucus, I want to extend our full support of the plan presented for the implementation of the integrative studies requirement.

In our UPUA resolution, which is projected on the screen, it states that these changes will provide deeper exploration and flexibility to students, and will also expose students to a more blended experience. Additionally in our resolution, we believe that this should not be the end of a process, but merely the first step.

We are urging the Senate and the University to continue to strive for changes to General Education that will deepen the curriculum's commitment to flexibility and exploration for students. We believe these
changes point us in a direction towards doing so, but believe it is imperative that our efforts do not become stagnant. Thank you.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Emily.

**Caroline Eckhardt:** Thank you, Emily. We'll now consider each of the seven recommendations.

**Margaret Slattery, College of Engineering:** We'd like to begin discussion of the first recommendation. This recommendation proposes updated domain and foundation of criteria. The foundations were formerly called skills. We reviewed the foundations and domain criteria at this point in time so that we could-- this was critical, so that we could do course proposals and reviews, and do it only one time.

So we have new learning objectives. This would be new domain criteria to go along with them. This streamlines the review process for Integrative Studies courses. And in order to invite broad input to these revisions, the report incorporates results from a survey of the Senate, faculty, and administrators that the committee undertook last October.

This survey showed a very high level of agreement with the proposed revision, but also some good suggestions for further adjusting words, particular words. And our committee has included these suggestions. The full report includes summary data from the October survey in Attachment 3 which is page 22 of Appendix B. There are several levels of this in the agenda and a comparison of the existing and proposed text is in Attachment 4. On the slide behind me is an excerpt of the beginning part of the recommendation. But on your handout, you have the full text of the entire recommendation. It's actually several pages long. On behalf of the committee, I'd like to open the floor for discussion on Recommendation 1.

**Chair Ansari:** The floor is now open for discussion of Recommendation 1. Is there discussion? Are we ready to vote? Is there discussion? OK. Please.

**Carolyn Mahan, Altoona:** Mahan from Altoona. I'm not sure if this is out of order. But is this where we will discuss the actual wording? Or do you just want to vote on the wording as it is for Recommendation 1?

**Chair Ansari:** We are voting on the recommendation that is in Appendix B. The entire recommendation one. Yes.

**Carolyn Mahan:** OK. I would like to request a word change.

**Chair Ansari:** OK.

**Carolyn Mahan:** It may sound minor, but it's on page four under the GN recommendations.

**Chair Ansari:** You'll have to make a motion to make that change.

**Carolyn Mahan:** OK. I'd like to make a motion.

**Chair Ansari:** Please, go ahead.
Carolyn Mahan: To change on page four, under Natural Sciences, to change the word “beauty” under the first bullet point under Natural Sciences to the word “function”.

Chair Ansari: OK. Nickie, did you get that motion? Could you repeat it slowly one more time so that we can write it down, please?

Carolyn Mahan: Sure. Bullet number one under the Natural Sciences, right now, it reads "encounter the order, diversity, and beauty of nature." I propose that we change the word “beauty” to “function”.

Mohamad A. Ansari: I think we have it. Laura, do we have it? Yeah. OK. Is there a second to this motion? OK. We have a second. Let me show the motion, then we're going to discuss the motion. Just a second, please. Can you place that on the document camera, please?

Yeah. OK. So the motion is to-- is that to insert or replace?

Caroline Mahan: Replace.

Chair Ansari: To replace the word that is circled and replace it with “function”. The motion has been made and is seconded, and we'll now open for discussion of the motion. John? Thank you, Jim. Thank you, Laura.

John A Nousek, College of Science: Hello. Nousek, College of Science. I understand what the term “beauty of nature” means. The phrasing “function of nature” doesn't mean anything to me, as a scientist. And I don't understand what the purpose is of the change, because are you actually trying to get that we should study how nature functions? But function of nature in that phrasing does not express-- you know, that doesn't say, how does nature function? Well, it doesn't mean anything. It's a nonsense phrase, as constituted that way.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, John. I have a question from Peter, and then Michael.

Peter Dendle, Mont Alto: Yeah, mine was basically the same point. It's not that it's not meaningful. The function of nature means what it's used for, implies some higher, I think, agency. So maybe the functioning of nature, or some other clearer phrase.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Peter.

Michael Bérubé, College of Liberal Arts: Bérubé, Liberal Arts. I served on this committee since July. I just want to point out that regardless of what you may feel about function, beauty, whatever words for nature. There was a time for this. It was about three months ago, when we sent around the domain descriptions and asked for input. If we get into wordsmithing this thing at this stage, we are here till midnight. I promise you.

[Applause]
Chair Ansari: Are there other discussions of this amendment? You need to be recognized, please. Wait for the microphone. Be recognized.

Michael J. Krajsa, Lehigh Valley: Krajsa, I call the question.

Chair Ansari: Is there a second? All in favor of calling the question, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed nay? Motion carries. Would you like voice vote on the amendment, or would you like the clicker? Voice vote? OK. All in favor of approving the amendment, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Ansari: Opposed, Nay.

Chair Ansari: I believe the nays have it. Am I correct? All right. Thank you. The motion has been defeated. I am sorry. We go back to the discussion of the Recommendation number 1; Is there any other discussion on Recommendation number one? Hearing none, are we ready to vote?

Would you like-- I guess I have to do this, because we have colleagues on Mediasite, so I need to put it on using the Clickers. Nickie, could you please start the clock? We are voting to approve Recommendation 1, as presented in Appendix B.

To accept, press A, reject press B. Yes, thank you. If you need clickers, please raise your hand. I need one here.

I'm waiting to receive the report from Anna from Mediasite.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 11 accept.

Chair Ansari: OK. That's the total. OK. Congratulations. Motion carries. The floor is now open for Recommendation number 2.

Matthew T. Wilson, Harrisburg: We now turn to Recommendation number 2. Like the other two recommendations in this section of the report, Recommendation 2 addresses general concepts for the Integrative Studies, and thus serves as a basis for the more detailed recommendations that will follow below.

In this case, the recommendation is short, so the full text is on the screen, I hope, as well as being in your handout and in your Senate agenda. Last spring's Legislative Report established two pathways to fulfill the six-credit Integrative Studies baccalaureate degree requirement. And also, left the door open for additional pathways, as Emily said in her remarks, once we've been able to assess the success of the two that were initially approved.

In the present proposal, each pathway is designed to ensure that students integrate knowledge across two
knowledge domains. Recommendation 2 recognizes the importance of having more than one pathway, and states that we are starting with two pathways, but others may be approved in the future.

Recommendation 2 also states that student choices must include two knowledge domains aims, and that students have the flexibility to choose which pathway to follow. The legislation also allows students flexibility in the timing to complete this requirement.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Discussions on Recommendation number 2? Hearing none, are we ready to vote? OK, Nickie, could you please start the clock?

To accept, please press A, to reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: The poll everywhere, I have 11 accept.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations, it carries. We are now open for discussion on Recommendation number 3. Matthew?

Matthew T. Wilson: Recommendation number 3 is necessary in order to recognize that there will be a need for exceptions, especially as students move from location to location, or want to use transfer or advanced standing credits, or to take advantage of opportunities, such as education abroad.

Recommendation 3 states that we will rely upon our existing procedures for granting exemptions. Because our existing procedures can differ somewhat from one college to another, the recommendation does not identify specific offices or committees, and we are not proposing a new set of exemption procedures, or asking anyone to change their exemption procedures.

Instead, we are just stating that exemptions will sometimes be needed. And if so, existing procedures will be drawn upon to consider such requests.

Chair Ansari: We're discussing Recommendation number 3. Discussion? We're ready to vote. Is that correct? Thank you. Is there a question? OK. Arthur?

Arthur Berg: Arthur Berg, Hershey. Can I propose we vote on everything at once?

Chair Ansari: No. We already decided that we go one by one. You should have made your objection at that time. Any discussions on number 3? Nickie, please start the clock.

To accept, please press A. to reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere I have 12 accept.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Congratulations. It is passed. Recommendation 4 is now open for discussion. Matthew?

Matthew T. Wilson: Recommendation 4 implements a concept that was implied in last spring's legislative report. Integrative Studies will be an important component of General Education, but should not wholly replace courses that provide a sustained focus on a single knowledge domain.

Thus Recommendation 4 states that students will always take at least three credits of coursework wholly
within each of the five knowledge domains. These courses are called single domain courses, and that's what almost all of our knowledge domain courses have been so far.

Putting together the provisions in this present proposal with the existing substitutions that are already built into General Education, students will have a good deal of flexibility. But as much as we want to emphasize flexibility, recommendation four makes clear that combining various forms of flexibility and substitutions cannot be construed as a way around taking at least one single domain course in each knowledge domain.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. We are open for discussion. Yes, please? Please raise your hand to get the microphone. Yes.

Lisa L. Posey, Business: I feel like this was addressed before, but--

Chair Ansari: Would please introduce yourself and unit?

Lisa L. Posey: Lisa Posey, Business. College of Business. The GHW, if it has to be single domain, it can't be included in interdomain then? If there has to be a single domain in GHW, and there are not that many credits, then it can't be an interdomain course with GHW? Or can it--

Caroline Eckhardt: An individual course is either single domain or interdomain. It can't be both at the same time. In the GHW category, there would be the three credits that would be just GHW. However, GHW could also participate in interdomain courses, and we'll be coming to those shortly.

Lisa L. Posey, Business: So you'd have to take two, if you wanted to-- if you took an interdomain in GHW, you'd also have to take a single domain.

Margaret Slattery: Yes. But one of the flexibilities that are provided when you create an interdomain course is that you free up credits for gen ed electives. So it becomes an acceptable thing.

Lisa L. Posey, Business: OK. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Lisa. Other questions or discussions? Yes?

William Lasher, Behrend: Lasher, Behrend. This is a point of clarification. I missed this in the last one. I see GQ is not listed here, so that's not an option for interdomain. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Other questions? OK. Nickie, please start the clock. We are voting on Recommendation number 4.

To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere I have 11 accept.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Congratulations. It passes. We're now opening Recommendation number 5. Carrie, would you like to make comments?

Caroline Eckhardt: After that set of general principles for Integrative Studies courses, we wish to begin
discussions of the two pathways, Linked Courses and interdomain courses, starting with the Linked
Courses pathway. Because Recommendation 5, like Recommendation 1 at the start of our report, is too
long to fully project on the screen, we are displaying-- Nickie, could you display slide eight, please?

Thank you. We are displaying just the beginning of this recommendation. The rest can be found on pages
six to seven of today's handout, and on pages 10 to 11, within Appendix B of your full Senate Agenda.
As a pathway approved to meet the Integrative Studies requirement, linked courses are matched or paired
courses-- paired implies just two, but there can be more than two, as I'll mention in just a moment-- that
address related subject matter, while each provides a sustained focus on its own knowledge domain.

Each is approved for one knowledge domain. These are what we are calling single domain courses, like
almost all of our knowledge domain courses. Now, however, two or more of these courses are
purposefully linked together, so that students will take six credits with a linkage, baccalaureate, and
practice the integration of knowledge across two domains.

Our committee heard about projects of this sort that are already underway, such as a campus-based
cluster of courses that all address the same international region. One other potential example, mentioned
among others on page 30 within Appendix B, is existing adventure literature series of courses, which
links English literature, Humanities, with Kinesiology, Health and Wellness, course work.

We anticipate that many more courses, new or existing, can be purposefully brought together in various
ways. Multiple courses can be included in a linkage, not just two. Having more than two, in fact, will
help provide flexibility for students. Flexibility is also available because linkages can be tailored to local
priorities, or sections can be linked temporarily rather than permanently, just as now, some sections of
courses, but not all, might be designated honors.

Recommendation 5 explains what will be requested in a course proposal for linked courses, as well as
providing details for this new category of course designation.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. We have received a motion from Senator Mary Beth Williams. I'll have Larry
Backer read that motion.

Larry Backer: All right. This is a motion that is put forward by Mary Beth Williams. And she's asked us
to read the following statement, which I will read now.

"I would like to express my strong support for this legislation, and commend you on the hard work that
you have done to bring to Senate an implementation plan of the April 2015 legislation. This Legislative
Report aligns well with that prior legislation, which this body enthusiastically endorsed, and I expect
we'll do so again today.

The new Integrative Studies component explicitly builds within the General Education curriculum
connections between knowledge domains, providing a rich learning opportunity for our students. In
Integrative Study courses, faculty will also have the opportunity to closely collaborate with faculty from
other knowledge domains to integrate their courses and course materials to ensure that the topics are
interwoven in meaningful and rigorous ways.

When students select the linked courses sequence pathway, in which students take two different courses,
to ensure faculty have that opportunity to work together to integrate their courses and to create meaningful connections, there is an essential time element. If, for example, for a pair of courses approved for the linked pathway, a student was to take one course in their second year, and the second course in their fourth, there will be little way to ensure faculty would have the ability, interest, or opportunity to closely align course materials over years, or even a few semesters.

As such, I would like to make a motion. Here's the motion. I move to amend Recommendation 5 with the principle that linked courses must be taken concurrently or in sequence as below, which is indicated in red." Shall I read all of B, or shall I just read the red?

Chair Ansari: Just please read part C.

Larry Backer: All right. For the new part C, linked courses must be taken concurrently or in sequence to ensure faculty collaboration in the design and integration of course materials." That's the motion.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Larry. I need a second. All right. The motion has been made, and it's been seconded. Is now open for discussion. Carrie, would you like to make a comment on the motion? Would you like to comment before I open it?

Caroline Eckhardt: Yes, I would like to comment. And I would also like, if possible, our student committee representative, Emily Miller, to comment if she would like to. Let me say first that the committee looked at this again and again. And the committee recognized that there may be many circumstances in which the ideal is for students to take their two linked courses in the same semester, or perhaps in consecutive semesters.

The committee also recognized that there might be other circumstances in which that's not the case. We heard some input that relates to the concept of scaffolding learning-- in other words, beginning at one point in time and level, and then returning to topics at a later point in time and level-- as being also an advantageous way to integrate learning. You revisit something that you had looked at earlier.

We tried to be sensitive to the overall guiding principle that I think that we primarily endorsed earlier, that in a University this complicated, diverse, and the nature of our students, our locations, the sizes of our different faculty groups, that the less rigid Integrative Studies is, the better.

That is not at all to prevent particular clusters of courses from operating simultaneously, or in immediate sequence. But the legislation as written also gives other circumstances a possibility of leading to linked courses that are not tied to that one form of implementation.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Are there any discussions of this amendment? Pat?

Patricia M. Hinchey, Worthington Scranton: Hinchey, Worthington Scranton. As a member of the implementation committee, I would extend what Carrie said. It's a topic that we revisited again, and again, and again, and again, and again, and again. We came back to this many, many times.

I personally am sympathetic to the point that it seems most sensible for the courses to be in sequence or simultaneous. However, as Carrie said, we kept coming back to, well; people would imagine these possibilities that seem to make sense. Where the whole thing settled for me was that we have quality
control, which I think this attends to, in the Curricular Affairs Committee.

In order for, say, a first semester and an eighth semester linkage to work, a persuasive proposal has to be put together and pass muster with Curricular Affairs. So rather than pronounce to the world, you may not do this ever, we thought it made more sense to say, we think it's going to go this way. We think probably, it's going to be simultaneous, or sequential. But if somebody can imagine a possibility and make it work and persuade Curricular Affairs it has quality, who are we to say no to some possibility we haven't imagined yet? So I would argue against the motion and for the original wording.

**Margaret Slattery:** In light of Pat's comment, I'd like to bring your attention to Recommendation 5, Part F, Part little three, or little i, which is the criteria that Curricular Affairs you would use where they would have to make that, as Pat phrased it, persuasive argument.

**Chair Ansari:** Are there other discussions of this amendment? Yes, please. Matthew?

**Chair Ansari:** And I think that-- I understand what you're proposing. But we wanted to err on the side of maximum flexibility for the students over time. That's one of the principles that guided us as we were working on these proposals, is flexibility for students.

**Chair Ansari:** Are there any other discussions of this amendment? OK. So we're going to start the clock for this, please. We're voting on this amendment, which is on the screen, Part C. To approve this amendment, please press A. To reject, please press B.

**Anna F. Butler:** On Poll Everywhere, I have eight accept and four reject.

**Chair Ansari:** OK. The motion has been rejected. We go back to Recommendation number 5 without any changes. Go ahead, please. Over here, Cindy. We're discussing Recommendation number 5.

**Kim Nelson, College of Science:** Kim Nelson, College of Science. Again, I want to reiterate my full support for this. I like the fact that your recommendations are offering full flexibility to students. However, I find Part E lacks flexibility for faculty implementation of this plan.

It requires Senate committee approval for both single course offerings and multi-year offerings. I don't know about you, but I do not want to put forth a full Senate proposal for a new course in collaboration with another faculty in a completely different college as an experiment with the thinking of running it once as a time commitment towards trying to do one of these new integrative.

I think single course offerings should potentially be allowed to run like all single course offerings at the level of the approval of the units.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. Are there discussions?

**Margaret Slattery:** I'd like to add that there was a special consideration to this idea of special topics courses being included in the integrative studies. Currently, gen ed designations are not given to Special Topics courses, and we did not want to have that as an option, because we value the experiment that goes on in special topics.
And I think that actually is part of the benefit, where students would gain from Integrative Studies. We've considered this. We've tried to put checks in place by having a fast-tracking-- in recommendation seven, a special committee that will review proposals year-long, rather than with the summer break of the Senate. And it would not be a full proposal. It would be just a looking at the integrative part of the course to satisfy this part of general education.

Chair Ansari: Other discussions? Ah, yes. Dawn?

Kim Nelson: I agree with what you said. I think they need Senate approval. But my question is about-- if you're going to do a single time course to just see how well it's working, then amount of time it takes to get through a Senate proposal through general education is long. And it is very difficult for faculty.

So my question is, in that group that's going to be looking at these, will there be an expedited process for the single time courses that's different from the permanent ones?

Margaret Slattery: Yeah. So Special Topics courses still would not have to appear on the Senate Curriculum Report. So therefore, the timeline and many of the perceived roadblocks of Curricular Affairs would not apply to these courses. To the single special topics courses.

Chair Ansari: Other discussions; Are we ready to vote? Nickie, please start the clock. We are voting on Recommendation number 5, which has not been changed.

To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept, and one reject.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. Motion carries. We're opening Recommendation 6 for discussion.

Margaret Slattery: This recommendation is on interdomain courses. As before, the screen shows the first part of the recommendation, hopefully. And the rest of the text is on pages seven and eight of the handout, or pages 12 to 13 within the appendix.

As a pathway, this was approved to meet the Integrative Studies requirement. And each interdomain course-- each demonstrate how two knowledge domains speak to one another, and how knowledge in one domain relates to knowledge in another.

Interdomain courses are each approved for two knowledge domains-- would be-- I should have said would be approved for two knowledge domains, and demonstrate consistently how knowledge is integrated across these two domains.

This recommendation also explains, would be requested in a course proposal for an interdomain course, and provides details for this new category of course designation. I'd like to add that the same strategy approach to the special topics courses that was described for linked courses would apply here. The floor is open for discussion.

Esther S. Prins: Prins, Education. This is more of a procedural question. Is there a chance to make other comments on this document aside from the recommendations?

Chair Ansari: No, I'm sorry. We're just voting on each recommendation one by one.
Esther S. Prins: OK, thanks.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other discussion? Mediasite. OK. Go ahead, Anna, please.

Anna F. Butler: This comment is from Ira Saltz, who is from Shenango. "I am concerned that if all integrative studies course requests must be approved across the University, that many units will not have a sufficient number of integrative study courses to fulfill the needs of students in those units' campuses.

I still do not understand why we cannot have, for example, a History 155 that is integrative at the campus proposing this if it meets the requirements, and have a History 155 that is not if other campuses or units that do not want History 155 to be integrative.

And please let us not use limitations within LionPATH as our excuse not to do this. Faculty teach courses in different ways. It is imperative to review all requests on an individual basis-- i.e., to grant acceptance of integrative course proposals, even if not all faculty teaching that course agree. Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Anna.

Go ahead. Please, respond.

Caroline Eckhardt: I completely understand those concerns. And in fact earlier, when we were talking about flexibility-- I mean, I have been clear about this, but it's possible for individual sections of a course at a local location-- sorry, not local location. Suited to local circumstances, and priorities, and student needs, to carry an Integrative Studies designation, where elsewhere, the same course might not. Or even at one location, certain sections might and others not, with the existing way that an H can be added for honors courses perhaps providing some precedent.

I understand H's may be gone if that's not technically a current course attribute. But the concept is that it is not binding on everybody teaching every section of the course everywhere, if a particular section of a course somewhere becomes designated for integrative studies.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other questions?

Margaret Slattery: But I would like to add to that that a course needs to be taught as it is proposed. And so, if there's a very significant change in content, that would be a problem. And that would be a Special Topics course. That could be a different version of course.

So I think that question lends itself more closely with the linked courses than perhaps interdomain courses, where you would expect about half of the content to represent each domain. And therefore, if you were to change the course to not represent one of those domains, you would be changing more than half the course content.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Maggie. Matthew?
Matthew T. Wilson: Well, I'd just like to remind everybody that a course is a course. A course as a university course. And so what's going to happen is that people will develop courses at particular locations with this designation, and then those courses will become available university-wide.

So then what's going to happen over time is that we're going to have a rich array of both linked and of Integrative Studies courses.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other questions or comments? OK. Nickie, could you please start the clock? We are voting on Recommendation number 6. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

We have a full agenda, and I really appreciate your presence here until we conclude our business. Thank you. They asked me to project a time that we end, and I could not do that.

[Laughter]

So please, I would appreciate it if you could stay, please stay until we conclude our business today. The folks have worked very hard to bring these reports to your attention.

Anna F. Butler: Sorry. We're having some trouble with connection here. If you could just wait just a couple of minutes?

Chair Ansari: Of course. Please take the time to relax. Stretch.

[Laughter]

But please come back when you go out.

Anna F. Butler: OK. I've just now put the vote out there for Poll Everywhere. It'll just be a minute or two.

Chair Ansari: Sure. Take your time, please, Anna.

Anna F. Butler: Now, on Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept.

Chair Ansari: OK. Thank you, OK. We have lost it, so we have to vote again. Yeah. Please vote again. I know some people left, but what can we do? We have to do it. So please press A for acceptance and B for rejection.

Nickie, did you start the clock? OK. This happens, so. I appreciate your cooperation. Thank you very much. Now, Mr. Parliamentarian, are we going to accept the Mediasite vote? Or should they do it again? It is going to be his call. Let me see what he says.

Larry Backer: Oh, I'm just going to be mean. Because two weeks from now I don't want someone coming back to me and saying, oh, there's this technical issue about the voting. So do it again.

Chair Ansari: Please ask the folks on Mediasite to vote again, please.
Anna F. Butler: OK. On Poll Everywhere, they have the option of removing their vote and putting it back, or anything they want to do. So it's still out there posted, so whatever they're voting on is--

Larry: Backer: In that case, we can consider it an open ballot. And they're voting now.

Anna F. Butler: OK.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. OK. Congratulations. The motion carries. We're now opening Recommendation number 7. Maggie?

Margaret Slattery: To accommodate the highly dynamic nature of our university and the faculties' academic pursuits, the Integrative Studies course review process will be done every five years, as we've discussed.

In order to help ensure the timely action on proposals, a new Senate Curricular Affairs Subcommittee to meet year-round should be established. And additionally, Integrative Studies courses depend on factors such as faculty collaboration, and administrative support. We've also heard that from comments today.

Therefore, to monitor currency and rigor, these courses will need to be reviewed periodically. I'd like to open the floor for discussion on Recommendation 7.

Chair Ansari: Questions or comments? Jamie?

Jamie Myers, Education: Myers, Education. Just a technical issue. As a standing Subcommittee of Curricular Affairs, it would need to be recommended by the Committee on Committees and Rules. And that could follow up at a later time?

Chair Ansari: That's correct. Yes.

Margaret Slattery: Yes, actually legislation's been drafted. And I've been in discussions with Pat Hinchey.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other questions or comments? Hearing none, Nickie, could you start the clock please? To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept.

Mohamad A. Ansari: Thank you, congratulations. Thank you, Carrie, and Maggie, and Matthew. I want to extend my special thanks to the members of the special committee for their hard work since last June that led to the development of these recommendations. Thank you, Maggie and everybody else. Matthew, Carrie.

[Applause]

Chair Ansari: And my special thanks to all of you for your cooperation. Thank you very much. We have two legislative reports from Curricular Affairs. The first appears as Appendix C. Committee Chair
Maggie Slattery and Committee Member Matthew Wilson will make some comments and respond to questions. This report is brought to the floor by the committee and needs no second.

If there are no objections, each recommendation will be discussed and voted upon separately. Are there any objections? Hearing none, Maggie, please go ahead.

**Margaret Slattery:** So this economic year, Chair Ansari charged Curricular Affairs with implementing the new learning objectives for General Education that we approved last April. There are four recommendations in this report. And the first recommendation describes the information that will be required as part of course proposals that request a general education designation.

The amount of information requested is less than previously requested. And these questions are directed at the specific learning objectives to be addressed in each course. I'd like to answer any questions about recommendation one.

**Chair Ansari:** We're open to discuss Recommendation number 1. Peter?

**Peter Dendale:** Hi, thanks. Yeah, this is just the most minor kind of typo fixing stuff, if we could bring it up on the screen.

**Chair Ansari:** Nickie, could you bring up Recommendation 1, please, on the screen?

**Peter Dendale:** Sorry. I just can't sleep at night if this sort of stuff goes by.

**Chair Ansari:** Do you have the report? Peter, can you make your comment. Let's see what it is. Because-

**Peter Dendale:** It'll be easier if we could look at-- thank you. There it is. I'm looking at-- OK, number one of the seven General Education learning objectives. When the s is in parentheses, it implies one or more. I think it would disambiguate it if we remove the parentheses in learning objectives there, as well as in item three.

And additionally-- once again back up to number one, which of the seven objectives, a minimum of two learning objectives-- I would like to see an S added at the end of objective.

**Chair Ansari:** Is this one editorial? You're making an editorial change? OK. It's that OK with Maggie and Matthew?

**Margaret Slattery:** Yes.

**Chair Ansari:** Is it OK with everyone?

**All:** Yes.

**Chair Ansari:** All right. Consider it done. Other questions or comments? Are we ready to vote recommendation number one? Please start the clock, Nickie. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.
Anna F. Butler: Poll Everywhere, I have nine accept.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. Motion carries. Recommendation number 2, Maggie.

Margaret Slattery: The second recommendation is to highlight the general education learning objectives and make them more obvious and explicit by requiring that they be included on syllabi.

Chair Ansari: Discussion?

Margaret Slattery: No discussion.


Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have seven accept and one reject.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. The motion carries. We now go to Recommendation number 3 Maggie?

Margaret Slattery: The third recommendation is to align current courses with the new learning objectives. This is absolutely essential to implementing what was approved last spring. I fully understand that the process of reviewing all gen ed course is daunting.

This is something that we as a university have done successfully in the past, and Curricular Affairs has already been in discussions as to how to streamline the process using ad hoc committees, and that it will occur over a period of time. Additionally, with the recent approval-- thank you very much-- of the new foundations and domain criteria, we can accomplish realignment for both of those at the same time. Any discussion on Recommendation 3?

Chair Ansari: Discussion on Recommendation 3? Questions or comments? Oh, Michael. I'm sorry, Dawn.

Dawn G. Blasko, Behrend: Blasko, Behrend. Can you just tell us a little bit around how you're thinking about doing this? Is this going to involve faculty in the disciplines? Is it going to be done within Curricular Affairs? Obviously, it's important but it is going to be a big project.

Margaret Slattery: Right. So this has been considered and discussed from before my time as chair this year by Judy Ozment, and then subsequently by myself this year. We envision expanding or-- Judy's word is deputizing-- additional people to expand the committee to look at courses. But it does need to happen through the Senate.

And I've also already discussed with Dan some support in terms of getting proposals into the computer system, so that departments who are doing the heavy lifting of getting an agreement across disciplinary communities aren't blockaded by paperwork, essentially. That was not enough of an answer for you, Dawn.

Matthew T. Wilson: And also, this will obviously need to take place over a couple of years. We're not
going to say to everybody, OK, next year, you have to have this done. That's not possible, given the size of the university.

Chair Ansari: Other questions? Are we ready to vote? [Please start the clock. We are voting on Recommendation number 3. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations, it carries. We now open to recommendation number four. Maggie?

Margaret Slattery: The fourth recommendation will put in place rolling review of General Education courses to address curricular drift and keep information for assessment current. Any discussion on Recommendations 4?

Chair Ansari: Questions or comments on Recommendation number 4? Do we have any questions? David?

David M. Babb, Earth and Mineral Science: David Babb, Earth and Mineral Science. I don't know. We don't look at other courses every five years. So I don't quite understand. I mean, we have kind of an honor system that we won't drift courses over the years. I know that may or may not be realistic. But I think this is an onerous one. I would encourage a no on this one.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, David. Other questions or comments? Dawn? In the front row, Dawn. Dawn has a question.

Dawn Blasko: I guess I'm just confused about why we would do this again in five years. If it takes three years to align them to the new standards, and then two years later, we start over and do them all again to the same standards, that to me just seems like the definition of crazy.

I mean, I appreciate-- I really support everything you do. And I'm not trying to be a pain. But I just am not seeing what added value there is to this in terms of the amount of work it's going to take for you and for everyone.

Margaret Slattery: So I appreciate those comments. I have to admit this is something that I did not really feel super enthusiastic about standing here and standing in front of everybody saying. Because I know everybody sees it as an onerous process.

But it is something that I feel strongly about. Because as we've gone through the gen ed reform process discussion, we've seen what happens when there isn't continual review of the courses. You're right. We don't review courses, all the other courses, every five years. But there are other processes in place that keep some of those courses in check.

Many of our majors are accredited in other ways. We are continually thinking about the assessment of our programs. General Education, as a program, as a whole, that impacts every single student at Penn State is distinct and different.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other questions or comments? Matthew?
Matthew T. Wilson: And I think too that the presupposition is that we know what's going on in our major courses. If our major courses aren't teaching what they're supposed to be teaching, we're going to hear it. Nobody has ever paid any attention to Gen Ed.

And I think one of the things that we've kept in mind as we've been developing this is that we're under Middle States, telling us that we need to assess Gen Ed. And I think that one of the ways that we can say that we're going to be assessing Gen Ed is that if we have this five-year rolling review, then what we're going to be doing is making sure the courses are doing what they're doing, and that we're going to be addressing curricular drift.

I'd also say to your question, Dawn, that I don't think that we're going to do the three-year, and then start two years later. I would say that probably what we're going to do is once the three-year implementation period is over, then we do the five-year.

Dawn G. Blasko: [Inaudible]

Chair Ansari: Cindy, could you give the mic to Dawn, please.

Dawn G. Blasko: Just for the people on Mediasite, what I said was that even if you wait until you're completely done and then start your five-year clock, then at that point, once you start doing your re-review, if you have the same number of courses or more-- because now we might be developing new ones, right-- then you end up having to, if you split it up into three years, because you're basically saying you're doing the same process.

I'm not saying that you shouldn't do some review, or check for curricular integrity, and so on. But I'm not sure the curricular review process we have right now is really built for that. I think there are probably other techniques to assess whether or not we're doing what we think we're doing. That's what I'm saying.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. We have a question from Mediasite. First, let me recognize that. Ann, would you read the question, please?

Anna F. Butler: OK. It's a comment and a question from Ira Saltz from Shenango. "This is a very daunting task. Is the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee on-board with us?"

Margaret Slattery: You have two Curricular Affairs members standing here.

Chair Ansari: Cortney, we have a question over there. Yes?

Jennifer Silko, Harrisburg: Jennifer from Harrisburg. I agree with what you've been saying. I agree with the opposition that the resources could be onerous. And kind of adding to that, my question is-- I'm going to have to give an example to pose the question.

I teach geology classes at Harrisburg. There's no geology department there. So I'm assuming that the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences would lead the way as far as getting these classes re-certified. But then how do we make sure that all of those re-certifications, rechecking, trickles out to the rest of the Commonwealth Campuses? It kind of just seems to make the problem more complex. Thank you.
Matthew T. Wilson: And coming from Harrisburg myself, I'm aware of that problem. And what we do is we use the regular curricular consultation process. And so, what we don't want is somebody at one location saying we're re-certifying this, and there is no input from anybody else. So we'd use the same process that we use right now.

Chair Ansari: Go ahead, please.

Dawn G. Blasko: I guess I'm going to play the cynic. Right? Standing up. What happens in the classroom may be completely different than what happens on a written document. And the real evaluation and assessment should be at the classroom level, because that's what the students are actually getting. So is this a process that's actually going to get us the data that we really want-- i.e. students and student learning?

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Meg? Katie?

Margaret G. Meloy, Smeal College of Business: Meloy, Smeal College of Business. I have a question. What proportion of our Gen Ed classes are being taught by fixed term faculty?

Margaret Slattery: A large number.

Margaret G. Meloy: And so it makes sense for me to say we've probably, given that there's going to be a lot more turnover in the teaching of those classes, it probably makes more sense to do a review of them every five years as outlined in the recommendation.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Meg.

Margaret Slattery: I'd like to address Kim's point about assessment. And I absolutely agree with her. I expect that you'll see a report from the special committee on gen ed assessment in April. And there are multiple levels to assessing. And I absolutely agree that we have to get at student learning. And that is part of the intention of Gen Ed assessment. But there are other parts of it too, of what is being offered to students, what is being available to students.

Chair Ansari: Other questions or comments? Are we ready to vote? Please start the clock. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have seven accept and two reject.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations, recommendation carries. Thank you, Maggie, and thank you, Matthew.

[Applause]

We have one report from Curricular Affairs, Undergrad Education, Admissions, Records Scheduling, and Student Aid.

Chair Ansari: OK. Well, all right. Let me just repeat that we have one from Curricular Affairs that appears as Appendix D, Policy 42-10, Course Uniformity. Maggie? Thank you.
Margaret Slattery: So first, I'd like to thank Roger Egolf for a comment he made at the Chairs and Officers Meeting in January, which spurred me to write this. And my committee was very excited to put this report together.

But this report is intended to formalize what is commonly known as the 80-20 rule. And students need assurance that the courses that they take will, at the minimum, satisfy the prerequisite content and skills needed for subsequent courses and requirements for their academic major.

All of this is balanced with the necessary flexibility that we provide instructors—flexibility to various pedagogical styles, delivery modes, instruction styles, and things like that. So this is just to codify what is commonly referred to and referenced in many Senate documents as the 80-20 rule. Open for discussion.

Chair Ansari: All right. Any discussion on 42-10, Appendix D? Are we ready to vote? OK. Nickie, could you please start the clock? To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept and one reject.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. Thank you, Maggie. We have one report from Curricular Affairs Undergrad Education, and Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. It appears as Appendix E. Curricular Affairs Committee Chair Maggie Slattery, Undergrad Ed Vice chair Ann Taylor, and ARSSA Chair Michel Haigh will respond to questions.

Margaret Slattery: You're not done with me yet. This report has brought approval from three Senate committees, and is the result of work that started over two years ago with an ad hoc committee in collaboration with the Office of Undergraduate Education.

The title necessarily references the current policy on minors, but this report does not change our minor policy. This creates policy on certificates that has never previously existed, but is needed as the numbers of certificates grows, and various types of credentials become more common. You can expect more updates on minors in April.

Chair Ansari: Are there discussions? Hearing none, Nickie, please start the clock. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Margaret G. Meloy: Sorry. Meloy. Smeal. Can we change the timers so that the poll ends faster?

Chair Ansari: Yes, we could. Thank you, Meg. We're going to change it. Thank you. Can you reduce by 15 seconds, please?

Anna F. Butler: On this vote on Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept.

Chair Ansari: OK. Thank you. Congratulations. We have one report from Undergraduate Education and Curricular Affairs that appears as Appendix F. UE Committee Vice Chair Ann Taylor and Curricular Affairs Chair Maggie Slattery, will respond to questions. Are there any discussions?

All right. Ready to vote? We're changing the clock. It probably takes more than a minute to change the
clock now. [Laughter]

We're good. OK. To accept-- hold on. Please start the clock. Yes. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B. We reduced the clock, Meg by 15 seconds.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. Thank you very much. We have one report from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid that appears as Appendix G. Committee chair Michel Haigh will respond to questions. Michel?

Michel M. Haigh: Are there any questions?

Chair Ansari: Discussion? Questions? I guess you're tired, so you would like to vote. Please start the clock. I don't blame you. I've been standing here too. I guess I'm tired too. But my wife is here. She's here, and she gives me energy from a distance.

[Laughter]

Thank you very much. You have been wonderful.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have eight accept.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Congratulations, Michel. We have three legislative reports from Committees and Rules. The first of these three appears in Appendix H. This revision to the Bylaws was presented at the January 26 meeting. It will be discussed and voted on today. Committee Chair Patricia Hinchey will respond to questions. Are there any questions? Appendix H. We brought this on in January. We vote and discuss it today. Amendment to the Bylaws.

I guess there are no questions. Please start the clock. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Mark Casteel: Simple or 2/3 majority?

Chair Ansari: No. I don't know. Let me ask the Parliamentarian. Would you check? Double check. Good question, Mark. We'll go check

Chair Ansari: Yeah. It's been a long day. So we'll find out. Great question. Thank you.

Patricia Hinchey: This is a wonderful climate to be presenting legislation in, I have to say.

Chair Ansari: We'll check. Our parliamentarian is checking. Thank you. Truth is, you're right. We need 2/3 majority. Thank you.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have 10 accept.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. It passes by 2/3 majority. The next report from Committees and Rules appears in Appendix I. Pat will respond to questions. Are there any questions?
No questions. Please start the clock. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

**Anna F. Butler:** Poll Everywhere, I have eight accept.

**Chair Ansari:** Congratulations. Motion carries. The final report is from Committees and Rules. It appears as Appendix J in the agenda. Pat will respond to questions. Are there any questions? Hearing none, Nickie, please start the clock. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B. We are voting on Appendix J.

**Anna F. Butler:** Poll Everywhere, I have nine accept.

**Mohamad A. Ansari:** Thank you. Let's give a big hand to all the presenters so far. Thank you very much. Thank you.

[Applause]

---

**ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS**

**Chair Ansari:** And also, thank you for your patience, and thank you for being here. Item J, Advisory/Consultative Reports. We have four Advisory/Consultative reports today. The first report is from Faculty Affairs, and Intra-University Relations and appears as Appendix K in the agenda.

Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Michael Bérubé and Vice Chair Rosemarie Petrilla will respond to questions. Are there any questions? This is a revision to HR 21.

Michael Bérubé: I just want to say that my wife is not here.

[Laughter]

And neither is my 24-year-old young man with Down Syndrome, who's waiting in the Institute for the Arts and Humanities wondering if I'll ever appear. But this is important. And if you do have questions, please.

**Chair Ansari:** Are there any questions? Yes, please.

**Valerie Ann Lynn, Hazleton:** Lynn, Hazleton. I'd like to make a motion that we strike the paragraph, the first paragraph, on page two.

**Chair Ansari:** Nickie, could you show the report, please? On page two?

**Valerie Ann Lynn:** Yes.

**Michael Bérubé:** So this would be the recommendation that fixed term review committees have at least five members?
Valerie Ann Lynn: No. It is the paragraph that starts out "as this committee noted in our advisory and consultative report on voting rights with regard to--" oh, sorry. It's at the top of my page.

Chair Ansari: We're going to show the recommendation.

Unidentified Senator: Where is it again?

Michael Bérubé: Sure. Thank you, Jamie. I think that paragraph dated from when this was twinned with the thing we debated in January about the fixture and faculty voting for P&T committees. So yeah--

Chair Ansari: Is there a second to this motion? Second. It has been moved and seconded. There's a discussion to removing that paragraph that you see on the screen. Are we ready to vote? OK. Please start the clock. To accept this motion, please press A. To reject, please press B. The motion is to remove that paragraph.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have six accept and two reject.

Chair Ansari: OK. Motion carries. That paragraph will be removed. We're back to this report, HR 24.

Chair Ansari: Cindy, please. Kim here.

Kim Nelson: Kim Nelson, College of Science. And I would like to point out that this is a joint statement by multiple representatives of the College of Science concerning this proposal. I acknowledge the importance of this proposed advisory report. My constituents and I in the Eberly College of Science are in strong support of efforts to support the promotion of our fixed term colleagues.

However, academic unit leaders within our college and maybe others at University Park, and perhaps those who are elsewhere, are concerned that they were not fully consulted for their review and input in this process. That's where it will be implicated.

Therefore, I have motion-- I move to send this legislation back to committee with the intent that University Park and campus academic units should be properly consulted, potentially contribute to the report, with the goal of practical and successful implementation of fixed term promotion at the academic unit level-- i.e., there may be more than one way to implement this proposal, and I'm not sure we've explored them all.

Chair Ansari: Is there a second to motion to send this back to the committee? I'm sorry. There is no second. The motion is out of order. Back to HR 21. Discussion of the report. Are there further questions or comments? Peter? Yes, yes, I apologize. I'll get to you in a second. Is that all?

[Ed. Note: After the meeting, Mary Beth Williams, Senator from Eberly College of Science, who was participating via Mediasite, reported to the Senate office that she had tried to second the motion, but due to a brief interruption in the Mediasite connection, her message did not reach the meeting room in time.]

Peter J. Dendle, Mont Alto: Dendle, Mont Alto. Thanks once again. There's a lot of important stuff contained in this. I guess my question is, to what extent have you worked with administrative units, with
the people who would actually be approving this, and making it happen, and funding it? And could you just give a sense of the level of commitment that has been expressed or not expressed so far in this process? Thanks.

Michael Bérubé: A lot of our consultation first is with the FT faculty themselves in various units. As far as consultation with administration, I basically took the lead from say, the document from the College of Engineering, about how they're going to administer fixed term faculty issues, and a document from the College of Liberal Arts about best practices for fixed term issues.

In other words, I didn't go around college to college and consult. I worked with the documents that we already had, and then incorporated other things that Ann Taylor had done with regard to the ARL. So I was working with things that I thought were already on the table.

Chair Ansari: We had a question from Rosemary over there.

Rosemary J. Jolly, Liberal Arts: This is not a question so much as-- whoa. This is not a question so much as a comment. It's just to say that the Liberal arts has been working very hard on this issue. And the Dean herself has expressed dismay that in the wake of 2008 budgetary constraints, we were unable to maintain multi-year contracts in the way that we would have hoped.

And despite the fact that there might be budgetary uncertainty in the future, you will note that the document actually does allow for that budgetary uncertainty for some degree. What the document does do, though, is allow for the promotion of our non-tenure rank faculty.

And I think the importance of this cannot be overstated. You already know the statistics of the non-tenured faculty who teach. And the second piece of it is, I would just like to add that there was a comment made in committee that this improves the morale of the limited term faculty.

I just want to point out that as a tenured faculty member, it increases my morale, because I know that faculty that I depend-- sorry, limited term faculty that we depend on for roles as varied in Liberal Arts as head of department, the way through to undergraduate direct and beyond, have recognition and a pathway through to promotion.

I'm not saying that there won't be a hitch here and there as we try to work it out. We have tried very hard to consult with very small units, and units on the distant campuses, to make sure that it is indeed workable. So some of the sort of finer wording around how many people are on a committee and who votes and who don't have been put there precisely in order to handle very, very tiny departments and units. So I just wanted to speak in support of this report.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Before I recognize Annie, there is a question from Mediasite. Anna, could you repeat the question.

Anna F. Butler: The question has been withdrawn.

Chair Ansari: The question was withdrawn. OK. Annie, thank you.

background, want to share a little more. Michael mentioned a report that I had written. It was a 25-page whitepaper that I gave to Faculty Affairs about a year and a half ago.

And it was summarizing the many, many, many consultations that have gone on around this issue since before 2007. Most recently, there was a special committee, a task force-- I don't remember what we're called-- I'm looking at Blannie to see if he remembers-- that was chaired by David Hall in IST, who was then dean.

Again, looking at this issue, I know at that time, I spoke with a number of associate deans. I don't remember speaking to someone in the College of Science. But I wasn't the one speaking to everybody. So there has been a lot of consultation done around this. And I am so grateful for the comments that were just made about the support for the morale of both fixed term and tenure line faculty.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Annie. Cortney, there's a question over there.

Douglas E. Wolfe, College of Engineering: Wolfe, College of Engineering. Again, I just want to reiterate our strong support for our fixed term faculty. This is a very important. It is long overdue. And again, it has the full backing of the College of Engineering, as well as the dean.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other-- yes, Kim?

Kim Nelson: Again, I just want to clarify from the College of Science's standpoint is not that we're not in support of promotion of fixed term. I'm fixed term, and I've been promoted multiple times. We just have a different way of going about it that works for us, which will not work within this legislative body in the way that it has been set forth, that there should be a separate fixed term committee that decides fixed term appointments.

We had no issues with doing that within the regular tenure track promotional system. And I think that's where our deans have their concerns, is that we have a different process, and it works. Why should we change our process due to something being legislated by the Senate without what they view as adequate input from them?

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Kim. Other comments?

Rosemarie Petrilla: Can I just respond to that?

Chair Ansari: Oh, please.

Rosemarie Petrilla: I think there was ambiguity in HR 23. It was left up to the unit. And I applaud the units for creating a pathway for our FT1 faculty when there wasn't some in some of the units, or in the Commonwealth College that was very clear.

And the administrators for me-- I'm in the Commonwealth College-- who are constrained by budget, and there's been a backup of FT1 faculty, I think would welcome some budget changes, and be able to put forth those people who are coming forward.

And I think what some of the units are having a concern with, because there are some tenure people that
are on those committees. And there are some administrators that are in those committees. And it has worked. But I think if we follow the tenure process that's in place and mirror that, and whoever's the top ultimately making those decisions, we should maybe want to hear from our peers separately, and then hear that administrators will ultimately have input also, and could put supportive letters together.

But I don't know. And maybe it has worked. But maybe those should stay separately. Because if we do have FT1 committees, we shouldn't have the influence of an administrator on that committee, so that there could be freedom to express who they want to put forward with real or perceived-- because they're still FT1, they may still be on FT contract.

So that has worked. It's outlined beautifully in our P&T committee. So it may be different. And I think it has worked. And I think it's new. But I think there's some merit to it.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. There is a question from over there. Rosemary?

Rosemary J. Jolly: Just to be very brief, because I've spoken already. We tossed this around a lot on subcommittee and committee. And I just want to point out that, obviously, all respect-- and not only that, but it's wonderful that it's working in your unit.

There were some very strong issues expressed very broadly across a number of different colleges and faculties from limited term faculty about conflicts of interest that can arise when you have tenured administrators sitting on the committees.

So with that in mind, and how much broad concern there was about that, we proceeded with this issue, aware that we would be putting a burden on some places like yours to change their processes, but also very aware the processes a Senate develops have to work for those small and most vulnerable of our units.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other comments? Are we ready to vote? All right. Please start the clock. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have six accept, and three reject.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. The motion carries. Thank you, Rosemarie. Thank you, Michael. Thank you so much. The second advisory consultative report is from Faculty Affairs, and appears as Appendix L in your agenda. Michael? Esther?

Michael Berube: First off, I want to thank Esther again and Leland Glenna for creating that fellowship. You weren't asked to stand. That was awesome. That was three hours ago, so never mind. We have a policy on stoppages of the tenure clock that limits people to exactly one stoppage for one year. There is a gender equity issue involved here that I think the report details eloquently.

But there's also, I think, a human rights issue here-- and I don't want to say under which gender is subsumed, because that would be silly-- but it potentially affects all tenure line faculty. And it affects tenure line faculty-- and I think another major addition to this revision of this proposal offers is that it doesn't necessarily have to be child birth.
Foster care is every bit as, and sometimes as time-consuming and life-changing as, actually, live birth. And we really need to make this policy not only more flexible in its own right, for the good of our own faculty. But also I think Esther's work benchmarking this details the rather appalling fact that we are really seriously behind our Big 10 peers in the flexibility of our stoppages of the tenure clock. You want to add anything?

**Esther S. Prins:** No. Just that I think this will benefit any faculty member who encounters critical life events during that six year probationary period. And the humane and rational thing to do is allow people to do a better job of balancing their caretaking commitments with their commitment to their professional life. And we think that our proposal does exactly that.

**Michael Berube:** It does other thing, and Esther was especially vigilant on this. No one who gets a stay of the tenure clock once or twice should be penalized for it. They're being evaluated not on time and position, but on time on the tenure clock.

And that needs to be made clear. So the last two recommendations in the bold part— if you have the same page I do, page eight— about making it clear that this goes into the evaluation letter, that this is an explicit part of any person who is being reviewed who's had stoppage of the tenure clock, that they not be penalized for it. Sounds like an addendum to this, but it's really not. It's fundamental to how the process would work.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you. Are there questions, comments? Lonnie?

**Lonnie Golden, Abington:** Golden, Abington. I just wanted to speak in favor of this it's really important to explicitly say two things. One, that it's OK to ask for a second one. Because that makes it a little bit safer to ask for the first one. And second, to explicitly tell people on the P&T review committees that they're not allowed to review under their own clock.

**Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Lonnie. Tim? Kadi, over there. Tim.

**Timothy M. Lawlor, Brandywine:** Lawlor, Brandywine. I favor this. But there is some sentiment on my campus that, why are you limiting it to two? Well, I know it seems like an obvious question. But really, it's-- so just to sort of paraphrase a comment made by one of the faculty on our campus was that, so now you can have up to two babies while you're on the tenure line, or you can have one baby and maybe a serious illness or death in your family. Your pick.

**Esther Prins:** OK.

**Timothy M. Lawlor:** So it seems like it might still be biased against--

**Esther Prins:** OK.

**Michael Berube:** We tried. We did try. This was has languished for like, three years in this committee. And so we started with unlimited, because yeah, life events don't go by people's tenure clock. That was scaled back this year to three. And then through conversations with various administrators, it was decided to scale that back to two. So we did reach for the stars, and came to something better than what we have now.
Chair Ansari: We have a question from Mediasite.

Michael Berube: Basically, the median of the benchmark, instead of like, the leading edge. My own feeling was that—and I know people who've had two stoppages of the tenure clock for quite serious offense. The bar should be pretty high for three. But that was my suggestion.

But if there were a third stoppage, it would have to be for very, very good reason. But people do have those very good reasons. The only argument against that that would be entertained was whether extending turns your clock into seven, eight, nine years becomes increasingly infantilizing. And we debated that. But we went for two, because we could get two.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Anna. Could you read the question or comment?

Anna F. Butler: Yes. This comment is from Ira Saltz from Shenango. Not sure if you've already answered this or not, but he says please explain to me what role this recommendation has. It is not legislative.

Michael Berube: It is advisory/consultative.

Chair Ansari: It is advisory/consultative, subject to approval and implementation by the president. Are there any other comments or questions? Thank you. Please start the clock. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B. We're not going to stop this clock even once.

[Laughter]

Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have eight accept.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. Thank you, Michael. Thank you, Esther.

[Applause]

I would like to inform you that this was a recurring charge from 2014-15, and the credit goes to my wonderful friend and sister, past chair, Jonna Kulikowich. Please give her a big hand.

[Applause]

Thank you, Jonna. The next advisory/consultative report is from Faculty Benefits. Jamie Myers, Chair of the JCIB, and Victor Brunsden, vice chair of Faculty Benefits—will respond to questions Victor and Jamie, please?

Jamie Myers: Thank you for your endurance. I'd like to begin just briefly by thanking the group of people that worked on creating this report. And that is Renee Borromeo. And I don't know if I pronounced your last name, close enough. And Victor, as chair and vice chair of faculty benefits.

Gregory Stoner in the back, and Cassandra Kitko, who are also members of Faculty Benefits. JCIB, and the president's health care advisory report. And Dennis Shea, who's a member of the president's Health
Care Advisory Committee. So all three of those committees had a chance to give input on this report, which is what brought it to where it is now.

It started with over 20 rather specific recommendations that were kind of more directive, and it reached, I think, a level of really good policy, and shared governance, and an embracement of transparency between what we need to do as members of this community, and what human resources needs to do in order to provide the best health care that we can possibly have.

So without objection, we'd like to take comments or questions you have on any of the recommendations. We'll take them in order, but we'll just have one vote at the end of the six recommendations on all six.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Jamie. Are there any questions? Comments?

Jamie Myers: Can we take them in order, please? Any questions on the first recommendation, the principle of choice? Any questions on the second recommendation-- I have forgotten it. I'm getting tired. The sharing principle in that the university will contribute a ratio of 75% to the employee's 25% of the overall cost of health care.

Any questions on the third principle of affordability and equity, and that there are various strategies, that we didn't come down on one strategy, that we should use in order to support all of the employees that may be below the median?

On the fourth recommendation on informed utilization, using a data warehouse that can help understand where cost savings and appropriate care can be maximized. On the fifth recommendation, a quality, transparency, accessibility, and cost effective. And on the sixth recommendation of the fostering in the culture of health.

Chair Ansari: Jamie, I'd like to recognize Matthew Wilson.

Matthew T. Wilson: Thank you. It's a great report, and we appreciate the work that you've done. I'd like to propose an amendment of the following sentence to be added to Recommendation 6. While there's a lot of nice initiative the administration could advance to try to improve health, I think there's real concern about micromanaging employee behavior and employee choices.

And the Take Care of Yourself Initiative was obviously an effort in good faith to improve employee health. But the surcharges were so high, they became coercive. So when we fell back in a position where employees were given $100 one-time fee, or one-time benefit, we recognized that wasn't coercive.

So I'm proposing a one sentence addition to limit anything which is targeted at individuals or their behavior, you can limit it to $100 per family, in line with the precedent established with the collapse of the Take Care of Your Health Initiative.

Chair Ansari: The motion has been made. It's on the screen. Is there a second? Second. Discussion. Questions on this amendment to the motion to Recommendation number 6? Any discussions? Victor, go ahead, please.

Victor W. Brunsden, Altoona: Matthew this was discussed at the committee meeting this morning.
And the committee voted against including this additional sentence. Amongst the reasons were that it is, we felt, unnecessarily prescriptive, and so goes against the intent of this report.

In none of the other recommendations do we specify dollar amounts or specific things like that. Also, the prescription against these sorts of behaviors, we think, is actually embodied in all of these recommendations in toto. So it is unnecessary and is unnecessarily prescriptive. So--

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Victor.

Victor W. Brunsden: For that reason, we did accept it.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Matthew?

Matthew T. Wilson: Fine reasons, and I really appreciate that. I think that the advantage to doing it in this manner is to draw a bright red line to say that this is something that the Senate is especially sensitive to. So I think that there is language in the document which might imply that this wouldn't be acceptable.

But to put it in, even with a dollar amount, this would be binding. This would simply say this is what we consider to be acceptable. But I certainly understand where the committee's coming from.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other questions or comments on this amendment?

Jamie Myers: Again, I would echo Victor's comment and urge you to vote against this amendment. I believe it is too prescriptive. I believe it may be, even on the face of it, in contradiction to what we already use in terms of a surcharge on smoking, which greatly exceeds $100 a year. It would be in contradiction to opportunities for lab services and imaging that may save you as an individual user of that health care maybe $400 or $500 a year, if you use particular providers.

So there are many ways in which health care design can maximize the appropriate care for you to manage chronic conditions, or just be informed about your own health, and reduce costs more than this $100 amount a year. So I really think that it over-specifies, and it really works against the kind of collaborative transparency that I think we are achieving in the fact that we're able to lay out right here the exact dollar cost of everything, what you're paying in out of pocket, and really just get a good view of the fact that we're a bit under that 75%-25% ratio.

We're paying a bit more than our share. And we can actually now say with this report that the University needs to be aware of that, and maybe kick in a little bit more in the next year in terms of that proportion. So I really urge you to vote against this over-direction, or over-specificity.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Jamie. Larry?

Larry C. Backer, Penn State Law: I just very briefly would like to speak in favor of this motion, precisely for the reasons that our esteemed chairs and vice chairs have proffered against it. And that is collaboration and transparency. One of the most difficult things that we have had in our collaborative relationship with the folks who helped devise these plans is precisely the inability to collaborate, except on terms at the time, and place, and manner in which these things are proffered to us from time to time.
I think having a principle that acts as a trigger for collaboration-- recall this is a principle that acts as a trigger for collaboration-- is a very, very healthy thing, especially given the asymmetries of collaborative power that exists within the benefits area. So I would urge you to take this for what it is, an effort to ensure the kind of collaboration based on a principle, which is inherent in that figure, which is a principal trigger. And so I would urge you very strongly to vote in favor of the motion.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other comments, questions? Are we ready to vote?

Jamie Myers: Again, I would state principle number five already achieves this intent. If you look at that principle-- "quality, transparency, accessibility, and cost effectiveness should guide the negotiation and management of contracts for health care services." So this principle is, in effect, that that's been asked in this amendment.

Chair Ansari: Thank you, Jamie. Let me recognize Renee, please.

Renee L. Borromeo, Mont Alto: Yes. As chair of the committee, I'd like to speak against the amendment as well. For the reasons that-- let me just echo what Victor and Jamie have already said. But the $100 amount is really, really prescriptive. And $100 today may seem like one amount and seem like different amount in five years or three years. We don't know what's coming down the pike. We might find an incentive that is really, really good for us, whereas now, the $100 penalty seems really like a bad idea. $100 or more. I mean, I know the value-based benefits design is excluded from this, because of the way it's written. But there may be another program like that that might come down that would really benefit someone more than $100.

We don't know what's coming down the pike. We might find an incentive that is really, really good for us, whereas now, the $100 penalty seems really like a bad idea. $100 or more. I mean, I know the value-based benefits design is excluded from this, because of the way it's written. But there may be another program like that that might come down that would really benefit someone more than $100.

And to have this kind of a statement would really limit us in taking advantage of something like that, without going through a long process of changing things. So anyway, that's my thoughts on it. Thanks.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Larry?

Larry C. Backer: I think that's brilliant, and brilliantly said. And I agree, were the amendment one to impose a rule restricting the construction of benefit plans to $100. But indeed, it's not. And indeed for the very reasons that you and Jamie and Victor have suggested, you make a stronger case, I think, in my mind for the $100 trigger for precisely the things that you have said.

In fact, if there are creative ways of doing something else with the $100 trigger would be to get someone who's being very clever about this to sit and collaborate and talk, not just among themselves, but to all of us about whatever it is they're doing.

So you're not looking at something that is proscriptive. You are looking at a trigger. And I think it is an extraordinary error to view this embedded in a principle as a rule. It is nothing more than a trigger to discussion. And if we cannot trigger discussion, well, then we've made a different kind of policy choice. And that's fine. But again, I would urge you strongly to vote in favor of the amendment.

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Other comments or questions? Are we ready to vote on this amendment? Nickie, please start the clock. We are voting on the amendment. Amendment is to add the sentence in blue to Recommendation number 6. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.
Anna F. Butler: On Poll Everywhere, I have three accept and four reject.

Chair Ansari: OK. The amendment has been rejected. We're back to Appendix M. Any further discussions on Appendix M, the original appendix that has not been altered? Are we ready to vote on the Appendix M? Nickie, please start the clock. To accept, the report, please press A. To reject, please press B. The clock has been started.

Anna F. Butler: On Poll everywhere, I have seven accept, and one reject.

Chair Ansari: Congratulations. Thank you, Renee. Thank you, Jamie. Thank you, Victor.

The final advisory/consultative report is from the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force. It appears as Appendix N. Task force Chair Larry Backer and subcommittee chair Willie Ofosu will respond to questions. Larry? Willie?

Larry C. Backer: Well, thank you very much for sticking around for this. My task is going to be very short and simple. I'm going to leave most of the discussion to Willie. What I want to do is just provide a short, small context to both what is being presented now and to give you a heads up on what will be presented hopefully at the April meeting.

When the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force was constituted at the end of April of last year, we received a six-point, very comprehensive, but very diverse charge. After discussion, we decided that it made sense on functional grounds to divide the work of the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force to three broad categories. And to that end, we constituted three subcommittees, all three of which you will hear from at the next meeting, but one of which you'll hear from now.

The first one is a technical subcommittee that is charged with working on curricular issues related to diversity and the diversity-related charges. The second was a policy subcommittee that was going to handle those portions of the task force charges dealing with the framework and its implementation across units.

And then really, the hardest work was what we call a substantive policy recommendation committee, which was charged. And I know it's difficult for people who are looking for a very pointed thing. This was the open-ended, think outside of the box, help us work through issues of diversity and diversity implementation and programs going forward, beyond what we had already begun working through in the framework to foster diversity.

And it is to the first-- that committee has worked tirelessly. It is producing two reports-- one now, and hopefully one that you'll hear in April. Their task was to think outside the box, and to begin to provide a series of recommendations which would help both the Senate and the administration in thinking through, and working on, and providing inspiration for additional work going forward.

There's no concrete proposal. There's a proposal for a door open-- a direction that might be taken. And with that, I give it to the chair of the substantive committee.

Willie K. Ofosu, Wilkes-Barre: Thank you, Larry. The first thing we decided to do was basically to
have some sort of a definition for diversity. And in very brief terms, we decided that that would be all under-represented groups. So it's from that point of view that we're looking at this.

And the second thing we did was basically to look at what really causes all the tension and the problems that we find between different groups. Let's put it this way. And obviously, we find that most of the time it is really based on as a result of misunderstandings and misconceptions. And so the next thing we decided was, basically, precisely how are we going to tackle this situation. And, we thought, the first thing to do in this respect-- actually, a 2-step process, the first step was to get some sort of background, like a foundation, rather, a base from which we can develop whatever systems will be developed within Penn State.

Of course, when we look at the nature of Penn State, we see that we have a very diverse group. And so, if we're going to find some sort of basis or base to work with, then it makes sense that we then, ourselves, we should look at all the possibilities or the situations that have arisen and still can arise, and try to resolve as much these as possible. So that, if and when we come out, in any way, in any form, we can come out with a united front.

What we decided would be the best approach is, basically, to have some conversations. And this is not a new concept. Like, for instance, in the music world, that's something that is going on, and in many other places. That wherever there aren't any conversations or discussions of any form or any sort, then, definitely, wherever the chasms between the diverse groups become wider, or that much more incendiary.

And for as long as there are conversations, that can be ameliorated in some way. So this is where we started off from. And we think that, we look at what Penn State has to offer: education, and we're thinking that we look at it from the point of view that we could offer a platform in education.

The idea here, basically, is for us to look at the different types of situations or events that have arisen that we can draw lessons from, and look at it from that point of view, from the historical point of view. There are quite a few that we can pick on.

And we see that some of them, actually, ended up very negatively, and some positively. And the idea here, basically, learning from these would help us decide, or come to some conclusions as to the type of topics that we can arrive at or we can generate for conversation.

To cite a few examples, for instance, if you've watched the documentary on terror in Mumbai, you find, almost at the end of the documentary, the one person who survived made it clear that they were, in fact, instructed that they should all die. All the people who were going to cause terror should all die, shouldn't come out alive.

It just happened that this one guy survived it, and in sort of interviewing him, it came out that part of the reason was, basically, to make money. His family was very poor, uneducated. They're sort of looking for assistance, and people who have been in that situation, they need some money.

And so, he was advised to go and do it. And the interesting point about this is that he realized, after all this, that he had done a very bad thing, and he was very sorry for this. Imagine somebody like that, given some education, and get him to understand what this whole situation is about.
Obviously, that's somebody who would have a second thought in going out and doing that type of act. And so, looking at it from that point of view, obviously, Penn State has a lot to offer in education. And this is one of the things that we're looking at.

And in this sense, or for that reason, it's why we're looking at the recommendations that we have this time-- at least for this report-- to help us, as a unit, to become that much more cohesive in our own thinking, in our own perceptions. To basically become that much more, hopefully, a bit more broad-minded. That we can very easily embrace the other person, and not see him as diverse and draw away from him. So this is the basis for this commendation. Any questions?

**Chair Ansari:** Are there any questions?

Thank you. Please restart the clock. Thank you. To accept, please press A. To reject, please press B.

**Anna F. Butler:** On Poll everywhere I have eight accept and one reject.

**Chair Ansari:** Congratulations. Thank you. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

**Chair Ansari:** We go to Informational Reports. We have one Informational Report from Committees and Rules. The report appears in Appendix O. Committee Chair Pat Hinchey will present names of those who have accepted nomination to one of the three extra-senatorial committees: Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, and University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. Senators may make additional nominations from the floor, provided that you have first received permission from the person whom you would like to nominate. Chair Hinchey, will you please present the slate of nominees for the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities?

**Patricia Hinchey:** Thank you, Chair Ansari. The nominees for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities are presented to you in Appendix O, and we will deal with each section separately. We need to elect two University Park faculty. One will serve as a member, and one will be alternate, each serving three-year terms.

**Chair Ansari:** Are there any additional nominations? Let's move on to faculty and locations other than University Park.

**Patricia Hinchey:** We need to elect two faculty from locations other than University Park. One will serve as a member, and one will be an alternate, each serving three-year terms.

**Chair Ansari:** Are there any additional nominations? Let's move on, deans and chancellors.

**Patricia Hinchey:** We need to elect two deans or chancellors. One will serve as a member, and one will be an alternate.

**Chair Ansari:** Are there any additional nominations? Let's move on to a Standing Joint Committee on Tenure.
Patricia Hinchey: For Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, we need to elect two, one member and one alternate, each serving a three-year term.

Chair Ansari: Are there any additional nominations? Let's move on to University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

Patricia Hinchey: Finally, we have the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Three members are to be elected for two-year terms.

Chair Ansari: Are there any additional nominations? Please note that only faculty with full Professor rank are eligible to serve on this committee. Is there a motion to close nominations and approve the entire slate of nominees? Is there a second? For approving this slate, please say "I." Oppose, "nay." Motion carries.

Patricia Hinchey: Thank you.

Chair Ansari: Thank you very much, Pat. I appreciate it. If there are no objections, I would like to reorder the agenda and address the informational report from the Senate Council Nominating Committee at this time. Is there any objection? Thank you.

The Senate Council Nominating Committee has made nominations for Chair Elect and Secretary of the Senate and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. You will find these in Appendix B of your agenda. Senators may make nominations from the floor, provided that you have secured prior approval from those whom they wish to nominate. Jonna Kulikowich, Immediate Past Chair and the Chair of the Nominating Committee, will present the nominations.

Jonna Kulikowich: Thank you. We have two nominees for Chair elect of the Senate listed in Appendix V, and both nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot. Their names are listed on the screen behind me.

Chair Ansari: Are there any additional nominations from the floor? Yes, go ahead, please. Wait for the microphone, please.

Keith D. Shapiro: Shapiro, Arts and Architecture. I nominate the senator from Arts and Architecture, William Kelly.

Chair Ansari: Has this person agreed to serve?

Keith D. Shapiro: Yes.

Mohamad A. Ansari: Is there a second for this?

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Ansari: It has been moved and seconded the name of William Kelly to be added to the list of nominees. Are there any other nominations from the floor? Let's move on to Secretary.
Jonna Kulikowich: For the office of Secretary of the Senate, we have three nominees listed in Appendix V, and all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Chair Ansari: Are there any additional nominations from the floor? Let's move on to Faculty Advisory Committee.

Jonna Kulikowich: For the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, one will be elected for a three-year term expiring in 2018. The four nominees are listed in Appendix V, and all nominees have given permission to have their names placed on the ballot.

Mohamad A. Ansari: Are there any nominations from the floor? Is there a motion to close nominations and approve the entire slate of nominees?

Unidentified Senator: So moved.

Chair Ansari: Is there a second?

Senators: Second.

Chair Ansari: Those in favor of approving this slate please say "I." Oppose "nay." Motion carries. Thank you so much, Jonna, I appreciate it.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

COMMITTEES AND RULES

Nominating Report for 2016-2017, Appendix O

Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-o/

ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2016-2017, Appendix P

http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-p/

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Joint Report from the President’s Commissions for Equity (The Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity; the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity and the Commission for Women), Appendix Q

Committee Vice Chair Robert Loeb and Commission representatives Amy Vashaw, Jamie Campbell, and Jennifer Stewart presented this report.

http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-q/

FACULTY AFFAIRS
Faculty Tenure Rates: 2015-16 Annual Report, Appendix R. Committee Chair Michael Berube presented this report.
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-r/

GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Considerations for Rewards and Recognition of International Engaged Faculty and Staff, Appendix S
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-s/

LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGY

Informational Report for Canvas, Appendix T
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-t/

RESEARCH AND LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGY

Report on changes to Research Computing at PSU, Appendix U
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-u/

SENATE COUNCIL

Nominating Committee Report for 2016-2017, Appendix V
Chair-Elect, Secretary, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President
Committee Chair Jonna Kulikowich presented this report. William Kelly, College of Arts and Architecture, was nominated from the floor for Chair-Elect.
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-v/

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Grade Distribution Report, Appendix W. Committee Vice Chair Ann Taylor presented this report.
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-w/

UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Penn State Space Report, Appendix X
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-15-2016-agenda/appendix-x/

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Chair Ansari: Is there any new business?

Larry Backer, Penn State Law: Yeah.

Chair Ansari: Please use the microphone.
Larry Backer: You all want to go. You've already seen it. I'd like to move the motion that I distributed to you as you walked in.

Chair Ansari: The motion is that resolution that you received. Is there a second?

Unidentified Senator: Second.

Chair Ansari: All right, thank you. We'll discuss this at the April meeting. Is there any other new business?

Chair Ansari: Any other new business? Comments for the good of the university?

COMMENTS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Anna F. Butler: This is from Tramble Turner from Abington. Congratulations to our Division I Athletics Director for a fine presentation. Her inclusion of the Commonwealth Campuses' athletics reporting lines is a welcome sign of the growth in Penn State Athletic system-wide. I urge my faculty senate colleagues to learn more about the five Division III NCAA programs, as well as learning more about the participation of student athletes in the PSUAC conference at the university college campus location.

[Message via Mediasite from Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: I wish I could have been at the Senate meeting today, but I’m in San Diego at a professional conference, participating by Mediasite. I decided to write in to thank Chairman Masser for addressing the Senate today. I spent three years as faculty representative to the Board and it’s the Governance and Long Range Planning Committee, and I want to let everyone know that from my interactions, I’m convinced that we have a Board that cares deeply about doing what is best overall for all of the constituents of the University, including its faculty and especially the students. During my years as faculty rep, the board overall and Chairman Masser in particular always made sure that I always had an opportunity to express my opinions and took them very seriously. Chairman Masser was instrumental in getting the changes made to the charter that among other things, added the Academic Trustee to the Board, now ably filled by Senator David Han, and made the Student Trustee position a regular Board seat, not just a position filled by a gubernatorial appointment that may or may not have been made, depending on the decision of the governor. Penn State is very fortunate to have dedicated people like Chairman Masser on the Board.]

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari: Thank you. Is there any other comment? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Senators: So moved

Chair Ansari: Is there a second? Thank you very much for being here until this late. Thank you. I appreciate it.
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### Appendix I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>