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Appendix A

Date: September 5, 2003 To: Christopher J. Bise, Chair, University Faculty Senate

From: Shelley M. Stoffels, Chair, Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

The Senate Curriculum Report dated September 2, 2003, has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to the University Curriculum Coordinator at the Senate Office, 101 Kern Graduate Building, e-mail ID sfw2@psu.edu, on or before October 2, 2003.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web. It can be accessed at http://www.psu.edu/ufs/bluex.html.

Appendix B

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) Procedures
(Advisory and Consultative)

Background

Penn State has been using the SRTE to provide student input into the faculty evaluation process for about 15 years. While there has been an internal study of its reliability (“An Analysis of the Penn State Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness: A Report Presented to the University Faculty Senate,” September 9, 1997), the SRTE instrument needs to be continually scrutinized because it remains a significant part of our faculty evaluation process. At the request of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, Vice Provost Robert Secor conducted a survey of SRTE use. The survey was University-wide and was conducted in the summer of 2002. The results of the survey are summarized in Appendix A. These results suggest the need for some clarification of procedures as well as some stricter oversight. In addition, the results suggest the need for some changes in procedures for the use of the SRTE in the faculty evaluation process.

Discussion

The survey results indicate the following areas need to be addressed:

1. Frequency of reviews by the SRTE

   The original Senate legislation allowed academic units to determine the frequency of SRTE use for their faculties, but cautioned against using the SRTE for every course every time it is taught. Research at the time the SRTE was created suggested that such frequent evaluation made students take student evaluations less seriously. Later research indicates that this regular evaluation does not have this effect and is advisable if the results are to be used for performance evaluations (as the SRTE is). The Secor survey reveals that most units are administering SRTEs at every opportunity, in apparent violation of the policy as it is currently written.

2. Determining which SRTE results are to included in dossiers

   There are indications that some units allow individual faculty members to decide which of their SRTE results are included in their dossiers. In addition, some units allow faculty members to decide which student comments are included. Clearly, if we are to have any confidence in SRTE results, all results must be included in candidates’ dossiers, not just self-selected results.

3. Student Comments

   Most units include summaries of student comments in tenure and promotion dossiers, and in the majority of cases the academic unit head or his or her delegate summarizes the comments. However, in some units, candidates themselves prepare these summaries, and in a few units the candidates make the decision about whether to include student comments in the dossier.

4. Procedural Irregularities
The survey revealed that a few units blatantly violate policy, e.g., by allowing faculty members to distribute or collect their own SRTE forms. Stricter oversight is necessary to assure adherence to mandated procedures.

**Recommendations**

1. **Frequency of Reviews**

Because most units do use the SRTE to evaluate each course every time it is taught and since research now suggests doing so is useful when student evaluations are used for performance reviews, we are recommending the following changes in the “frequency of review” section of the Administrative Guidelines for HR23.

The current version of this section reads as follows:

11. Frequency of reviews
   a. The specific procedures for determining the frequency of reviews for the faculty members within a unit shall be determined by the unit, based on guidelines developed by the coordinating office. Surveys shall also be conducted when requested by the faculty member. The following principles about the frequency of reviews apply:
      (1) Where possible, evaluations should be conducted over a period of years and in a variety of courses.
      (2) Units should refrain from having every course evaluated every time it is taught.

**Recommendation 1.** We recommend that the section on frequency of reviews be changed to read as follows:

11. Frequency of reviews
   a. The specific procedures for determining the frequency of reviews for the faculty members within a college shall be determined by the college. These procedures must be developed in consultation with the faculty of the college. The following principles about the frequency of reviews apply:
      (1) Where possible, evaluations should be conducted over a period of years and in a variety of courses.
      (2) For provisional faculty (i.e., tenure track faculty who do not yet have tenure), all sections of all courses shall be evaluated by the SRTE every time it is taught. The results from each of these evaluations must be included in tenure or promotion dossiers. Such agreements should be in writing.
      (3) For all other faculty, each college must develop clear and specific guidelines to accomplish the purpose outlined in the principles stated in section 11a of the Administrative Guidelines. Since students now expect to have the opportunity to evaluate their instructors and their courses and since such evaluations continue to have value for many purposes, it is recommended that all sections of all courses shall be evaluated. College Guidelines will be reviewed by the Office of the Provost to ensure that they are consistent with these principles.
      (4) Faculty being reviewed for promotion, even when it is not coupled with a tenure review, should be able to demonstrate their teaching achievements in part through student evaluations that have been done over time and in a variety of courses.
2. Inclusion of Results

**Recommendation 2.** We recommend that the procedures require that the results from all SRTEs that have been conducted during the appropriate period be included in tenure and promotion dossiers. There shall be no selecting of which results should be included and which excluded.

3. Student Comments

The current statement about summarizing student comments says, “If student comments from such sources as student evaluations, formal interviews or exit surveys are reviewed, the findings should be presented by a summary statement that conveys the students’ sense of strengths and weaknesses.”

**Recommendation 3.** We recommend adding the following statement to these guidelines:

The summary shall be prepared by the department head, division head, director of academic affairs, or the department head’s administrative or faculty delegate, perhaps in consultation with the chair of the unit’s tenure and promotion committee. Under no circumstances shall the candidate be involved in preparing the summary of student comments.

4. Procedural oversight

**Recommendation 4.** We recommend that academic units, under the guidance of the Office of the Provost, take responsibility for seeing that proper procedures are followed in the use of SRTEs. Under no circumstances shall a faculty member be present during the administration of the SRTE for the evaluation of his or her teaching.

**Additional Recommendations**

Discussions of the SRTE suggest that some further refinements of the SRTE could enhance its usefulness. Among these changes is the selection of items for the B (discipline-specific) section.

5. Selection of Items for the discipline-specific (B) section

Items for section B are chosen by academic units so that unit-specific concerns and behaviors can be addressed and evaluated. The original legislation required that academic units (departments or department-like units such as divisions) make these selections from a large pool of items.

Two developments in the last decade suggest that it may be time to make some changes in the selection of items for the B-section. First, the academic structure of the University has been radically changed. When the original legislation was implemented, all faculty at Commonwealth Education System campuses were members of University-wide departments. Now faculty at those locations are members of new academic units (generally divisions of new colleges),
although some have retained their connections to their UP-based departments. It makes sense to allow the faculty of these new units to make their own selection of items from the pool for inclusion in the B-section.

The second development that suggests that it is time to reconsider which items should be in the B-section is the change in the way classes are taught. In the last 15 years, there has been a significant shift away from traditional lectures toward more active and collaborative classrooms. Thus questions that were once appropriate for evaluating instructors may not be as relevant today; and new questions that were not important may be crucial for evaluating instructors in this new era of instruction.

**Recommendation 5.** Therefore we recommend that the items for the B-section be chosen by current academic units. For faculty in the campus colleges, that will mean the academic divisions in their colleges. For faculty at University Park, the unit will remain the department or department-like entity.

**Recommendation 6.** We further recommend that every academic unit review the questions it has chosen for inclusion in the B-section of the SRTE in light of its current academic practices and concerns.

As units review their selections, they should keep in mind that different courses are often taught in different ways and thus may require different sets of questions for appropriate evaluation. This point is most obvious for multi-discipline divisions; the questions that are best for one discipline may not be best for another within the same division. However, it may also be true even for a single-discipline unit. For example, the questions appropriate for an English composition course may not be the best questions for evaluating a literature course, even though both are taught by the English department. Similarly, science departments may want to use a different form for evaluating laboratory courses than they use for regular classroom teaching. Therefore units may want to have different forms for different courses. Some departments have already been doing this but it is not clear that everyone realizes that they may do so.

**Conclusion**

We believe that the changes we are proposing will enhance the usefulness of the SRTE for evaluating the quality of teaching. However, our evaluation of the SRTE, indeed of all our methods of evaluating teaching, is an ongoing process. As new methods of evaluation are developed or new evidence arises, we must look anew at our practices to make sure that we are using the best practices available. One issue under current study is the order of the A and B sections of the SRTE. The questions in section A are the most general and play the most central role in promotions and tenure. They include the student’s overall evaluation of the course and of the instructor. There is some evidence that more meaningful results will be obtained if students are asked about specific instructor attributes first (such as those in section B) and then make a general judgment about the instructor. This simply requires that we reverse the order of sections A and B on the SRTE form. We are currently researching this question and will return with a specific recommendation if the results indicate that a change is warranted.
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SRTE SURVEY
The following message is being sent to department and division heads. The Faculty Affairs Committee plans to review the implementation of SRTEs to see if changes are warranted, particularly when practice does not conform to practice. They have asked me to gather some information from you, and so I would appreciate you sending back some brief answers to the following questions:

1) How frequently are SRTE forms used for courses taught by the faculty in your department or on your campus?

   A) Provisional Faculty?

   B) All Faculty?

2. Do you make use of written comments from students in faculty dossiers for P&T? If so, how are student comments presented? If in summary form, who prepares the summary?

3) Are SRTE scores measured against departmental norms or averages determined over time?

4) Who distributes the SRTE forms to and collects them from the students?

I appreciate your help in sending back this information to me. Best wishes.

This survey was distributed to Department and Division Heads electronically by Robert Secor, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, on May 7, 2002.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE SRTE SURVEY

NUMBER OF RESPONSES - 82 (Out of 136 possible responses or a 60% response rate)
2 Abington
6 Agricultural Sciences
2 Altoona
3 Arts and Architecture
3 Berks-Lehigh Valley
2 Erie
4 Business Administration
4 Capital
10 Commonwealth College
3 Communications
4 Earth and Mineral Sciences
4 Education
2 Erie
7 Engineering
3 Great Valley
4 Health and Human Development
12 Liberal Arts
3 Medicine
6 Science

FREQUENCY
Provisional faculty
66 Every course
7 Other

All faculty
63 Every course
5 Every semester
2 Every other semester
1 Recommended only
2 Expected only for faculty being reviewed for promotion

WRITTEN COMMENTS
60 Yes
19 No

If so, are they summarized?
54 Yes

If yes, by whom?
25 Department head/division head/school director/ director of academic affairs
6 Administrative or staff assistant
8 Committee chair or member of committee
4 Another faculty member or team of faculty
7 Candidate himself/herself
4 Other

6 Not summarized, but lists of representative comments

Who chooses representative list? – Department head; director of academic affairs; chair of department promotion and tenure committee; member of the department promotion and tenure committee; department promotion and tenure committee; administrative assistant; department head secretary; staff assistant

Are there norms or averages?
36 Yes
36 No

Where yes, how normed? – College/school/department averages; national averages; look at typical scores and use them as a benchmark to compare individual evaluations against average or model scores; normed against two averages—one weighted by the number of students and one not
weighted of all full professors in the department; department head tracks SRTEs over time and
develops a rubric that is used during annual career conferences; averages of questions three and
four are computed annually; broken out by level of course

14 Not formally normed, but division head/director of academic affairs has clear sense of
norms in mind as a result of experience

DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION
13 Faculty member distributes
69 Someone other than faculty (e.g., student in class, colleague, staff assistant, graduate
student) distributes
79 Someone other than faculty (e.g., student in class, colleague, staff assistant, graduate
student) collects
14 Response indicated that faculty member leaves class after distribution

SPECIAL CONCERNS OR QUESTIONS RAISED BY RESPONSES

3 Individual faculty members make the decision whether or not to submit student comments
for their dossiers.

7 Candidate prepares own summary of student comments, sometimes with oversight by the
department promotion and tenure committee and/or the department head.

13 Faculty members distribute their own SRTE forms in class.

2 Response indicated that the use of SRTEs is required, but not enforced

-----------
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Annual Report for 2001-2002

(Informational)

I am pleased to present the report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and
Responsibilities to you today.

The committee expresses its appreciation to the Ombudsmen for their work to resolve conflicts
and disputes prior to review by our committee. Additionally the committee acknowledges the
ongoing efforts of Vice Provost Robert Secor to increase awareness of the policies and procedures regarding promotion and tenure and hiring. We believe that their combined efforts positively affect the number of petitions submitted to the Committee for review.

During the 2001-2002 academic year, the committee dealt with six cases, two more than in the previous year. Three of these cases involved promotion and tenure denial; the other three concerned disputes between individual faculty and their administrators.

The three petitions concerning denial of promotion and/or tenure alleged irregularities with regard to the review procedures at the department or college levels. In two of the cases, the committee did not find procedural irregularities and recommended to the Vice Provost that no corrective action needed to be taken. In one case, the committee did find a procedural irregularity and recommended corrective action.

The three cases considered by the committee that involved disputes between faculty members and their administrators each involved procedural fairness. One involved procedural fairness regarding teaching assignments and research responsibilities. The committee found that existing documentation did not support a re-evaluation of teaching assignments. The second case involved committee assignments and merit pay. The committee did not find procedural irregularities with regard to committee appointments; and the merit increase issue is outside the purview of the committee. The third case pertained to hiring practice regarding years of service. Procedural irregularities were found and were addressed with a recommendation to the Provost.

I wish to thank the other members of the committee who have expended considerable time and effort in considering these varied cases. Their thoughtful involvement and attention to the details in each of these cases for the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee has served the University.
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I am pleased to present the report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities to you today.

The committee expresses its appreciation to the Ombudsmen for their work to resolve conflicts and disputes prior to review by our committee. Additionally the committee acknowledges the ongoing efforts of Vice Provost Robert Secor to increase awareness of the policies and procedures regarding promotion and tenure and hiring. We believe that their combined efforts positively affect the number of petitions submitted to the Committee for review.

During the 2002-2003 academic year, the committee dealt with five cases, one less than in the previous year. Three of these cases involved promotion and/or tenure denial; the other two concerned disputes between individual faculty and their administrators.

The three petitions concerning denial of promotion and tenure, or denial of early tenure both alleged procedural irregularities. In two of the cases, the committee did not find significant procedural irregularities and recommended to the Vice Provost that no corrective action needed to be taken. In one case, the committee did find procedural irregularities and recommended corrective action.

The two cases considered by the committee that involved disputes between faculty members and their administrators each involved procedural fairness. One involved procedural fairness regarding teaching, research and service assignments. The committee found that existing documentation did not support a re-evaluation of assignments. The second case involved procedural issues regarding teaching assignments stemming from disciplinary action. The committee did not find procedural irregularities and did not recommend corrective action.

I wish to thank the other members of the committee who have expended considerable time and effort in considering these varied cases. Their thoughtful involvement in these cases for the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee has served the University.
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Dawn G. Blasko
S. Diane Brannon
Renata S. Engel, Chair
Daniel J. Larson
Sallie M. McCorkle, Vice-Chair
David H. Monk
Eva J. Pell
Our previous annual report covered the time period from October 2001 through May 2002. Since that time, the Joint Committee has met on November 5, 2002, February 26, 2003 and April 29, 2003.

This report is a summary of the issues reviewed and discussed and the actions recommended by the Committee in the following areas:

· Health Care Rates

· Health Plan Issues and Changes

· Counseling and Therapy coverage

· Life Insurance

· Long-term Care Coverage

**Health Care Rates**

In accordance with the recommendations of the Task Force on the Future of Benefits, the University is implementing a seven-year phase-in of increased employee contributions to HMO coverage. The committee reviewed the philosophy and the methodology of the rate increases.

The Committee agreed that the Office of Human Resources should continue to monitor and request additional data regarding health care trends and share pertinent information with the Committee regarding the impact of those trends on University benefit plans.

**Health Plan Issues and Changes**

Among the issues reviewed by the Committee were the ongoing changes in plan availability at specific campuses. HealthAmerica was unable to come to an agreement with Gettysburg
Hospital and some of the physicians associated with that facility. As a result of the contraction of that network, faculty and staff, most of whom were at the Mont Alto campus, were given the opportunity to change their coverage from the HMO or POS to either Plan A or the Healthpass PPO. Similarly, Health Net announced that it was withdrawing its HMO from Pennsylvania effective October 1, 2003. The Employee Benefits Division has arranged a special enrollment for affected employees that will give them the opportunity to enroll in one of the Aetna health plans.

In cooperation with the University Health Services Pharmacy and the University sponsored health plans, arrangements were made to meet the needs of faculty who are on sabbatical and other types of leave that require them to be out of the area for extended periods of time. Faculty and staff can now receive up to a year’s supply of drugs, subject to restrictions for controlled substances. Requests for these extended drug supplies must be coordinated through the Employee Benefits Division.

The Committee recommended that the University explore the possibility of negotiating discounts for hearing aids, since they are not covered under any of the University health plans. Health America is currently in negotiations with a national audiology group that may be able to provide the variety of vendors as the Committee recommended.

**Counseling and Therapy Coverage**

There were several initiatives related to outpatient mental health coverage. Effective January 1, 2003, Value Options assumed responsibility for the Penn State Employee Assistance Plan (EAP). As Value Options is the mental health provider for HealthAmerica’s medical plans, it is anticipated that the mental health benefits provided by both programs can be more easily coordinated.

Concurrent with the new partnership with Value Options, there were additional initiatives designed to enhance the options available for outpatient mental health services. The definition of eligible mental health providers under the University health plans was expanded to include licensed social workers. Additionally, the Psychology Clinic at University Park will be contracted to be part of the Value Options EAP network. The committee agreed that the use of the clinic by employees would be presented as only one of several options available to them, with no pressure or obligation on their part. As an enhancement to the EAP, Value Options added a financial planning service. The service is designed to assist employees and their household members regarding budgeting and planning issues. Investment counseling is not a part of this service.

**Life Insurance**

In cooperation with Prudential, the Employee Benefits Division announced an enhancement to the age-grade life insurance program. This enhancement:

- Lowers the percentage of coverage reduction after age 65
- Increases the maximum salary multiplier from 4 times salary to 5 times salary
- Increases the maximum coverage amount from $300,000 to $500,000
Provided a limited open enrollment allowing employees currently enrolled in the level premium plan to switch to the age-graded plan without proof of insurability

**Long Term Care Coverage**

The Committee continues to examine and explore the benefits of a Long Term Care program for University faculty, staff and family members. Committee members attended a presentation on Long Term Care benefits and later discussed many of the issues involved in the coverage. It was agreed that the Committee should continue to study the feasibility of this benefit and recommended that general information regarding Long Term Care programs be included on the Life Events web page.

**In Recognition**

Michael G. Klein, who had been an administrative representative to the Committee since its inception, retired from Penn State on July 1, 2003. The Committee would like to express their appreciation to Mr. Klein for his many contributions and invaluable expertise.

**Future Considerations**

The Committee will continue to review new information regarding health care cost and coverage trends, focusing on affordability issues for the University and faculty and staff. Additionally, the Committee will continue to monitor and review the issues related to Long Term Care coverage for faculty and staff.

NOTE: Senators with specific questions should contact committee chair George Franz at

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND BENEFITS**

Kenneth S. Babe
Leonard J. Berkowitz
Bill Ellis
George W. Franz, Chair
Michael G. Klein
Patricia J. Long
Cara-Lynne Schengrund
Patience L. Simmonds
Karen M. Volmar
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SENATE COUNCIL
Presentation to the University Faculty Senate  
September 16, 2003  
by Graham B. Spanier, President  

(Informational)  

In a special presentation to the Senate that he is delivering in lieu of his normal State of the University address, President Spanier will speak about the changing demographics of the Commonwealth, the implications that those changes will have on Penn State's future, and the questions this raises for the University as a result.  

The changes occurring in Pennsylvania over the next few decades will be profound and impact directly on who our students will be, how we will teach them, who we will work with as colleagues, and the resources that we will have for doing our work. Dr. Spanier will outline the demographic challenges that will significantly alter the academic landscape for the next generation of faculty and students.  
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MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 2, 2003 – 1:30 p.m.

102 Kern Graduate Building


Members Absent/Accounted For: A. Leure-duPree, H. Manbeck, J. Moore, G. Spanier


CALL TO ORDER

Chair Christopher Bise called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 2, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2003

The minutes of the April 8, 2003 meeting were approved as presented.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Bise welcomed the new members of Senate Council and offered a brief overview of the responsibilities of Council. He announced a New Senators’ Workshop to be held on Monday, September 15 at 6:00 p.m. in the Faculty Staff Club at the Nittany Lion Inn. Chair Bise asked Council members to encourage new senators from their voting units to attend. Dr. Bise also noted that he was interested in improving channels of communication between the Senate and the colleges. He encouraged Councilors to talk with their deans about giving an up-date on Senate meetings at College faculty meetings.

Chair Bise noted that he expects the Senate Self Study final report and recommendations to appear on the October 14 Senate Council agenda.

Chair Bise announced that the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President met on August 1 and discussed the following topics: State of the University Address; background checks for faculty applicants; where American universities are going with affirmative action; tuition increases and enrollments for fall semester; bowl championship series update; and fan behavior at fall football games.
The Faculty Advisory Committee met again on September 2 and discussed the following topics: late breaking updates; update on Title Nine implications; impact of relations with PSU sponsors and book-publishing organizations; what forms of consultation between the Faculty Senate and the administration are most beneficial; and Circleville Farm faculty proposal.

Chair Bise noted that the next meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President is scheduled for October 14. Any items for discussion at FAC may be submitted to a Senate Officer or one of the three elected members: Wayne Curtis, Harvey Manbeck, and Peter Rebane.

The Senate Officers will visit eight campuses this fall beginning with a September 11 visit to the DuBois Campus. The schedule of visits appears on the Senate web site.

Chair Bise announced that the following reports from the April 22 Senate meeting were approved for implementation by the President:

- From the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid, “Change to Policy 34-68: Auditing a Course” has been approved and referred to the Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment Management and Administration for implementation summer 2003.
- From the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs – “Revision to Policy AD53: Privacy Statement” – the President asked the Associate Vice President for Human Resources to revise the policy in accord with the recommendations.
- From the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics – “Revision of Senate Policy 67-00: Athletic Competition” the President informed the Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA of his approval and asked the Executive Secretary of the University Faculty Senate to amend Senate Policy 67-00.

Chair Bise invited Provost Erickson to make comments. Dr. Erickson welcomed everyone to the new academic and Senate year, noting that all went well with move-in at locations with residence halls. He commented on the budgetary political maneuvering in Harrisburg and said that he is cautiously optimistic that there will be a budget by the end of September. The emphasis on the 2004-2005 budget will be on the restoration of previously lost funding. There will be a budget presentation at the September 19 Board of Trustees meeting.

Provost Erickson commented on the record number of applications received by the University, more than 86,000—6,000 applications more than last year. The next six weeks will give a complete enrollment picture, he expects approximately 42,000 students at the University Park campus. Dr. Erickson noted that campus enrollments were stable, with some campuses showing slight enrollment gains and others small declines.

Dr. Erickson acknowledged the Information Technology Services and security staff in keeping Penn State’s technology networks clean and running. He noted that many students returned to campus with unpatched computers and commented that about one-two percent of all student machines were infected. Some research universities nation-wide reported computer corruptions of 50-60 percent.

**AGENDA ITEMS FOR SEPTEMBER 16, 2003**
Forensic Business
none

Legislative Reports
none

Advisory and Consultative

Faculty Affairs – Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) Procedures—This report was placed on the Agenda on a Jurs/Esposito motion. Several editorial and content changes were provided by vice-chair Mohamad Ansari. Peter Rebane asked Robert Secor the rationale for having SRTEs administered for all sections of all courses. There was discussion on who are the individuals to summarize student comments.

Informational Reports

Faculty Rights and Responsibilities—This report was placed on the agenda on a Spychalski/Pytel motion. Renata Engel will stand for questions at the Senate meeting.

Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits—This report was placed on the Agenda on an Esposito/McCarty motion. Councilor Pytel suggested that a statement be added at the end of the report encouraging Senators with specific questions to contact chair George Franz. Committee Chair Franz will stand for questions.

Presentation by Graham B. Spanier—This special report was placed on the Agenda on a Scaroni/Smith motion. On a Gouran/Glumac motion, the main motion was amended to have the report given under the sponsorship of Senate Council.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

The Agenda was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

External Matters Subcommittee—The following Senate Council members volunteered to serve on this subcommittee: C. Baggett, J. Esposito, T. Glumac, R. McCarty, A. Scaroni.

Unit Constitutions Subcommittee—Chair Bise requested a motion to confirm the membership of the Unit Constitution subcommittee. Senate Secretary, Jamie Myers with members Dennis Gouran and Louis Milakofsky, will chair the subcommittee. The subcommittee membership was confirmed on a Pytel/Scaroni motion.

NEW BUSINESS
There was no new business.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Senate Chair Bise thanked Council members for their attendance and participation and accepted a motion to adjourn the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan C. Youtz
Executive Secretary

Date: September 5, 2003

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Susan C. Youtz, Executive Secretary

Please note the scheduled time and location of your committee. If you are unable to attend, notify the Senate Office prior to Senate Day, if possible.

**Monday, September 15, 2003**

6:00 p.m.

New Senators Workshop Faculty Staff Club, Nittany Lion Inn

7:30 p.m.

Officers and Chairs Meeting Faculty Staff Club, Nittany Lion Inn

8:30 p.m.

Commonwealth Caucus Meeting Penn State Room, Nittany Lion Inn

**Tuesday, September 16, 2003**
7:30 a.m.
Intercollegiate Athletics 233 HUB/Robeson Cultural Center

8:00 a.m.
Faculty Affairs 129A HUB/Robeson Cultural Center
Outreach Activities 502 Keller Building

8:30 a.m.
Admissions, Records, Scheduling 203 Shields Building
and Student Aid
Committees and Rules 114 Kern Graduate Building
Curricular Affairs 102 Kern Graduate Building
Faculty Benefits 201 Kern Graduate Building
Intra-University Relations 325 HUB/Robeson Cultural Center
Research 106 HUB/Robeson Cultural Center
Student Life 107 HUB/Robeson Cultural Center
Undergraduate Education 330 HUB/Robeson Cultural Center
University Planning 327 HUB/Robeson Cultural Center

9:00 a.m.
Computing and Information Systems 322 HUB/Robeson Cultural Center
Libraries 510A Paterno Library

1:30 p.m.
University Faculty Senate 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: September 5, 2003

To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (This includes all elected Senators from Campuses, Colleges, and Locations Other Than University Park)

From: Thomas Glumac and Tramble T. Turner

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2003 – 8:30 p.m.
PENN STATE ROOM
NITTANY LION INN
Guest: George Franz, Chair, Senate Self Study Committee

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2003 – 11:30 a.m.
ALUMNI LOUNGE
NITTANY LION INN
A buffet luncheon will be served at 12:15 p.m.

The Agenda includes:

I. Call to Order

II. Announcements and Reports from Co-chairs of the Caucus

III. Reports from Committee Chairs

IV. Other Items of Concern/New Business

V. Adjournment and Lunch