THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate
AGENDA
Tuesday, March 17, 2015 – 1:30 p.m.
112 Kern Graduate Building

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

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

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the January 27, 2015, Meeting in The Senate Record 48:4

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of February 24, 2015

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of February 24, 2015

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

F. NEW BUSINESS

G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Forensic Report on 21st Century Student Life Skills
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Revisions to Senate Policy 34-20 (Registration)
J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Faculty Affairs

Report on Policy AD-77, Engaging in Outside Professional Activities
(Conflict of Commitment)  Appendix F

Faculty Benefits

Employee Contributions to Penn State’s Self-Insured Health Care Costs  Appendix G

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Council

Nominating Committee Report for 2015-2016  Appendix H
Chair-Elect, Secretary, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President,
Academic Trustee

Report on Fall 2014 Campus Visits*  Appendix I

Committee and Rules

Nominating Report for 2015-2016  Appendix J
Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
Standing Joint Committee on Tenure
University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

How to Bring a Concern to the University Faculty Senate
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  Appendix K

Elections Commission

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2015-2016*  Appendix L

Educational Equity and Campus Environment

Update on the Activities of the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and
Transgender Equity  Appendix M
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Faculty Affairs

Report on Resolution on Faculty Contracts Referred by the Full Senate
to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs at the September 9, 2014 Senate Meeting*
L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 28, 2015, 1:30 p.m., Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

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

DATE: February 4, 2015

TO: Jonna M. Kulikowich, Chair, University Faculty Senate

FROM: Judy Ozment, Chair, Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

The Senate Curriculum Report dated February 24, 2015 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Julia Gibboney, curriculum coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, jsg1@psu.edu, on or before March 27, 2015.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web and may be found at: http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/
While our students are pursuing academic careers, many are also navigating through the increasingly complex experiences of confronting financial, legal, and health care issues. Both anecdotal and statistical indices seem to suggest that significant numbers of students struggle with these types of life skills and benefit from the resources that we currently offer. Student debt, litigation, and fluctuations in health care benefits and levels of usage are all on the rise. This appears to be a prudent juncture at which to reflect upon the role that life skills assistance, literacies, and resources might play in Penn State students’ learning.

This report is intended to raise questions about the extent to which the faculty might be involved in bolstering, adding to, or codifying the current resources available to students. A variety of means exist through which to infuse the Penn State educational experience with a purposeful degree of life skills development. Life skills development, we opine, follows a process that, while occurring regularly at Penn State, is not adequately promoted or analyzed.

Here are some central questions for discussion:

1. How do we cultivate and promote a shared understanding of the importance of developing financial, legal, and health care literacies in our students?
2. Would these life skill sets evolve through student services, university libraries, curricular structures, digital badges, information collating, or some combination?
3. What other realms of life skills and literacies – aside from financial, legal and health care -- could be emphasized?
4. Might a Penn State degree come to signify the mastery of a set of tools for negotiating the different venues in which the practical aspects of life unfold and the diverse realms -- including digital -- in which life skills and literacies are increasingly constructed? In what ways might the Senate contribute to this project?

These are our overarching queries. We have also compiled a brief overview of some of the resources that are currently available to students seeking help in three of the realms that our committee identified as being particularly in flux, and in demand: financial, legal, and health care.
Financial Literacy at Penn State

With financial literacy emerging as a must-have skill for the 21st century learner, universities, libraries and other educational institutions are taking steps to address this need. Pennsylvania libraries are engaged via the PA Forward initiative (http://www.paforward.org/) and Penn State University has a number of workshops and programs of its own.

Penn State University Libraries’ Collaborations and Partnerships

1) MoneyCounts: A Financial Literacy Series
   http://www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/researchguides/business/financialliteracy.html#moneycounts
   a. A monthly financial literacy workshop series hosted by University Libraries in Foster Auditorium, Paterno Library and presented by Dr. Daad Rizk, Financial Literacy Coordinator, Commission for Adult Learners
   b. Past workshops have included Budgeting, Credit Cards, Debt Management, Financial Literacy for Women, Getting Student Loans, Student Loan Repayment, Identity Theft, Mortgages, Spring Clean Financial Clutter, and Wage and Tax

2) Student Financial Education Center (SFEC)
   https://www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/business/sfec.html
   a. A peer-to-peer financial education program
   b. Students are welcome to drop in or make an appointment with trained Peer Educators to discuss personal finance problems
   c. A partnership between University Libraries and University Park Undergraduate Association (UPUA), with advisory support from faculty and staff in Commission for Adult Learners, College of Agricultural Sciences, Student Aid and Student Affairs
   d. As of October 2014, 9 Peer Educators trained in curriculum covering budgeting, credit and student loans
   e. Located in Schreyer Business Library office suite, Paterno Library
   f. Seeking opportunities for brief presentations to classes and student groups

Beyond Penn State University Libraries (note: this is not an exhaustive list)

1) Financial Literacy Webinars for World Campus
   http://student.worldcampus.psu.edu/paying-for-your-education/financial-literacy-series
   a. Presented by Dr. Daad Rizk

2) Making Ends Meet
   a. Presented by Dr. Daad Rizk for Outreach & Online Education and World Campus Financial Aid
b. Designed for adult learners, with a focus on budgeting and financial aid  
c. Piloted in Lewistown  

3) Personal finance-related courses  

a. AYFCE 270 Consumer and Financial Skills  
b. MATH 034 The Mathematics of Money  
c. FIN 108 Personal Finance  

**Legal Life Skills Resources at Penn State**

Our preliminary survey of the available resources identified a striking distinction between the resources available at UP vs. other campuses. There are courses available through the Law School and fields ranging from Business Law to Criminology or Labor and Employment Relations. We note that restrictions exist on eligibility to enroll in or audit courses through the Law School. Our preliminary survey, however, could not uncover a particular class that focused explicitly on the types of legal issues that would be of personal importance to our students (such as those pertaining to leasing, renting, harassment, and misdemeanors).

**Student Affairs Legal Services:**

Student Affairs has a robust Legal Services program available to University Park students. Created in 2008, Student Legal Services (SLS) is currently funded at $4 per student per semester level. Main mission of this office is to provide qualifying Penn State students with advice, representation, referrals and other legal services. It was originally established to protect the rights of students, and to provide them with access to the judicial system and to educate students about legal issues.

In 2014, SLS processed 1,525 intakes from qualifying students, up about 50% from the 1,016 intakes in 2013. Roughly 60% of these intakes represent criminal (mostly summary offenses and misdemeanors likely to qualify for ARD, Accelerated Rehabilitative Dispositions) and the remaining 40% involve civil matters (e.g., landlord tenant matters). SLS office enjoys a 91% student satisfaction. Their success is attested by saved or returned money to students (for 2014 $44,643.91) through various civil settlements and verdicts, and representation provided to 86 students (worth $129,000).

To meet the needs of qualifying students, the office has grown from one full-time attorney to 3 full-time and 1 part-time attorneys, 2 full-time staff members and 2 law student assistants. At its current capacity, SLS provides services to 1 in 30 students and has 1 attorney for every 13,000 students. A recent benchmarking reveals the capacity of a well-established SLS office that offers civil and criminal representation to be 1 in 20 to 25 students.
Although services are free, students are responsible for costs and expenses related to the case. These might include:

- Fines
- Court costs
- Restitution
- Filing fees
- Transportation costs (students are responsible for getting themselves to court hearings)
- A judgment imposed by the court

SLS office provides document preparation (simple wills, power of attorneys, living wills); notary services; educational presentations; and consultation, referrals, and representation on a wide variety of issues, including:

- taxes
- patent
- copyright
- trademark
- felony criminal charges
- contested divorce or custody
- class action lawsuits
- medical malpractice or personal injury

**Limitations on Services**

They are only available to University Park students with paid activity fees. They can't give someone advice for another person (such as when a student completes the intake form to ask a question on behalf of a non-student friend). Further, COI condition of the case or its location can prevent from handling it directly; in such cases, SLS may provide referrals. Examples of COI or location restrictions include:

**Conflict of Interest**

- cases against the University or its employees
- cases against other students
- cases where other students will likely be involved in an adversarial way, such as where a student may be called as a witness for the opposing party

**Location**

- out of county (They can often provide advice, but not representation)
- out of state
In general, SLS refers student entrepreneurs to Small Business Development Center although they can help with business formation. SLS does not give tax advice; they refer students to the VITA tax assistance program that is jointly run by Smeal College of Business and the Law School to help students with income tax preparation. Global Programs Office provides similar services for international students.

*Note: Information on the SLS services was compiled from the website for the office, as well as through a series of communications with SLS Director Kelly Mroz, Esq.*

**Health Care Life Skill Development**

- There are myriad courses that focus on health and wellness in departments ranging from Kinesiology, to Bio-behavioral Health, to Psychology.
- No courses have been identified that focus primarily on the health care and insurance systems themselves.
- University Health Services has an Insurance Office which, though primarily focused on administering the Aetna student insurance, can also help students with questions about other plans.
- World Campus students are not currently eligible to purchase student health insurance.
- Some Commonwealth campuses have health and wellness centers, but many more have nurses or nurse practitioners, or a dedicated staff member who can refer students to local health professionals.
- Urgent Care (walk-in only) services are available at UHS on Saturdays from 11:00am to 3:00pm during the Fall and Spring semesters.
- Services provided at UHS are 100% covered for students that have the University’s health insurance. There are costs incurred for services provided outside of UHS.
- Students on Medicaid are not covered by UHS. Additionally, while UHS does accept some third-party insurances, Geisinger Health Plan will not pay for services at UHS.
- Penn State students are not eligible to receive the services of the local free clinic (CVIM).

**MENTAL HEALTH**

- According to the International Association of Counseling Services, Inc., which accredits Penn State’s Center for Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), “Every effort should be made to maintain minimum staffing ratios in the range of one FTE [full-time equivalent] professional staff member (excluding trainees) for every 1,000-1500 students, depending on services offered and other campus mental health agencies” (section V.C.1 of the Standards for University and College Counseling Services).
• Given this CAPS is currently under staffed and would need to nearly double its force in order to meet current need.
• Counseling and Psychological services are almost non-existent at Commonwealth campuses and are not available to World Campus students (NB: 17 percent of World Campus students are veterans or current military).
• CAPS offers a local provider data base
• Active Minds is a student group that aims to combat the stigma of mental health, they put on and co-sponsor events, and offer mental health support for students.

Respectfully submitted by:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE
• Mary Miles, Chair
• Enica Castañeda, Vice Chair
• Steven L. Andelin
• Anand R. Ganjam
• Kevin Harwell
• Gül E. Kremer
• Barrett A. Lee
• Emily J. McDonald
• Daniel F. Murphy
• Alexei Novikov
• Rosemarie Owoc
• Lisa L. Sherwood
• Damon R. Sims
• Bradley J. Sottile
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

Revisions to Senate Policy 34-20 (Registration)

(Legislative)

Introduction & Rationale

Registration at Penn State is currently a two-part process: students initiate registration by scheduling classes and complete it by paying tuition and fees or confirming that tuition and fees are completely satisfied through student financial aid. Aid disburses to the student account near the beginning of the semester for students who have completed registration. This structure is confusing to students and families who often believe that registration is complete once classes are scheduled. There are several ramifications for students who have not completed registration: financial aid does not disburse, they are not permitted to add additional courses, register for future semesters, or process late drops. Faculty are not able to submit final grades for these students. If any outstanding balance is not paid by the last day of classes, or if registration is not confirmed by students who do not have any out-of-pocket expenses, students have the opportunity to complete registration retroactively, but may not use any student financial aid sources to do so.

The implementation of a new student information system provides the opportunity to change this process, making it clearer to our students and their families, and providing Penn State with better avenues for collecting tuition and fees. Representatives on the LionPATH project from the Bursar’s Office, Office of the University Registrar, Office of Student Aid, and the campuses have developed a new approach to registration at Penn State.

Under the new plan, students will agree to the Student Financial Responsibility Statement that clearly outlines students’ responsibility to pay the tuition and fees incurred by registering for classes and also outlines the steps that may be taken by Penn State to ensure any outstanding bills are paid. These actions include imposing finance charges based on a percentage of the outstanding balance, placing holds on future semester registrations, possibly cancelling future semester schedules, withholding transcripts and diplomas, and pursuing collection activity on delinquent accounts. The change in process will also include a comprehensive plan for communicating with continuing and new students. Students will be considered officially enrolled at the time they register for classes. Financial aid will continue to disburse at the beginning of the term. Students will be able to drop and add classes, including late drop, and instructors will be able to grade all students at the end of the semester.

Recommendations

Most of the policy and procedure changes needed to implement this new process will occur in the Academic Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual. However, minor changes are needed in Senate Policy 34-20 (Registration) to remove references to the need to have tuition and charges paid before students will be considered officially enrolled.
Revised Policy: 34-20 Registration

Students register at specified times and locations for credit courses. Although the registration procedures are generally uniform, there are variations at some locations. Information on registration for courses offered through Continuing Education is available from the Office of Continuing Education at each location or service area.

Students are strongly urged to consult with their adviser before registering for any credit course regardless of delivery system. No student shall be permitted to be enrolled for more than a typical credit load (see Section 34-52) in any one semester by all delivery systems without consultation with the student’s academic adviser.

No student is permitted to register for another student or to permit anyone to register on the student’s behalf. Students are expected to register during the assigned time.

Students are not considered officially enrolled unless tuition and charges for the semester have been paid or arrangements for payment have been made.

Students are considered officially enrolled when they have

1. Agreed to the Student Financial Responsibility Statement which outlines student financial obligations and
2. Registered for courses.

Effective Date: Upon approval by the Senate and revision of relevant AAPPM policies by the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education for Fall 2016

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

- Richard W. Robinett, Chair
- Martha W. Aynardi
- Albert L. Bartlett
- Stephen H. Browne
- Joseph T. Chletos
- Rachel L. Fore
- Anna M. Griswold
- David C. Han
- Robert A. Kubat
- David Kuskowski
- John Marsh
- Eugene L. McFeely
• Richard Singer
• Douglas E. Wolfe
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6b (Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

Rationale:

Articulation agreements are put into place as jointly sponsored agreements between Penn State (specifically, individual units of the University) and other higher education institutions. These agreements have been in place, in some cases, for over 50 years. While there is an AAPPM policy (AD-11) that outlines how new agreements are submitted and processed, there is no outline for processing of revisions/renewals. However, the University Faculty Senate process for both original and revised/renewed agreements seems somewhat ambiguous and unstructured. Further, reviews of proposed articulation agreements may be inconsistent due to turnover of committee members and loss of associated ‘institutional memory’ as well as the sporadic submission of proposals. Finally, policy AD-11 requires periodic review of existing articulation agreements. A mechanism that would ensure timely review is needed.

Recommendation: Create a new standing subcommittee dedicated to dealing with articulation review.

Bold type indicates new wording; strikethroughs indicate deleted wording.

1. Membership:
   (i) At least ten elected faculty senators
   (ii) One undergraduate student senator
   (iii) Executive Director for Undergraduate Admissions* (iv) The University Registrar*
   (v) The Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Director for Student Aid*

2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

3. Duties: The Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid shall initiate legislation relating to academic admissions and readmission standards for the Senate Policies and Procedures for Undergraduate Students. It shall make recommendations on policies concerning the effect that Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid procedures have on the attainment of the University’s overall educational objectives. It shall be the University Faculty Senate advisory body to the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Administration and the Registrar, and
it shall maintain liaison with other University officials in these areas. It shall be the 
University Faculty Senate advisory body to the Assistant Vice Provost for Student Aid 
for responsibilities related to student aid. It shall be concerned with policies involving 
student awards, scholarships, and student aid. It shall have the authority to act on 
individual problems of reinstatement and certification of credit referred to it by the Vice 
Provost for Enrollment Management and Administration or the Registrar.

4. Standing Subcommittee on Articulation

The ARSSA articulation review subcommittee membership shall include two 
faculty from ARSSA, including the Vice-Chair of ARSSA, who serves as chair, in 
addition to three other representatives: one from the Undergraduate Admissions 
Office, one from the Office of Student Aid, and one from the Office of the University 
Registrar. The University Faculty Senate Office (Senate Office) shall facilitate 
composition by requesting those offices to identify representatives.

The subcommittee shall review articulation agreements to ensure they adhere to the 
current university policies and provide final recommendations to the entire ARSSA 
committee for approval. Recommendations are forwarded to the Office of 
Undergraduate Education for final University approval and implementation.

Articulation Agreement submissions will include:

For New Submissions:
   1. A cover memo stating what is included
   2. The new proposal
   3. The agreement

For Renewal/Revision/Termination of Agreement:
   1. A cover memo stating what is included
   2. The former proposal, with addendum either noting changes to the 
      proposal or stating no changes have been made.
   3. The agreement, or former agreement if no changes have been made.
   4. An addendum detailing changes made and justification for those changes
   5. For renewals, an addendum that includes statistics on the number of 
      students participating since initial approval or last review.
   6. For termination, an explanation of the reason for discontinuation and 
      plan for phase out.

Five Year Review:
   1. A cover memo stating from sponsoring unit what is included
   2. The agreement for review
   3. Statistics on the number of students involved per year and the number of 
      students completing their degree through the agreement.

The Senate Office, with assistance from the Office of Undergraduate Education, 
shall be responsible for collecting the necessary information for, and the submission 
of, any new, revised, or five year review articulation agreements to ARSSA. The
Senate Office will provide brief annual overviews to subcommittee members on policies and workflow procedures vetting and providing feedback on the proposals.

4. Mandated reports: none. The Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

*nonvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Mohamad A. Ansari
- Larry C. Backer
- John W. Bagby
- Dawn G. Blasko
- Mark A. Casteel, Chair
- Michael J. Chorney
- Patricia M. Hinchey, Vice Chair
- Pamela P. Hufnagel
- Jonna M. Kulikowich
- Jeffrey A. Laman
- Christopher P. Long
- Kim C. Steiner
- James A. Strauss
- Brenton M. Yarnal
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Changes to the Bylaws, Article II (SENATE COUNCIL), Section 1

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

From time to time, reports on topics of potential interest to the University Faculty Senate and (or) the university community are brought forward by individuals or groups outside the Senate, for consideration by Senate Council. Dissemination of such information is described in Article I, Section 1(d) of the Senate Constitution. In certain situations, such as the annual budget informational report presented by the Executive Vice President and Provost, a standing committee of the Senate has sponsored the report. Recently, other reports prepared and submitted by groups external to the Senate have not had an obvious sponsor, resulting in an awkward situation whereby the report was presented in a forensic session, when an informational report would have been more appropriate. A clear mechanism is needed for Senate Council to consider reports from individuals or groups external to the Senate, while avoiding confusion regarding the origin of such reports or any appearance of endorsement by the Senate.

The proposed changes to the Bylaws are intended to remedy the situation described above.

Bold type indicates new wording; strikethroughs indicate deleted wording.

SECTION 1

Duties:

(a) It shall ensure that the Senate addresses issues of major concern to the faculty voting units and the faculty as a whole.

(b) It may initiate Senate legislation in the same manner as a standing committee. In addition, it may charge a standing committee of the Senate to investigate matters deemed appropriate by the Council.

(c) It shall provide a mechanism for Council members’ review of all legislative, forensic, advisory/consultative, and informational reports submitted for the Senate Agenda. If Council determines the report is adequately prepared, it will be submitted to the Senate Agenda, with the following options for informational reports:

1. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda for presentation and discussion.
2. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda only for the purpose of dissemination to the Senate and University community.

3. Place other informational reports, not otherwise sponsored by any Senate Committees, on the Senate agenda for either presentation and discussion or for the purpose of dissemination to the Senate and University community.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
- Mohamad A. Ansari
- Larry C. Backer
- John W. Bagby
- Dawn G. Blasko
- Mark A. Casteel, Chair
- Michael J. Chorney
- Patricia M. Hinchey, Vice Chair
- Pamela P. Hufnagel
- Jonna M. Kulikowich
- Christopher P. Long
- Robert D. Ricketts
- Kim C. Steiner
- James A. Strauss
- Brenton M. Yarnal
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Report on Policy AD77, Engaging in Outside Professional Activities
(Conflict of Commitment)

(Advisory/Consultative)

Introduction

The Vice-President for Administration approved Penn State Policy AD77, Engaging in Outside Professional Activities (Conflict of Commitment) on February 18, 2013. The policy was published on February 22, 2013, and went into effect that same day.1

As one task for the 2014-2015 academic year, the Committee on Committees and Rules has charged the Committee on Faculty Affairs (the “Committee”) with preparing an Advisory and Consultative report on AD77. This report responds to that charge. The Committee sought input on concerns with AD77 from its own membership, the Senate Officers, and the chairs of other Senate committees. Based on the information it acquired from these sources, the Committee followed up with several faculty members in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences who had raised specific concerns about the policy.

Recommendations

1. The Committee concludes that Bullet Point 5 under “Policy” is so overbroad as to be unworkable in its current form. Actual enforcement of a policy prohibiting faculty members from “teaching at another institution” absent “prior written approval” from two senior administrators would, in the view of the Committee, be inconsistent with Penn State Policy HR64, Academic Freedom.4

---

1 The current version of AD77 is available at: https://guru.psu.edu/policies/AD77.html. The policy indicates that an “[e]ditorial change” was made on August 21, 2014.

2 Id.

3 Id.

4 The current version of HR64 is available at: https://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr64.html. HR64 provides in part:

AS A CITIZEN:

Faculty members are citizens, members of learned professions, and representatives of this University. When the faculty member speaks or writes as a citizen, the faculty member shall be free from institutional censorship or discipline . . . .
It would also interfere with the ability of faculty members to fulfill their obligation of service through “[s]ervice to society as a representative of the University.” In many cases, the type of service a faculty member is most qualified to provide “to society as a representative of the University” is in fact teaching—through lectures, presentations, writing in the popular press, legislative testimony, and numerous other activities—in the faculty member’s area of expertise. Except in those unusual cases where this teaching could directly compete, in a significant manner, with revenue-generating University activities, these activities should not require any type of prior approval from unit or University administrators.

The Committee considered the possibility of recommending that AD77 be amended in a manner that spells out the type of teaching activity that is, and is not, permitted under the policy. Following discussion, the Committee determined that this is not desirable. Outside teaching activity that is appropriate for a faculty member in one unit may not be appropriate for a faculty member in another unit. Moreover, whether particular outside teaching activity is appropriate will likely depend in part on whether the University offers a revenue-generating program that competes with the outside teaching activity in question.

The Committee is aware of one College, the Smeal College of Business, which has implemented its own guidelines for the implementation of AD77. The Committee concludes that College-level guidelines of this type are a more appropriate location for specific information about what teaching activities require administrative approval.

AS RELATED TO THE UNIVERSITY:

Faculty members are free to speak and write on governance issues of their respective departments, colleges, units, libraries, and of the University as a whole, and are free to speak and write on all matters related to their professional duties without institutional discipline or restraint.

IN INSTRUCTIONAL ROLES:

Academic freedom is also inherent in faculty members’ roles in the classroom and in related instructional activities.

PSU Policy HR64, Academic Freedom.


6 Id.

7 Smeal Guidelines for AD-77 Policy. The text of the Smeal guidelines is attached as an Appendix to this report.
Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the Vice-President for Administration add the following to the current policy as Bullet Point 5:

- Each College/Unit must promulgate its own set of Guidelines for the implementation of AD77. These guidelines should, at a minimum, identify a representative set of teaching activities that do, and do not, require approval from the Budget Administrator and Budget Executive. They may also:
  - identify types of teaching activity that require approval only from a Dean or Department Chair
  - identify specific teaching activity that will not be approved under any circumstances
  - provide other clarifications the College deems appropriate.

Care should be taken to ensure that its guidelines are consistent with HR64, Academic Freedom. The Policy Steward for AD77 should maintain a single website displaying each College’s current Guidelines for the Implementation of AD77.

The Vice President for Administration should set a reasonable deadline for when colleges/units should have these guidelines in place.

The current Bullet Point 5 should become Bullet Point 6 (with current Bullet Point 6 becoming Bullet Point 7) and be amended to read:

- University employees are prohibited from teaching at another institution in a manner inconsistent with their College’s Guidelines for the Implementation of AD77 unless prior written approval is obtained from the Budget Administrator and Budget Executive. Courses (resident or online) taught at another institution must not compete with coursework offered by the University. For purposes of this Policy, there is no distinction between resident or online teaching.

2. The Committee concludes that the language “Outside activities shall not . . . require an excessive amount of time . . . .” (in Paragraph 2 under “Purpose”) is phrased in a manner that appears to go beyond any reasonable intent for the policy. In particular, the Committee is concerned by the possibility that this language could be interpreted ungenerously to give University administrators authority to determine what faculty members do in their spare time, even when it does not interfere with their work for the University.

To address this concern, the Committee recommends that the paragraph be revised as follows:

University employees are encouraged to engage in outside activities when such activities enhance the mission of the University and do not compete with the
University. Examples of outside activities that enhance the University’s mission include the following: serving on a peer review boards, serving as a referee for a scholarly journal, attending or presenting at a professional meeting, visiting other sites in connection with accreditation/audits, etc. Employees’ primary professional duties and responsibilities are to the University, and such primary obligations require that employees be available and accessible to fulfill the obligations of their appointment. Outside activities shall not adversely affect the University’s interests or mission, or require a significant commitment excessive amount of time, that interferes with an employee’s primary University responsibilities, or competes with coursework or services provided by the University.

3. The Committee concludes that the statement “Outside activities shall not adversely affect the University’s interests or mission” (also in Paragraph 2 under “Purpose”) is also phrased in a manner that appears to go beyond any reasonable intent for the policy. In particular, the Committee is concerned by the possibility that this language could be interpreted ungenerously to prohibit faculty members from criticizing policies or decisions made by the University or its units.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the Vice-President for Administration add an additional sentence at the end of the last paragraph of the “Policy” section. The new sentence should read as follows: “This policy shall not be interpreted to interfere with any faculty member’s academic freedom (as defined in HR64, Academic Freedom), including his or her freedom to criticize University policies and decisions.”

With this addition and the alteration from Recommendation 2, above, the modified paragraph would then read as follows:

University employees are encouraged to engage in outside activities when such activities enhance the mission of the University and do not compete with the University. Examples of outside activities that enhance the University’s mission include the following: serving on a peer review boards, serving as a referee for a scholarly journal, attending or presenting at a professional meeting, visiting other sites in connection with accreditation/audits, etc. Employees’ primary professional duties and responsibilities are to the University, and such primary obligations require that employees be available and accessible to fulfill the obligations of their appointment. Outside activities shall not adversely affect the University’s interests or mission, or require a significant commitment excessive amount of time, that interferes with an employee’s primary University responsibilities, or competes with coursework or services provided by the University. This policy shall not be interpreted to interfere with any faculty member’s academic freedom (as defined in HR64, Academic Freedom), including his or her freedom to criticize University policies and decisions.
Appendix

The text of the Smeal document setting out guidelines for the implementation of AD77 is set out below:

Smeal Guidelines for AD-77 Policy

The AD-77 policy (see http://guru.psu.edu/policies/AD77.html) addresses conflict of commitment in the professional activities of faculty. Most of the policy integrates existing policy on external activities (consulting, conflict of interest) and the use of university resources. There is a new element, however:

“University employees are prohibited from teaching at another institution unless prior written approval is obtained from the Budget Administrator and Budget Executive. Courses (resident or online) taught at another institution must not compete with coursework offered by the University. For purposes of this Policy, there is no distinction between resident or online teaching.”

This part of the policy was established after Penn State central administration found PSU faculty with multiple full-time (even tenured) appointments at different institutions, and faculty teaching online for institutions such as Strayer in direct competition with Penn State offerings. Penn State faculty teach in many external settings that are appropriate and beneficial to them and to Penn State. To avoid having to check with the administration on every possible external teaching activity (including Sunday school!) the Dean’s Office has established the following guidelines to help you decide when you need to seek prior approval.

The following activities do not require pre-approval by the Budget Administrator and Budget Executive:

• Giving a seminar or short course at another institution.
• Serving on a Doctoral or Master’s committee at another institution, when any compensation is only for travel expenses and perhaps a small ($1,000 or less) honorarium.
• Any teaching that is not for academic credit, including professional education courses for licencing, etc.
• Any teaching that is not in the general area of expertise of your appointment at Penn State.
• Teaching by our FT-2 faculty (but department chairs should be aware of other teaching commitments).

Academic activities of the following types require pre-approval by the Budget Administrator and Budget Executive:

• Teaching/research appointments (even short) that include intellectual property agreements (may be permitted).
• Teaching for credit at another institution of higher education (may be permitted, particularly for 1-year sabbatical, though unlikely if at an online institution).
• Chairing Ph.D. committees at another institution of higher education (may be permitted).
• Holding an honorary chair at another institution (may be permitted).
• Lab chairing at another institution of higher education (will not generally be permitted).

The following academic activities will not be approved:

• Tenure at another institution of higher education.
• Teaching for an online institution such as the University of Phoenix or Strayer University.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

- Harold W. Aurand
- David M. Babb
- Michael Bérubé
- Blannie E. Bowen
- Thomas Brown
- Victor W. Brunsden
- Diane C. Ebken
- Gary L. Gray
- Betty J. Harper
- Rosemary Jolly
- Lawrence E. Kass
- Kenneth C. Keiler
- Patricia B. Koch, Chair
- Gretchen Kuldau
- William C. Lasher
- Angela R. Linse
- Barrie E. Litzky
- Salvatore A. Marsico
- Margaret G. Meloy
- Rajen Mookerjee
- Adam I. Muchmore
- Ann Ouyang
- Brad Pinter, Vice Chair
- Esther S. Prins
- Timothy D. Pyatt
- Andrew Schulz
- Eileen M. Trauth
- Jane M. Wilburne
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

Employee Contributions to Penn State’s Self-Insured Health Care Costs

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the President

Background

This report makes recommendations for the process of setting health care plan premiums. The process is grounded in the premise that the entire Penn State community is a single group, geographically dispersed. As a group, we constitute a single risk pool and a responsibility by each member to all members of the group to provide quality health care at an equitable individual cost. The committee supports the introduction of new plans and contribution strategies designed to lower overall health care costs and to achieve equitable employee contributions across income levels and plan options.

The report provides recommendations to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To more clearly define employee contributions to the health insurance system to include premiums, co-pays, deductibles, coinsurance, and surcharges.

2. To reaffirm the university's longstanding commitments to cover 80% of employee's and 70% of dependent's medical expenses under the 1998 Joint Committee on Benefits.

3. To call for substantial revisions to steep benefits contributions indexing instituted in 2014, based on the framework outlined in the August 30, 2011 Senate Benefits Committee report.

4. To establish an equitable system of benefits support for all faculty and staff by requiring the university to contribute an equal dollar contribution to employees within the same income bracket across different health plans.

5. To require the university to be more transparent in reporting the support it provides employees at different income levels and within different health insurance plans.
1. Redefining Employee Contribution to Health Insurance

Rationale

The university has a longstanding commitment to cover approximately 80% employee/70% family member of total health care expenses, leaving the balance to be contributed by employees. Prior to 2011, employee contributions were monthly premiums. Since 2011, the university has introduced deductibles, coinsurance, and fees that result in significant new out-of-pocket expenses to employees. When out-of-pocket expenses and fees are not classified as employee contributions, the full percentage of employee contribution to the total health care cost of the Penn State group is hidden, and the university percent of contribution in comparison to employee premiums only is over-reported. To accurately evaluate the policy of 20% employee/30% dependent contribution endorsed by the Faculty Senate and Administration in the 1998 Joint Committee on the Future of Benefits Report (when premiums were the only form of contribution), all information released on contributions to health care should include all sources of contribution by employees and the university.

When the total cost of health care to the entire group includes contributions made by subscribers that are considered out-of-pocket expenses, the percentage of contribution between employee and university can be accurately examined. As the “2014 Cost Sharing by Plan” bar chart 1.1 below indicates, employee premiums and university contributions comprise only 91% of costs for those enrolled in the PPO Blue Plan, 85% of costs for those enrolled in the PPO Savings Plan, and an average of 90% across the entire group enrolled in both plans. Out-of-pocket contributions provide a substantial employee contribution to the entire group’s health care costs, amounting to 9% for the PPO Blue, 15% for the PPO Savings, and 10% across the entire PSU group adjusted for plan, tier level, and indexing.
Figure 1.1 illustrates how the PPO Blue plan includes a substantially higher employee contribution than the PPO Savings Plan. Employees in the PPO Blue plan pay 18% of the cost of their plan in premium and 9% in out of pocket costs, while employees in the PPO Savings plan pay 5% in premium, receive 5% for their Health Savings Account from the University, and pay 15% in out of pocket costs. (Figure ©Towers Watson 2014)

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Employee contributions to health care shall be reported to include all paid premiums, co-pays, deductibles, coinsurance, and surcharges.

2. Establishing Employee Contributions Based on 1998 Joint Committee on Benefits

Rationale

The 1998 Joint Committee on the Future of Benefits established the goal of phasing in over 7 years an employee contribution level of 20% for the individual employee and 30% for spouse and family members to health care. Over the time this recommendation was implemented by the university (it was achieved by the 2008 benefit year), it applied only to employee premiums as no other form of employee contribution was made to meet the total health care costs known as
the total Estimated Allowed Charges to the entire Penn State group. Since 2011, deductibles, coinsurance, and surcharge fees were introduced to transfer additional health care costs to employee out-of-pocket contributions.

The above bar graph 1.1 shows the total employee contribution is 27% for the PPO Blue Plan, 20% for the PPO Savings Plan, and 26% for the combined adjusted average. Table 2.1 below shows the number enrolled in 2014 at each tier level within the two available plans. Each tier level would have an expected employee contribution based on a blend of the 20% employee/30% dependent contribution levels and the number of individuals covered on average for each tier is indicated in parenthesis in column 1. Using the number enrolled in a plan at each tier, a weighted average can be calculated to determine the overall % of employee contributions to be expected for each plan. For the PPO Blue Plan, the weighted average contribution of 23.99% is lower than the actual 2014 employee contribution of 27% to that plan, thus employee contributions exceeded the 20% employee/30% dependent contribution level for the PPO Blue plan by 3.0%. For the PPO Savings Plan, the weighted average of 24.38% is higher than the actual 2014 employee contribution of 20%, thus employee contributions fell short of the 20% employee/30% family contribution level for the PPO Savings plan by 4.4%.

Table 2.1 2014 Enrollment in Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPO Blue</th>
<th>Contribution Expected</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>% of total enrolled</th>
<th>Weighted Average Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual (1)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>39.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person (2)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Children (3)</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>9.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (4)</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>33.62%</td>
<td>23.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPO Savings</th>
<th>Contribution Expected</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>% of total enrolled</th>
<th>Weighted Average Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual (1)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>36.62%</td>
<td>24.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person (2)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>12.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Children (3)</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (4)</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>45.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PPO Savings plan includes a Health Savings Account (HSA) and in 2014 and 2015 the university is contributing $400 individual/$800 family to this account for each plan holder. The decision by the university to contribute to this HSA account is made yearly. In bar graph 1.1 above, “2014 Cost Sharing by Plan,” the HSA contribution equals 5% from the university toward the PPO Savings plan. If this contribution was paid into the HSA account by the employee instead of the university, then the total employee contribution to the PPO Savings plan would be 25% and the university contribution would be 75%; this would then closely align the PPO Savings plan 2014 employee contributions with a 24.38% weighted average contribution based on 20% employee/30% family contribution levels.
Taken together, recommendations 1 & 2 establish employee contributions as a combination of premiums and out-of-pocket costs. The out-of-pocket costs for the PPO Blue Savings plan includes both the 15% contributed by employees and the 5% contributed to the HSA account by the university, for a combined total of 20%. The out-of-pocket costs for the PPO Blue are 9%. The key difference between the PPO Blue and PPO Savings plans should be the out-of-pocket costs, which using the 2014 contribution data, are 11% higher for the PPO Savings plan.

In setting premium contributions for the next year, if out-of-pocket costs are projected at 9% for the PPO Blue plan, then premiums would make up the remaining employee contribution at each tier level to achieve the 20% employee/30% dependent contribution levels appropriate for that tier. For example, premiums for the individual PPO Blue plan would require an additional employee contribution of 11%, while premiums for the family PPO Blue plan would require an additional employee contribution of 18.5%. If out-of-pocket costs are projected at 20% for the PPO Savings plan, then premiums would make up the remaining employee contribution at each tier level to achieve the 20% employee/30% dependent contribution levels. For example, premiums for the individual PPO Savings plan would require an additional employee contribution of 5%, while premiums for the family PPO Savings plan would require an additional 7.5%.

These employee premium contribution levels would be adjusted for income indexing proportionately equal across both PPO Blue and Savings plans. The level of contribution from the university to both plans would be equal in dollars at each tier based on the 20% employee/30% dependent contribution level, and the difference would be made up by employee contributions through premiums and out-of-pocket expenses. The employee contribution would differ between the two plans based on indexing and on different ratios of premium to out-of-pocket contributions. The PPO Savings plan has a lower premium because it includes a tax-free HSA account to meet the higher percentage of out-of-pocket costs.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

The employee contributions to health care costs shall not exceed the average of 20% employee/30% dependent for the total Estimated Allowed Charges required to provide health care to the entire Penn State group.

3. Index Tiered Benefits Contribution Rates Base on August 30, 2011 Senate Report

Rationale

Concerned that rising healthcare costs were having a disproportionately harmful impact on lower paid university employees, Human Resources and the Faculty Benefits Committee drafted a report outlining possible changes to benefits contributions. Whereas contributions to the health insurance system had heretofore been based on a flat fee depending on the employee’s health insurance plan, the August 30, 2011 report proposed a tiered contribution system, wherein
employees earning under $45,000 would contribute to the health insurance system based on a fixed percentage of their salary rather than a flat fee. Employees earning more than $45,000 would contribute gradually higher amounts based on income. The report recommended adjusting contributions based on five principles:

1. Employee contribution for healthcare based on annual base salary;
2. Those making $45,000 or less will contribute the flat percentage as indicated on the chart;
3. Those making over $45,000 will contribute a percentage that has been modeled by actuarial experts; the basic premise of the model is that the more an individual earns, the more the individual will pay toward healthcare;
4. This model provides for a cap of the employee contribution at an annual base salary of $121,000;
5. Monthly and annual savings for employees would be significant for the majority of faculty and staff based on this model.

Under the rates implemented in 2012 and 2013, as outlined in the 2011 report, the highest income earners would pay roughly twice as much for insurance as lower income employees, based on a percentage of salary that declined as salaries increased above $45,000. For 2014 (and continued into 2015) the university implemented a revised indexing plan wherein employees paid a flat percentage of income for each tier at all salary levels up to $140,000. Table 3.1 below presents the different percentages under the first indexing plan in 2013 and revised plan in 2014.

Table 3.1: Percentages of contribution/salary for employee premiums to the PPO Blue Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPO Blue Plan</th>
<th>$45,000</th>
<th>$75,000</th>
<th>$100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013 Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Premium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>16.99%</td>
<td>18.91%</td>
<td>20.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>18.31%</td>
<td>20.41%</td>
<td>22.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Premium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>13.61%</td>
<td>22.69%</td>
<td>30.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 illustrates how the change in insurance contributions changed from 2013 to 2014 with the introduction of benefits contributions based on a flat percentage of salary. In 2013, an employee earning $45,000 a year paid 6.69% of his/her salary to pay for a family plan, while an employee earning $100,000 paid 3.64% of his/her salary for the same plan. In 2014, all employees earning up to $140,000 paid 5.43% of their salary for a family plan. The revised system created potentially large increases in premium contributions for employees earning more than $60,000 a year. ©Towers Watson 2014 (October 21, 2014 Report)

The 2012 & 2013 modest indexing plan resulted in a significant decline in premium contributions for those earning under $45,000, without a substantial increase in premiums for
higher income employees. The percent of premium contribution ranged between 16.99% and 22.17% between the PPO Blue plan tiers across all income levels. When adding the 2014 out-of-pocket costs of 9% to each premium level, the full employee contribution slightly exceeds the 20% employee/ 30% dependent contribution levels (the exact out-of-pocket costs for the 2012 and 2013 years are unavailable).

The 2014 and 2015 revised rates resulted in a decrease in premium contributions for employees earning under $45,000 a year from 16.99% to 12.73%, but simultaneously created substantial premium increases for those earning more than $100,000 a year from 20.53% to 28.28%. When adding the 2014 out-of-pocket costs of 9% to each premium level, employees earning under $45,000 enrolled in the employee only plan contributed 21.73%, those at $75,000 contributed 30.21%, and those earning over $100,000 contributed 39.25%. All of these contribution levels exceed the 20% level of contribution expected for the employee only PPO Blue plan.

The line graphs below in Table 3.2: Health Contributions as a Percentage of Salary illustrate the premium contributions as a percentage of salary and real dollar premium contributions for the three different premium plans used in 2010 (before indexing), 2012 (modest indexing), and 2014 (steep indexing).

**Figure 3.2: Health Contributions as a Percentage of Salary**

![Graph showing health contributions as a percentage of salary.](image)

**Figure 3.2** Illustrates how the change in benefits contributions formulas altered the percentage and total dollars paid for premiums by employees at different income levels from 2010 to 2012 to 2014. In 2010 all faculty paid a flat contribution for an individual policy. This resulted in lower income employees paying a relatively high portion of their salary for health insurance premiums. In 2012 the contributions system was modified to lower to premiums for those earning under $45,000 a year, without any substantial alternations in the total dollars paid by higher income employees. With the adoption of employee premium contributions based on a flat percentage of income, some employees saw their health insurance rate double in one year. (Illustration prepared by the Faculty Benefits Committee)

In the “Health Contributions as a Percentage of Salary” graph, all employees in 2010 contributed the same premium for the PPO Blue plan, thus employees at lower incomes contributed as much as 9% of their total income as a health care premium. With the 2012 modest indexing, employees contributed based on income and the lower premium contributions by those with incomes below $45,000 were offset by higher premium contributions from those earning more. This indexing strategy reduced the percentage of income contributed to premiums by lower paid
employees to nearly 4%, and set premiums for salaries over $45,000 that closely follow the percent of income they had contributed in previous years. Even though the percentage of salary for employees earning more than $45,000 tracked the lower percentages paid for premiums in earlier years, the “Monthly Healthcare Contributions” graph shows that additional dollars paid by higher income employees balanced the premium dollars saved by lower income employees.

In 2014, a flat percentage was used across all income levels for each plan and tier, thus those enrolled in the PPO Blue plan with incomes above $60,000 (the median income for enrolled employees) contributed significantly more in dollars than what was required to offset the lower premiums contributed by those in the same PPO Blue plan below $60,000. Employees earning in excess of $100,000 saw insurance premium rates effectively double again from 2013 premiums in terms of real dollars. The 2014 indexing strategy generated a far greater contribution from employees at higher income levels in the PPO Blue plan than was required to reduce premiums for employees at lower incomes. The “Monthly Healthcare Contributions” graph in Table 3.2 illustrates the steep increase in premium dollars contributed by employees with incomes above $60,000. The 2014 indexing strategy to apply a flat percentage to individual employee incomes based on their plan and tier level created inequities within the group in employee premium contributions.

Whatever the deficiencies in the 2012 indexing plan, the revised rates, introduced in 2014 represent a radical departure from the rate structures recommended by the Faculty Benefits Committee in their 2011 report. As the substantial increase in contributions from higher income employees did not result in an equal reciprocal decrease in contributions of lower paid employees within the same PPO Blue plan, the 2014 and 2015 steep indexing generates excess funding from employee premiums, and certainly does not meet the objectives outlined in the August 30, 2011 Faculty Benefits Committee report.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:**

Income based employee insurance contributions shall be reset to an indexing plan similar to 2012 and 2013, as described in the August 30, 2011 Senate Benefits Committee report. Except for employees earning under $45,000 (as outlined in the 2011 report), the University shall not set insurance contributions based on a fixed flat percentage across all income levels. Any deviations from the 2011 framework as implemented in 2012 and 2013 shall be done in consultation with the Faculty Benefits Committee and the University Senate.

**4. Provide for Equitable Benefits Compensation within Income Brackets**

**Rationale:**

When the university implemented the revised steep indexing in 2014, and simultaneously introduced a new PPO Savings plan, the rate shifts had a dramatic impact on employee contributions, particularly for those earning more than $60,000 per year. The changes in employee premium contributions from 2013 to 2014 are detailed in Table 4.1 below.
### Table 4.1: Change in Employee Premium Contributions from 2013 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>25K</th>
<th>30K</th>
<th>35K</th>
<th>45K</th>
<th>50K</th>
<th>60K</th>
<th>70K</th>
<th>75K</th>
<th>85K</th>
<th>100K</th>
<th>140K</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPO Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>-$40,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>-$130,000</td>
<td>-$67,000</td>
<td>-$31,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$203,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + Spouse</td>
<td>-$22,000</td>
<td>-$37,000</td>
<td>-$116,000</td>
<td>-$55,000</td>
<td>-$24,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$888,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + Child(ren)</td>
<td>-$15,000</td>
<td>-$30,000</td>
<td>-$81,000</td>
<td>-$29,000</td>
<td>-$19,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-$62,000</td>
<td>-$92,000</td>
<td>-$295,000</td>
<td>-$130,000</td>
<td>-$78,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$1,861,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-$139,000</td>
<td>-$209,000</td>
<td>-$622,000</td>
<td>-$271,000</td>
<td>-$152,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$206,000</td>
<td>$509,000</td>
<td>$789,000</td>
<td>$1,606,000</td>
<td>$1,342,000</td>
<td>$3,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>-$18,000</td>
<td>-$25,000</td>
<td>-$56,000</td>
<td>-$42,000</td>
<td>-$72,000</td>
<td>-$68,000</td>
<td>-$29,000</td>
<td>-$55,000</td>
<td>-$55,000</td>
<td>-$52,000</td>
<td>-$31,000</td>
<td>-$503,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + Spouse</td>
<td>-$6,000</td>
<td>-$7,000</td>
<td>-$34,000</td>
<td>-$12,000</td>
<td>-$32,000</td>
<td>-$41,000</td>
<td>-$31,000</td>
<td>-$39,000</td>
<td>-$41,000</td>
<td>-$84,000</td>
<td>-$89,000</td>
<td>-$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + Child(ren)</td>
<td>-$2,000</td>
<td>-$6,000</td>
<td>-$30,000</td>
<td>-$7,000</td>
<td>-$13,000</td>
<td>-$28,000</td>
<td>-$8,000</td>
<td>-$11,000</td>
<td>-$19,000</td>
<td>-$28,000</td>
<td>-$20,000</td>
<td>-$172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-$10,000</td>
<td>-$25,000</td>
<td>-$114,000</td>
<td>-$90,000</td>
<td>-$159,000</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$231,000</td>
<td>$487,000</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
<td>$1,879,000</td>
<td>$1,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-$36,000</td>
<td>-$63,000</td>
<td>-$234,000</td>
<td>-$151,000</td>
<td>-$276,000</td>
<td>-$318,000</td>
<td>-$176,000</td>
<td>-$318,000</td>
<td>-$376,000</td>
<td>-$651,000</td>
<td>$471,000</td>
<td>$3,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-$175,000</td>
<td>-$272,000</td>
<td>-$856,000</td>
<td>-$422,000</td>
<td>-$428,000</td>
<td>-$73,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$191,000</td>
<td>$413,000</td>
<td>$955,000</td>
<td>$871,000</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Employees on PPO Blue who earn > $50,000 a year paid an additional $4.7 million in benefit contributions. All but $234,000 was redistributed to other employees in the form of contribution reductions.

Using financial estimates provided by the university’s benefits consultant Towers Watson, the committee concluded that the 2014 rate increases on employees earning more than $60,000 a year in the PPO Blue plan far exceeded the rate reductions provided to employees earning less than $60,000 a year. Of the $4.7 million in new contributions raised from employees earning more than $60,000 a year in the PPO Blue plan, only $1.4 million was used to reduce the contribution of those in the PPO Blue plan earning less than $60,000 a year. A large proportion of the new revenue, $3,304,000, from PPO Blue premiums became available to fund the entire PSU group’s total health care allowable costs. In comparison, the difference in premium contributions from 2013 to 2014 for employees who switched from the PPO Blue plan to the PPO Savings plan decreased by $3,070,000.

For 2014, employee premiums paid for both plans contributed only $234,000 new dollars towards the PSU group’s total health care allowable expenses for 2014. The increased premium contributions paid by employees in the PPO Blue plan made up almost exactly for the decreased premiums paid by employees moving to the PPO Savings plan; although, it was not possible to know the number of employees who would change plans prior to setting premium rates for 2014. Table 4.2 below, labeled “Differences in Penn State Contributions,” illustrates how the increases in employee contributions to the PPO Blue plan for employees in the PPO Savings plan.
Table 4.2 shows how, even within the same income bracket, Penn State provides additional health insurance premium support for most employees in the PPO Savings (high deductible) plan. An employee earning $140,000 a year on the PPO Blue family plan receives $3,200 less support in medical insurance premiums than an employee with the same income in the PPO Savings family plan.

Although Penn State requires higher premium contributions from higher income employees, the adjusted average cost of the insurance plans, labeled in the table 4.2 and 4.3 as “True Cost,” is the same at each tier level within a plan regardless of the employee income. For the PPO Blue plan, the True Cost of the insurance plan for an individual employee is approximately $515 a month. For a family plan, the PPO Blue plan costs $1,494 a month. This is the cost of the insurance plan only, and does not include out-of-pocket costs also contributed by the employee to meet the full cost of health care allowable expenses for the entire PSU group. For the PPO Savings plan, the True Cost of the insurance plan for an individual employee is approximately $451 a month, 12.4% lower than the PPO Blue plan. For a family plan, the PPO Savings plan costs $1,309 a month, 12.4% lower than the PPO Blue plan. The difference in true costs between the plans arises from the responsibility of the employee to pay more out-of-pocket costs, approximately 11% more, for health care costs in the PPO Savings plan.

The columns in the table 4.2 above, labeled “PPO Blue (Current)” show the university and employee contributions to the PPO Blue plan, and the percentage of the total true cost of the insurance plan contributed by employee premiums at four income levels ($25k, $60k, $100k and $140k). Note that given indexing based on a flat percentage of income, the actual premium contribution from employees range across these four example salaries, and are capped at $140k. Also, again note that out-of-pocket costs in both plans are contributions beyond the true cost of the plans that are necessary to meet the total health care allowable expenses for the entire PSU group. The cost of the insurance plan for individual only employees is $515 a month, and an employee earning $25k a year would contribute $36 a month, while an employee earning $140k a month would pay $204 per month.
The “PSU Contribution” column is determined by subtracting the employee premium contribution from the total cost of the insurance plan to reveal Penn State’s contribution for each income bracket. Using the previous example, for a single employee earning $25k a year, the cost of the insurance plan is $515 a month and their contribution is $36 a month, leaving the university to contribute $478 a month toward the plan for that employee. By contrast, for a single employee earning $140k a year, the total cost of the insurance plan is $515 a month and their contribution is $204 a month, leaving the university to contribute $310 a month for that employee.

The columns labeled “PPO Savings Plan (Current)” provide the estimates of the university contribution to that plan, again comparing the total cost of the plan to the employee contribution. Looking to the PPO Savings plan, for a single employee earning $25k a year, the cost of the insurance plan is $461 a month and their contribution is $10 a month, leaving the university to contribute $451 a month toward the plan for that employee. For a single employee in the PPO Savings plan earning $140k a year, the cost of the insurance is $461 a month and their contribution is $58 a month, leaving the university to contribute $403 a month for that employee.

With an indexed premium contribution structure, where higher paid employees pay a larger share of their health plan premium costs, we would expect Penn State to contribute more toward the healthcare costs of the employee making $25k a year than the employee earning $140k a year. And with two plans, we would expect the university contribution to the PPO Blue and PPO Savings plan to be the same at each tiered benefit level because the difference between the total cost of the two plans is made up by the higher out-of-pocket contributions from those enrolled in the PPO Savings plan. The calculations in the column labeled “Monthly Difference” and “Annual Difference” look at these two assumptions and reveal a different actuality.

Except for employees earning $25,000, the university contributes more in real dollars to the total costs of the PPO Savings plan even though this plan has a lower total cost of $461 as compared to the $515 for the PPO Blue plan. The differences are relatively small for employees at the $60k income range where those enrolled in the PPO Savings plan pay between $108 and $281 less in premiums per year. However, for employees at the $100k a year income threshold in the PPO Savings plan, the university is providing an extra $600 to $1,600 of premium per year over those in the PPO Blue plan. At $140k, the highest income threshold, employees in the PPO Savings Plan receive $1,100 and $3,200 in extra premium contribution from the university than their colleagues at the same income threshold in the PPO Blue plan.

What the above table 4.2 shows again is an unequal distribution in premium contributions between the two health care plans under the indexing formula implemented for 2014 and 2015. As a consequence, particularly for employees at the higher income levels, the PPO Savings plan becomes more attractive than its real underlying costs warrant if premiums were based on the original indexing plan recommended by the University Faculty Senate in 2011 and implemented in 2012 and 2013. This attractive inequity may have the effect of pushing employees into the low premium, high deductible PPO Savings plan. In their presentation to the faculty benefits committee on October 21st, Towers Watson, the University’s benefits consultant did confirm
that the revenue shifts highlighted in the tables above were not uncommon as organizations made the transition from traditional plans to high deductible plans. The movement of employees from the PPO Blue plan to the PPO Savings plan was 16% of Penn State’s benefits eligible employees in 2014. At the end of open enrollment for 2015, that figure increased only slightly to 16.9%.

To correct the inequitable distribution in employee contributions to premiums both within and between the PPO Blue and PPO Savings plan, the university shall adopt a policy of providing equitable premium contributions at each tier for employees at similar incomes regardless of the health care plan. Under a revised premium contribution, the university would set aside funds for employees at different income levels, providing identical support for employees regardless of their insurance program. Table 4.3 below, “Eliminating the Differences in Penn State Contributions” illustrates this policy.

**Table 4.3: Eliminating the Differences in Penn State Contributions by Health Plan and Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan by Income Bracket</th>
<th>PPO Blue (Revised)</th>
<th>PPO Savings (Revised)</th>
<th>Most by Difference</th>
<th>Annual Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU Contribution</td>
<td>Employee Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emp %</td>
<td>Emp %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Earning $25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$78.14</td>
<td>$74.90</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$84.25</td>
<td>$81.43</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$122.40</td>
<td>$119.85</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$137.16</td>
<td>$132.75</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Earning $50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$423.14</td>
<td>$423.14</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$392.28</td>
<td>$392.28</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$224.28</td>
<td>$224.28</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$224.28</td>
<td>$224.28</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Earning $100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$354.07</td>
<td>$354.07</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$317.62</td>
<td>$317.62</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$414.20</td>
<td>$414.20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$414.20</td>
<td>$414.20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Earning $140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$354.07</td>
<td>$354.07</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$317.62</td>
<td>$317.62</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$441.95</td>
<td>$441.95</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,091.25</td>
<td>$441.95</td>
<td>$441.95</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Under an revised plan Penn State would still the same benefits contributions to employees regardless of their health insurance choices.

**Figure 4.3 shows how rates might shift if Penn State provided the same level of premium support to employees in both the PPO Blue and PPO Savings plan. The revised rates would reduce the rates for employees currently in the PPO Blue plan while increasing the rates in the PPO Savings plan. This shift would occur because a revised plan would end the indirect subsidy established when Penn State provided additional financial support for most employees enrolled in the PPO Savings plan.

A single employee earning $60k a year would receive $429 per month in insurance premium support from the university whether he elected to enroll in PPO Blue or PPO Savings. Enrolling in the PPO Savings plan would still result in a lower employee premium contribution of $52 monthly, a 7.0% employee contribution, as compared to the PPO Blue plan at $86, a 16.7% employee contribution. The difference in premium contribution of 9-10% approximately equals the difference in contributions of 11% between the two plans in out-of-pocket costs. As you examine the difference in premiums between plans in table 4.3 above at each tier level, you note
an increase in employee premium contributions toward of the true cost of the insurance plan, and a consistent difference in the percentage of employee premium contributions between plans at 9-12% lower for the PPO Savings plan, reflective of that plan’s higher out-of-pocket contributions. At the $25k a year salary, an employee selecting the PPO Savings plan would actually have a premium contribution of zero dollars, and the excess University contribution shown could be redirected by the University to the HSA account for that employee.

A principle of equitable compensation would, in the short term, result in a modest drop in the rates of employees currently enrolled in the PPO Blue plan. Those in the PPO Savings plan (particularly those in the higher income brackets) would see a more substantial increase in order to achieve the expected contribution balance based on the 20% employee/30% dependent contribution level policy. These shifts would benefit the vast majority of employees, 83% of whom remain the PPO Blue plan. More importantly, the policy of equal university contribution to both plans would eliminate the inequitable contribution support provided to the PPO Savings plan as a consequence of premium levels priced below those required to fully fund the PPO Savings plan and above those required to fully fund the PPO Blue plan. Further, the extra contribution of 5% to the PPO Savings plan HSA account by the university artificially reduces the higher out-of-pocket costs that should accompany the PPO Savings plan, thus only adds to the already inequitable premium contributions between plans.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:**

The University shall provide an equal dollar contribution in premium support to employees at the same income level, regardless of the health insurance program in which they are enrolled.

**RECOMMENDATION 5:**

Human Resources shall publish yearly a table showing the per employee cost of insurance plans, the university’s and employee’s dollar contribution in premium support for individual employees, broken down by income bracket and insurance plans.

**RECOMMENDATION 6:**

The University shall not contribute extra dollars to the Health Savings Account of those enrolled in the PPO Savings plan beyond the dollar amount contributed to employees in any plan.
Conclusion

Beyond the foundational equity sought by the recommendations in this report, the committee is mindful of the importance of controlling healthcare expenditures both to maintain the fiscal health of the university, and to mitigate the possible impact of the so called “Cadillac” excise tax written into the Affordable Care Act.

The federal excise tax on healthcare, which begins in 2018, will levy a 40% tax on the value of health insurance premiums over and above $10,200 for individuals, and $27,500 for families. The tax is calculated only on the value of health insurance plans above the threshold. Any business that provide less than $10,200 of coverage per individual would not be subject to the excise tax. For example, after 2018, a business which provides an employee with $11,200 of health insurance coverage would pay $400 in excise taxes ($11,200 benefit - $10,200 cap = $1000 x 40% rate = $400 excise tax). While the $10,200 cap on so called “Cadillac” health insurance will grow at the rate of inflation (CPI), health spending rates generally grow more rapidly. While the ceiling for the excise tax was set well above most health insurance plans, by indexing the rate to the CPI (rather than medical inflation) the tax will gradually place burdens on a growing proportion of US businesses.

The excise tax poses no immediate threat to Penn State employees as the university insurance is presently well below the threshold defined by the ACA. The university’s benefits consultant Towers Watson reports that the annual projected costs of the medical/pharmacy plans for those enrolled in the more expensive PPO Blue system runs $6,228 a year for individuals and $18,069 for family coverage. These are well below the $10,200 and $27,500 thresholds.

Nonetheless, if the ACA is not modified by Congress the law could eventually place significant burdens on employee benefits as Penn State’s health insurance expenses will, almost certainly, outpace the rate of inflation. Working with Human Resources, the Faculty Benefits Committee will continue to examine how the university might slow the growth of medical expenditures with greater efficiency, expanded access to preventative care and the voluntary adoption of high deductible insurance systems like the PPO Savings plan.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

- Susan McGarry Basso, Vice President for Human Resources
- Rebecca C. Craven
- Amy R. Dietz
- Robin L. Haas
- Peter C. Jurs
- Chris Muscarella
- Jamie M. Myers
- Willie K. Ofosu, Chair
- Gregory W. Roth
- Petra Tschakert
- Nicholas D. Warcholak
- Matthew Woessner, Vice Chair
SENATE COUNCIL

Nominating Committee Report for 2015-2016

(Informational)

The Nominating Committee consisting of the elected representatives of Senate Council was
covenated on January 27, 2015. Additional nominations may be made from the floor of the
Senate on March 17, 2015.

CHAIR-ELECT OF THE SENATE

Thomas O. Beebee, Edwin Sparks Professor of Comparative Literature and German, College of the
Liberal Arts
Robin M. Bower, Associate Professor of Spanish, Penn State Beaver
Chester A. Ray, Professor of Medicine, and Cellular and Molecular Physiology, College of
Medicine
James A. Strauss, Senior Lecturer, Eberly College of Science

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Patricia H. Hinchey, Professor of Education, Penn State Worthington-Scranton
Keefe B. Manning, Associate Professor of Bioengineering and Surgery, College of Engineering
Laura L. Pauley, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering
Ann H. Taylor, Director of the John A. Dutton e-Education Institute, College of Earth and
Mineral Sciences
Keith D. Shapiro, Associate Professor of Art, College of Arts and Architecture

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT

(One to be elected, term expires 2019)

Mark A. Brennan, Professor and UNESCO Chair in Community, Leadership, and Youth Development,
College of Agricultural Sciences
Rosemary J. Jolly, Weiss Chair in the Humanities, Professor of Comparative Literature, English,
Bioethics, African Studies, and Women’s Studies, College of the Liberal Arts
Patricia B. Koch, Professor of Biobehavioral Health, Health Education, and Women’s Studies, College
of Health and Human Development
Nicholas J. Rowland, Associate Professor of Sociology, Education, Human Development, and Social
Sciences, Penn State Altoona
ACADEMIC TRUSTEE*

Martha W. Aynardi, Director of Academic Support and Projects, Senior Lecturer in Biology, Penn State Berks

Larry C. Backer, W. Richard and Mary Eshelman Faculty Scholar, Professor of Law and International Affairs, Penn State Law

Ingrid M. Blood, Professor of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Health and Human Development

Roger A. Egolf, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Penn State Lehigh Valley

David C. Han, Associate Professor of Surgery and Radiology, College of Medicine

Jeffrey A. Laman, Professor of Civil Engineering, College of Engineering

Kim C. Steiner, Professor of Forest Biology, Director of The Arboretum, College of Agricultural Sciences

*This is the first election of an Academic Trustee, a full voting member with all rights and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees of The Pennsylvania State University. The term is three years, running from May 1, 2015 to April 30, 2018. The name of the candidate who receives the highest number of votes will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees, which then will appoint that candidate according to its Charter, Bylaws, and Standing Orders. If the designated Academic Trustee cannot serve the full term, the recipient with the next highest number of votes in this election will be then be nominated as Academic Trustee to fill the unfinished term. Please vote for just one candidate.
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Report on Fall 2014 Campus Visits

(Informational)

The Senate Officers visited eight campus locations during Fall 2014 including The Penn State College of Medicine (9/30/14), Penn State Altoona (10/3/14), Penn State Fayette (10/3/14), Penn State Schuylkill (10/15/14), Penn State Hazelton (10/16/14), Penn State Wilkes-Barre (10/16/14), Penn State Worthington-Scranton (10/17/14) and The Pennsylvania College of Technology (10/30/14).

Goals for Senate Officer Campus Visits:

The Senate Officers were proactive with our meetings and made conscious efforts to convey the issues we heard from both student and faculty discussions with the Campus Administration representatives. We presented a comprehensive, 20-page report that encompassed our campus-specific observations and discussions during a January 15, 2015 meeting with Executive Vice President and Provost Nicholas Jones, and Vice President of Commonwealth Campuses Madlyn Hanes. At this meeting, the Senate Officers had a productive exchange with the Provost and Vice President and thought our observations, impressions, and recommendations were appreciated and addressed by our administration colleagues.

Traditionally, detailed, campus-specific discussions and recommendations from Senate Officer visits are not presented in the public report published in the Faculty Senate Plenary Meeting Agenda. The Senate Officers offer the following general discussions and recommendations from our campus visits for Faculty Senate review.

Student Discussions:

Students are generally very enthusiastic and complimentary about their degrees, the quality faculty instruction they receive, their good access to faculty in small class venues, and the educational, athletic, and extracurricular opportunities available at their locations. They value Penn State community building efforts including displays of Penn State banners and logos on campus, student union cafeterias and meeting areas, group travel to University Park for sporting events, and special campus organized trips to domestic and abroad locations during semester breaks. Being a part of a nationally recognized Penn State education and earning a Penn State titled degree are very high priorities for our students and a primary reason cited for matriculation. Many students we met are pragmatic with their major selection with and they acknowledged that knowing their degree will lead to a quality job, graduate, or professional program in the future was very important.

Some of the student issues include access to housing and living in a fair and respectable housing environment. Some locations have dormitories, but dormitory space is viewed as limited and renovations of that space is needed in some instances. Off-campus housing is very problematic
at some locations and housing contracts, timely repairs, and landlord disputes are common issues. Additionally, as a cost-saving step, many students live at home and commute, often working to pay a portion of tuition. It is observed that students working part or full-time reduces the time they can spend on their academics and perhaps most importantly, reduces the time they can spend interacting with other Penn State students in community and social activities.

At some locations, students travel to multiple Penn State campuses during the week, sometimes daily, to earn specific credits required for their degree. This is viewed as a challenging logistic and time issue, especially considering winter travel. At one location, campus buildings are in two different locations, separated by a distance that requires car or bus travel during the day, depending upon class schedule. At that location, streamlined transportation and improved schedule coordination that better considers course offerings, program locations, and travel time is recommended.

Faculty and Administration Discussions:

Faculty report they enjoy their jobs, student instruction, and at many locations, an atmosphere where they conduct small enrollment classes and know their students by name. Faculty acknowledge good infrastructure facilities, recent technology upgrades, and feel the education they provide to students and service they offer the surrounding community are very important reasons justifying their employment. Some locations feature exceptional relationships with surrounding community entities and individuals, resulting in financial synergies that ultimately create degree programs, support special student programs, and fund multi-million dollar building construction. Additionally, it is noted that at many locations, Penn State Campuses were viewed as important economic engines and stabilizing elements for local economies that support the local community by providing employment at multiple levels.

Some of the issues discussed included clarifying the expectations of research for fixed-term instructional faculty. Our discussions with administration confirmed there is no required research expectation for fixed-term faculty. At one location, standing faculty were concerned about a new contract expectation where significant grant funding was expected for part of their financial compensation. The administration thought faculty contracts were more lenient than those of other benchmarked institutions. At one location, faculty were also concerned about the extreme competition for NSF and NIH grant funding, and the longer time period it takes to conduct research and establish a quality portfolio of published papers. On this issue, both faculty and administration are allied and both entities desire to extend the tenure clock for new hires as compensation for this reality.

At several locations, faculty expressed a desire that fixed-term faculty with decades of instruction, clinical, or research service to Penn State should be able to retire with Emeritus Status. The Senate Officers supported this idea and relayed it to our Administration for their consideration.

Declining enrollment in specific degree programs or declining enrollment at campus locations in general was a major concern for both faculty and administration. That considered, Senate Officer discussions with administration indicated that all campus locations remain financially
sound. Some Penn State campuses have intense competition for students locally from outside higher education institutions and in some instances, even from neighboring Penn State campus locations that might offer similar degree programs. The Senate Officers discussed the idea with administration of organizing close proximity Penn State campuses into “Strategic Alliances” to better share resources, course offerings, degree programs, and technology links to the benefit of students, enrollments, and faculty.

Faculty and campus administration at several locations discussed their concerns over a proposed “Common Penn State Schedule” across all locations. They observed strategic benefits for their current course schedules, which consider student’s commuting time, and also saw advantages for their “Common Hour” open block during lunch, which was believed to strengthen their local Penn State student-faculty community.

Penn State signage and advertising competition are challenges at some campus locations. At such locations, other competing higher education institutions have highly visible, electronic road-side advertising signs and similar advertising does not exist for Penn State campuses. Additionally, some campuses could improve their public presence and recognition by a series of road signs aiding sight navigation from major highway locations, to their campus location. These ideas were discussed with both local campus and central administration.

The Senate Officers note that at many Penn State campuses, the most secure and optimistic students were those who perceived they were earning degrees that had direct employment prospects upon graduation or continued paths leading to graduate or professional degrees in the future. Considering that observation, the Senate Officers believe it is important for all Penn State campus locations to consider support of quality advising, career fairs, internships, and other experiences that foster practical experience, communicate employment possibilities, and connect Penn State degrees to student’s employment future.

Prepared by:

James A. Strauss, Faculty Senate Secretary in consultation with Faculty Senate Chair Jonna M. Kulikowich and Chair-Elect Mohamad A. Ansari
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Nominating Report for 2015-2016

(Informational)

The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules identified the following nominees to stand for election to three extra-senatorial standing committees. Additional nominations may be made from the floor of the Senate on March 17, 2015.

Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

University Park *Elect three* (two members; one alternate)
- Larry Backer, W. Richard and Mary Eshelman Faculty Scholar and Professor of Law, The Dickinson School of Law
- Jonna Kulikowich, Professor of Education (Educational Psychology), College of Education
- Kim Steiner, Professor of Forest Biology, College of Agricultural Sciences

Deans/Chancellors *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- Christian M. Brady, Dean, Schreyer Honors College
- William Easterling, Dean, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
- Marie Hardin, Dean, College of Communications
- Keith Hillkirk, Chancellor, Penn State Berks
- Gary Lawler, Chancellor, Penn State Hazleton

Standing Joint Committee on Tenure *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- Patricia Hinchey, Professor of Education, Penn State Worthington Scranton
- Jeffrey Laman, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering
- Brent Yarnal, E. Willard & Ruby S. Miller Professor of Physical Geography, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences

University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee *Elect four*
- John E. Carlson, Professor of Molecular Genetics, College of Agricultural Sciences
- William Carlsen, Professor of Education (Science Education), College of Education
- Deborah Eicher-Catt, Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences, Penn State York
- Jonna Kulikowich, Professor of Education (Educational Psychology), College of Education
- Linda Miller, Professor of English, Penn State Abington
- Kathryn Wolfe, Professor of French, Penn State Erie, the Behrend College
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

- Mohamad A. Ansari
- Larry C. Backer
- John W. Bagby
- Dawn G. Blasko
- Robin M. Bower
- Mark A. Casteel, Chair
- Michael J. Chorney
- Patricia M. Hinchey, Vice Chair
- Pamela P. Hufnagel
- Jonna M. Kulikowich
- Jeffrey A. Laman
- Christopher P. Long
- James A. Strauss
- Brenton M. Yarnal
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

How to Bring a Concern to the University Faculty Senate

(Informational)

Introduction

The Senate functions as a deliberative body under the leadership of the Chair and three other elected officers. The work of the Senate is done through the Senate Council, 15 standing committees, and ad hoc special committees; the Senate acts on this work during its regularly scheduled plenary meetings. The Senate is comprised of faculty senators who play two important roles, both as representatives of their units and as the contact persons for the faculty in bringing issues of concern to the Senate.

Given this structure and mode of conducting business, the Senate Committee on Committees and Rules thought it would be useful to share information on "How to Bring a Concern to the University Faculty Senate." The Committee intends to post the following document on the Senate website to provide guidance to Senators who seek to bring matters of concern to the Senate, as well as to aid the Senators in undertaking their duties.

How to Bring a Concern to the University Faculty Senate

The University Faculty Senate is a body that represents all faculty at all locations. As a deliberative body governed by its Constitution and Standing Rules, it can take action on behalf of faculty formally through its Standing Committees or informally by acting as intermediary with administration. In addition, the Faculty Advisory Committee can address concerns in its discussions with the President and other administrators.

Faculty across the university are invited to share their concerns with the Senators representing their unit. Given the number of ways outlined above that the Senate can address faculty concerns, unit Senators have several options for bringing issues to the attention of Senate officers or other constituents or units.

Specifically, Senators may choose among the following options for action:

1. Ask advice from one of the following:
   a. The Senate Chair, Chair-Elect, or Secretary
   b. The head of the Senator’s caucus
   c. The chair or vice chair of the Senator’s standing committee.

Names of these persons are available from the Senate webpage: <senate.psu.edu>. 
Talking to a Senate officer is often a productive starting point because officers can provide advice on the most effective channel for the Senate to address specific concerns. Several options are open: legislative action, consultation with the administration, compilation of an informational report by a standing committee, forensic discussion on the Senate floor, or discussion by a standing committee. Officers can also help determine whether the concern is university-wide or local, and can provide advice for next steps in either case.

Consulting the head of the unit’s caucus or the chair or vice chair of a standing committee can also help provide direction for further action. Caucus leaders might suggest contacting a Senate officer or discussing the issue in caucus or in committee. After discussion, caucuses and standing committees may recommend that the Senate leadership take some action to address the issue.

2. Share thoughts and concerns with colleagues in the UFS Discussion Forum accessible from the Senate website, <senate.psu.edu>.

Blogging about a concern at the UFS Discussion Forum starts a discussion among fellow Senators. It is a good way to assess their opinions about the importance and urgency of a concern.

3. Raise the concern during the last segment of the plenary meeting, “Comments and Recommendations for the Good of the University,” either in comments or via motion or resolution.

Raising a concern at the Senate plenary puts it before the entire Senate and, if an issue is presented with a particularly cogent argument or is one of great concern, this strategy may move the Senate or the Senate leadership to address the issue. If the Senator chooses to introduce a concern in the form of a motion or resolution, and if it is seconded:

"It shall be laid on the table until the next regular meeting of the Senate unless the Chair calls a special meeting to consider this item before the next regular meeting" (Standing Rules, Article I, Section 7).

4. Where matters of special concern require immediate attention, and the usual procedures of the Senate will impede or unduly delay consideration, a Senator can call for a special meeting of the Senate to address the issue:

"The Chair shall convene the Senate in response to a written petition of at least fifty members of the University faculty to consider proposals of the petitioners stated in writing, providing the petition contains:

   a. statement of purpose of petition and
   b. names of five faculty members designated to meet with the Senate Council.

The five designated faculty members will review the issue substantively with the Senate Council before the special meeting of the Senate" (Bylaws, Article V – Meetings, Section 3).
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- Mohamad A. Ansari
- Larry C. Backer
- John W. Bagby
- Dawn G. Blasko
- Mark A. Casteel, Chair
- Michael J. Chorney
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ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2015-2016

(Informational)

PENN STATE ABINGTON
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2017
Le, Binh P.

Term Expires 2018
Brown, Thomas

Term Expires 2019
Golden, Lonnie
Ozment, Judith
Turner, Tramble T.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
SENATORS (9)

Term Expires 2016
Kuldau, Gretchen

Term Expires 2017
Perkins, Daniel F.
Radhakrishna, Rama B.

Term Expires 2018
Roth, Gregory W.
Shannon, Robert D.
Webster, Nicole S.

Term Expires 2019
Abdalla, Charles W.
Brennan, Mark A.
McDill, Marc E.

PENN STATE ALTOONA
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2016
Brunsden, Victor W.

Term Expires 2017
Rowland, Nicholas J.
Term Expires 2018
Mahan, Carolyn G.

Term Expires 2019
Hayford, Harold
Seymour, Beth
Singer, Richard

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2017
Clements, Ann C.
Desai, Madhuri S.

Term Expires 2018
Kelly, William
Schulz, Andrew P.
Szczygiel, Bonj

Term Expires 2019
Shapiro, Keith D.
Kenyon, William

PENN STATE BERKS
SENATORS (4)

Term Expires 2016
Aynardi, Martha W.

Term Expires 2017
Bartolacci, Michael
Nasereddin, Mahdi

Term Expires 2019
Snyder, Stephen

SMEAL COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2016
Meloy, Margaret G.
Muscarella, Chris

Term Expires 2017
Miles, James A.
Term Expires 2018
Harrison, Terry P.
Posey, Lisa L.

COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATIONS
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2016
Jayakar, Krishna P.

Term Expires 2017
Haigh, Michel M.

Term Expires 2019
Connolly-Ahern, Colleen

DICKINSON SCHOOL OF LAW
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2016
Butler, William E.

Term Expires 2019
Welsh, Nancy

COLLEGE OF EARTH & MINERAL SCIENCES
SENATORS (8)

Term Expires 2016
Babb, David M.

Term Expires 2017
Yarnal, Brenton M.

Term Expires 2018
Smithwick, Erica
Tschakert, Petra

Term Expires 2019
Forest, Chris
King, Beth
Kubicki, James
Taylor, Ann
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2016
Prins, Esther S.

Term Expires 2017
Kulikowich, Jonna M.

Term Expires 2018
Baker, Rose M.
Myers, Jamie

Term Expires 2019
Duschl, Richard
Plummer, Julia

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
SENATORS (15)

Term Expires 2016
Butler, Peter J.
Lagoa, Costantino M.
Laman, Jeffrey A.

Term Expires 2017
Kremer, Gul E.
Pauley, Laura L.
Schiano, Jeffrey L.

Term Expires 2018
Jovanovic, Igor
Messner, John
Regan, John M.
Slattery, Margaret J.
Wolfe, Douglas E.

Term Expires 2019
Giebink, N. Christopher
Hodgdon, Kathleen
Horn, Mark
Manning, Keefe

PENN STATE ERIE, THE BEHREND COLLEGE
SENATORS (8)

Term Expires 2016
Khalilollahi, Amir
Troester, Rodney L.
Term Expires 2017
Blasko, Dawn G.
Lasher, William C.

Term Expires 2018
Mangel, Lisa A.
Nelatury, Sudarshan R.

Term Expires 2019
Lobaugh, Michael
Noce, Kathy

PENN STATE GREAT VALLEY
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2016
Jablokow, Kathryn W.

Term Expires 2017
Litzky, Barrie E.

PENN STATE HARRISBURG
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2016
Ruiz, James M.

Term Expires 2017
Wilburne, Jane M.
Woessner, Matthew

Term Expires 2018
Subramanian, Rajarajan
Winch, Samuel P.

Term Expires 2019
Meyer, Jennifer
Wilson, Matthew

COLLEGE OF HEALTH & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
SENATORS (9)

Term Expires 2016
Duffey, Michele L.

Term Expires 2017
Ricketts, Robert D.
Yarnal, Careen M.
Term Expires 2018  
Hickerson, Benjamin D.  
Coleman Kelly, Mary Dean

Term Expires 2019  
Eggebeen, David  
Finke, Erinn  
Koch, Patricia  
Sharma, Amit

COLLEGE OF INFORMATION SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGY  
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2016  
Bagby, John W.

Term Expires 2018  
Trauth, Eileen M.  
Friedenberg, Marc A.

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2018  
Jett, Dennis C.

PENN STATE LAW  
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2017  
Backer, Larry C.

Term Expires 2019  
Scott, Geoff

COLLEGE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS  
SENATORS (20)

Term Expires 2016  
Abel, Jonathan  
Berube, Michael  
Browne, Stephen  
Guerrero, Jose Antonio  
Miles, Mary

Term Expires 2017  
Beebee, Thomas  
Dietz, Amy
Lee, Barrett  
Nelson, Keith  
Shen, Shuang  

*Term Expires 2018*  
Eckhardt, Caroline  
Jolly, Rosemary  
Marsh, John  
Safran, Janina  
Thomas, Darryl  

*Term Expires 2019*  
Gouran, Dennis  
Linn, Suzanna  
Long, Christopher  
Makoni, Sinfree  
Wagner, Johanna  

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES**  
SENATORS (3)  

*Term Expires 2016*  
Pyatt, Timothy D.  

*Term Expires 2017*  
Copeland, Ann W.  

*Term Expires 2018*  
Harwell, Kevin R.  

**COLLEGE OF MEDICINE**  
SENATORS (30)  

*Term Expires 2016*  
Gilchrist, Ian C.  
Gingrich, Dennis L.  
Ouyang, Ann  
Raab, Gregory E.  
Reeves, W. Brian  
Robinson, Cynthia
Term Expires 2017
Bascom, Rebecca
Boehmer, John P.
Freiberg, Andrew S.
Kass, Lawrence E.
Ropson, Ira J.

Term Expires 2018
Davis, Dwight
Eckert, Jill
Han, David C.
High, Kane M.
Meyers, Craig
Neves, Rogerio Izar
Potochny, John
Ross, Stephen
Vrana, Kent
Walker Eric

Term Expires 2019
Berg, Arthur
Bruno, Michael
Cockroft, Kevin
Enama, Joseph
Levin, Martha
Palmer, Tim
Ray, Chet
Song, Jim
Wenner, William

MILITARY SCIENCES
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2019
Garey, Richard

COLLEGE OF NURSING
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2017
Brown, Raymonde A.

Term Expires 2018
Ebken, Diane C.
RETIR ED FAC UL T Y SEN AT ORS
SEN AT ORS (2)

Term Expires 2016
Moore, Jr., John W.

Term Expires 2018
Jurs, Peter C.

E B ER L Y CO LLEGE OF S CIENCE
SEN AT ORS (13)

Term Expires 2016
Asbury, John B

Term Expires 2017
Keiler, Kenneth C.
Novikov, Alexei
Robinett, Richard W.

Term Expires 2018
Funk, Raymond L.
Krasilnikov, Andrey
Muzzucato, Anna L.
Sigurdsson, Steinn
Strauss, James A.

Term Expires 2019
LaJeunese, Todd
Nelson, Kimberly
Nousek, John
Williams, Mary Beth

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
SENATORS (31)

Beaver (2)
Term Expires 2016
Bower, Robin M.

Term Expires 2018
Mookerjee, Rajen

Brandywine (3)
Term Expires 2017
Blockett, Kimberly
Term Expires 2018
Azemi, Asad

Term Expires 2019
Lawlor, Timothy M.

DuBois (2)
Term Expires 2017
Loeb, Robert

Term Expires 2019
Hufnagel, Pamela P.

Fayette (2)
Term Expires 2016
Crawford, James P.

Term Expires 2019
Eberle, Peter M.

Greater Allegheny (2)
Term Expires 2016
Grimes, Galen A.

Term Expires 2017
Jaap, James A.

Hazleton (3)
Term Expires 2016
Lynn, Valerie Ann

Term Expires 2018
Marko, Frantisek

Term Expires 2019
Petrilla, Rosemarie

Lehigh Valley (2)
Term Expires 2016
Egolf, Roger A.

Term Expires 2018
Krajsa, Michael J.
Mont Alto (3)
Term Expires 2016
Henry, John

Term Expires 2018
Dendle, Peter J.

Term Expires 2019
Borromeo, Renee

New Kensington (2)
Term Expires 2015
Bridges, K. Robert

Term Expires 2018
Kalavar, Jyotsna M.

Schuylkill (2)
Term Expires 2016
Aurand, Harold W.

Term Expires 2019
Andelin, Steve

Shenango (2)
Term Expires 2016
Pettit, Angela L.

Term Expires 2017
Saltz, Ira S.

Wilkes-Barre (2)
Term Expires 2016
Marsico, Salvatore A.

Term Expires 2018
Ofosu, Willie K.

Worthington Scranton (2)
Term Expires 2015
Hinchey, Patricia M.

Term Expires 2016
Aebli, Fred J.
York (2)

Term Expires 2017
Sutton, Jane S.

Term Expires 2018
Casteel, Mark A.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

Update on the Activities of the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity

(Informational)

One of the functions of the Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment (EECE) is to provide a communication avenue between the Faculty Senate and the three Presidential Equity Commissions. Membership on the EECE Committee includes a representative from each commission who provides a report on the activities of that committee. At the request of Chair Backer in 2012, the EECE began sponsoring an annual informational report to the Faculty Senate by one of the three commissions. Over the course of three years and on a rotating basis, the Faculty Senate will receive a report on each of the presidential commissions. In 2013 a report was presented from the Commission for Women (CFW) (March 12, 2013 Senate meeting) and in 2014 a report was presented from the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity (CORED) (April 29, 2014 Senate meeting). This year EECE is sponsoring a report from the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity (CLGBTE). Marie Lindhorst, the Chair of CLGBTE, will give a presentation and answer questions at the Senate meeting.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

- Kimberly Blockett
- Mary Dean Coleman
- Dwight Davis, Vice Chair
- Susan Fredricks
- Ron Gebhardtsbauer
- Patreese Ingram
- Sonia Khanchandani
- Melissa McCleery
- Luis Ocampo Giraldo
- Laura L. Pauley, Chair
- David Shupp
- Jane Sutton
- Mary Vollero
- Marcus Whitehurst
COMMISSION ON LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER EQUITY

Introduction
Created in 1991, the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity (CLGBTE) is an advisory group to the President. The purpose of the commission is to improve the climate for diversity within Penn State by specifically addressing issues affecting the welfare of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) members of the University community. The commission serves to improve the climate for LGBT members of the Penn State community through examination of current policies and practices and through the initiation and promotion of programs that result in a more equitable and supportive environment.

http://equity.psu.edu/clgbte
https://twitter.com/CLGBTE
http://www.facebook.com/clgbte

Commission Organization
Current students (undergraduate and graduate), faculty, staff, administrators, and technical service employees from all Penn State campuses are eligible to serve on the CLGBTE. Currently, the commission has twenty-three appointed members and twenty-nine affiliate members from twelve University campuses and multiple academic and administrative units. We work through the following six standing committees:

Communications / OUTreach:
Promotes the visibility of the commission and LGBT equity issues across the University.

Curricular Integration:
Strives to enhance the teaching and learning environment pertaining to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues at all Penn State campuses.

Employee Concerns:
Addresses matters related to the environment, policies, and benefits for LGBT faculty and staff at Penn State.

Nominating:
Facilitates the membership and awards processes.

Student Concerns:
Examines issues relative to LGBT students, and advocates on their behalf.
Transgender Concerns:
Identifies and addresses concerns related to gender identity and expression, and the climate for transgender persons at Penn State.

Achievements and Initiatives

1. Advocated Successfully for Recent Revisions to University Policies, Benefits, and Curriculum
   - Same-sex Domestic Partner Benefits
   - Administrative Policy AD84 - Preferred Name Policy
   - Creation of the Sexuality and Gender Studies minor
   - Support for the creation of online courses in the minor

2. Participate on the Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment
   (2014–2015 CLGBTE representative is Ron Gebhardtshauer from the Smeal College of Business)

3. Advocate for LGBT Support and Resources at all University Campuses
   - As recommended by the August 2012 EECE Report on LGBTQ Resources for Students at Penn State and with the President’s subsequent support, we are working with the Office of the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs to implement the recommendation that liaisons for LGBT concerns and resources be established at every Penn State campus. (This is being established as the Coalition on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity.)
   - Contacted campuses about the possibility for permanent safe meeting and gathering spaces for LGBT students
   - Visit at least one Commonwealth campus each year. The April 2014 visit was to Penn State Erie, The Behrend College, for the LGBTQ@PSU Conference, which the commission helped to fund. The 2015 visit will be to Penn State Altoona on April 9

4. Monitor and Advocate for Equitable Benefits and Services for LGBT Faculty and Staff, in Partnership with the Office of Human Resources
   - Proposed a policy to establish restroom access according to an individual's gender identity
   - Researched current policies regarding unisex bathrooms in University buildings
   - Advocated for health care coverage for gender confirmation surgery for University faculty and staff

5. Bring LGBT Concerns and Advocacy to University Leadership
   - Meet annually with the President of the University to discuss issues related to LGBT equity and bring recommendations we may have for changes to University policies, procedures, and programs
   - Meet annually with the Board of Trustees to share the work and concerns of the three President’s commissions for equity
   - Participate (with CORED and CFW) in executive-level searches; meet with new University executives to share concerns and perspectives
6. **Fund and Support LGBT Scholarship and Programs**
   - Support the continued growth of the Sexuality and Gender Studies minor
   - Partnered with Intercollegiate Athletics to promote the unveiling of Penn State's video *You Can Play* for the national campaign
   - Provide consultative and financial support for programs and activities at all University campuses that enhance the climate for LGBT faculty, staff, and students, and raise awareness of LGBT equity

7. **Build Community and Support for LGBT Students**
   - Supported the successful launch of ALLY House, a special living option for LGBTQA students at University Park
   - Promote and support University health care services for transgender students
   - Work with the LGBTQA Student Resource Center on matters of mutual concern; present annual Outstanding Service Awards at the Lavender Graduation

8. **Advance Institutional Policy Changes to Promote Greater Equity**
   - Currently monitoring plans to include fields for "preferred" or "chosen" gender in student and faculty/staff information systems
   - Participated in the launch of a Vendor Equity Task Force organized by the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business to discuss ways to anticipate and avoid relations with companies whose records on LGBT equity are poor

9. **Advance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at Penn State**
   - Participate on *A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State* review teams
   - Partner with CORED and CFW to promote the inclusion of equity concerns in the General Education curriculum
   - Partner with CORED and CFW to host an annual promotion and tenure symposium to address issues important to early tenure-line faculty from underrepresented groups

**Conclusion**

The Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity thanks the Faculty Senate for this opportunity to inform senators about our activities. We look forward to partnering with the Senate and the EECE to further enhance the University climate for LGBT faculty, staff, and students.

**Submitted By:**

- Marie Lindhorst, Chair, Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity
- Amy Vashaw, Chair-elect, Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity

Members of the CLGBTE Executive Committee:

- Christine Avery, Co-chair, Employee Concerns
- Nancy Ostiguy, Co-chair, Employee Concerns
- Krista Quesenberry, Co-chair, Student Concerns
- Parker Werns, Co-chair, Student Concerns
• Borja Gutiérrez, Chair, Curricular Integration
• Matthew Ciszek, Chair, Communications/OUTreach
• Dana Kletchka, Immediate past chair, CLGBTE; Chair, Nominating Committee
• Jeanine Ruhsam, Chair, Transgender Concerns

This publication is available in alternative media on request.

The University is committed to equal access to programs, facilities, admission, and employment for all persons. It is the policy of the University to maintain an environment free of harassment and free of discrimination against any person because of age, race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, creed, service in the uniformed services (as defined in state and federal law), veteran status, sex, sexual orientation, marital or family status, pregnancy, pregnancy-related conditions, physical or mental disability, gender, perceived gender, gender identity, genetic information, or political ideas. Discriminatory conduct and harassment, as well as sexual misconduct and relationship violence, violates the dignity of individuals, impedes the realization of the University’s educational mission, and will not be tolerated. Direct all inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policy to Dr. Kenneth Lehrman III, Vice Provost for Affirmative Action, Affirmative Action Office, The Pennsylvania State University, 328 Boucke Building, University Park, PA 16802-5901; Email: kfl2@psu.edu; Tel 814-863-0471. U.Ed. OVP 15-16.
Report on Resolution on Faculty Contracts Referred by the Full Senate to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs at the September 9, 2014 Senate Meeting

(Informational)

Introduction

At the April 29, 2014 Senate meeting, Senator James Ruiz (Harrisburg) introduced a resolution relating to faculty overload contracts. The resolution read as follows:

Whereas fairness and mutual respect should serve as the baseline in defining the relationship between administrators and faculty, and

Whereas, fairness requires that people be given fair notice of their working conditions and obligations

And Whereas administrators sometimes fail to give faculty reasonable notice of the need to teach overload courses or the terms and conditions thereof,

And Whereas faculty make preparations far in advance in their academic and private lives to be properly prepared to teach an overload class in a timely manner,

And Whereas fairness in planning may require administrators to reserve a right to cancel under enrolled classes but that fairness also require a reasonable period of advance notice

Be it resolved that it shall be the policy of The Pennsylvania State University that all faculty overload contracts shall be fully executed at least five business days before the first class day of any semester.

Senate Record, April 9, 2014. The resolution received a second, and was placed on the Agenda for the September 9, 2014 Senate Meeting as Appendix F. Appendix F consisted solely of the text of the resolution. At that meeting, the full Senate referred the resolution to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (the “Committee”).

1 The April 9, 2014 Senate Record is available at: http://www.psu.edu/dept/uf/record/13-14/042914/042914record.html.

2 Appendix F to the September 9, 2014 Senate Agenda is available here: http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/september-09-2014-agenda/appendix-f/. It was
Scope of Investigation

The Committee sought additional information about the concerns motivating this resolution from the three Harrisburg Senators who spoke in the September 9, 2014 discussion, from Committee member Vice-Provost Blannie Bowen, and from other members of the Committee.

The Committee determined, based on the information it received in response to these initial requests, that no broader investigation was warranted. The Committee stands ready to conduct further investigation if it receives information indicating such investigation is warranted, or if directed to do so by Senate leadership or the full Senate.

Conclusions

For the reasons set out below, the Committee on Faculty Affairs concludes that the full Senate does not need to take further action on the Ruiz resolution at this time.

1. The Committee received information suggesting that a group of faculty members in one unit on the Harrisburg campus feel that their administrators have been unreasonably delaying formal agreements on compensation for World Campus overload courses. This has apparently led to these faculty members later feeling they had no choice but to accept compensation that was significantly less than expected at the time they had agreed to teach an overload schedule. The Committee has been informed that a new administrator has recently been chosen for this unit, and that any such issues are likely to disappear following the scheduled leadership change. The Committee did not receive any information suggesting that faculty in other units have the same concern.

2. The Committee did not receive any information suggesting that the following issues implied in the resolution existed broadly at the university level:
   - a general lack of fairness and mutual respect as a baseline in defining the relationship between administrators and faculty;

---

3 During discussion of the resolution, Senator Caroline Eckhardt (Liberal Arts) moved to refer the resolution to the Committee on Faculty Affairs. Following further discussion, the Senate approved the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Faculty Affairs by a vote of 140 in favor and 28 opposed. The transcript of this discussion is available here: http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/september-9-2014-record/#unfinished.

4 These were Senators James Ruiz, Matthew Wilson, and Matthew Woessner. Only Senator Ruiz provided additional information.

5 The Committee did not contact the relevant administrators for a response, so this is not a finding that the relevant administrators were in fact treating their faculty members unfairly.
- faculty members not being given fair notice of their working conditions or obligations;
- administrators failing to give faculty members reasonable notice of the need to teach overload courses or the terms and conditions thereof;
- faculty members not receiving notice of the need to teach an overload course in time to arrange their academic and private lives to be properly prepared to teach that course;
- administrators failing to give reasonable advance notice in canceling under enrolled classes.

3. If the information the Committee received in response to its requests is accurate, the Committee believes there is a possibility it implicates Harrisburg Academic Policy F-4, “Governing Overload Compensation for Faculty.” However, it is the view of the Committee that a determination of whether to investigate compliance with this policy should rest, at least in the first instance, with the Penn State Harrisburg Faculty Senate.

4. The Committee believes that a resolution on the floor of the Penn State University Faculty Senate is generally not the appropriate initial response to an issue of the type identified in its investigation. The Committee suggests that issues of this type are more appropriately presented, at least in the first instance, to the unit Ombudsperson or to an individual campus’s faculty senate.

---

6 Harrisburg Academic Policy F-4 is available here: http://harrisburg.psu.edu/policy/governing-overload-compensation-faculty.
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In March 1987, the Senate passed legislation requiring an annual review of grade distribution data for baccalaureate students. The attached tables show data that have been provided by the Registrar’s Office for each spring semester from 1975 to 2014. The report focuses on spring semesters 2004 to 2014 and detailed data for spring semester 2014.

Tables Attached Include:

**Table 1 - Percentage of Grades Awarded in 0 - 499 Resident Instruction Courses Comparison for Spring Term/Semester 1975 to 2014**

- Since 2001, the average grade awarded has been slightly more than 3.00, which is equivalent to a B.
- It appears, in that time, there has been a small decrease in grades assigned in the B-C range. There is a corresponding increase in A’s and A-minuses.

**Table 2 - Summary of Grade Distribution for Resident Instruction Spring Semester 2014 (All locations - All Courses for All Colleges except the College of Medicine and Dickinson School of Law)**

- For all the freshmen and sophomore courses (0-399), descriptively, it appears that a greater percentage of grades in the range A-B are awarded at University Park compared with other campuses. Additionally, there is a higher percentage of grades assigned below a B at campuses other than University Park.
- While last year World Campus exhibited a grade distribution which was very similar to that of the university in aggregate, in spring 2014, it seems more closely aligned with the distribution at the other campuses.

**Table 3 - All University Distribution of Semester Grade Point Averages for Baccalaureate Students**

- The percentage of students earning a semester grade point average within the range of 3.00-3.99 has increased since 1992. Comparatively, the proportion of students earning a semester grade point average in the range of 2.00-2.99 has decreased since 1992. However, the changes in both these ranges have been relatively modest since 2004. Finally, the share of students earning semester grade point averages below 1.99, and the proportion with a semester grade point average of 4.00, appear to have remained stable since 2007.
Table 4 - Spring Semester Grade Point Averages and Dean’s List - Summary by College for Spring Semester 2014

- Computing differences between 2004 and 2014 semester grade point averages for baccalaureate degree-seeking students reveals that two academic units have grade point increases of 0.16 or more: Smeal College of Business Administration, and Arts & Architecture.

- Additionally, over the same time period and baccalaureate population, Altoona, Altoona, Capital, Earth and Mineral Sciences, and University College show a slight decrease.

- This report shows a significant drop in the semester GPA between 2004 and 2014 for baccalaureate inter-college programs. However, it’s important to note that there were only 10 students enrolled in these programs in 2004, compared to the 594 enrolled in 2014.

- Although we report World Campus grade distribution, as we do for other campus locations, it should be noted that World Campus does not employ its own, separate faculty. Therefore, the grades reported for World Campus offerings are grades that have been entered by Penn State faculty from throughout our campus locations.
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Table 1
Percentage of Grades Awarded in 0 - 499 Resident Instruction Courses
Comparison Spring Term/Semester 1975-2014

Graph comparing the average grade awarded in 0 to 499 resident instruction courses during the spring semester between the years of 1975 to 2014.
### Percentage of Grades Awarded in 0-499 RI Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Average Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1976: 8 week drop rule in effect
- 1984: 10 week late drop rule in effect, switch from terms to semesters
- 1988: Plus/minus grading began
- 1990: 12 week, 16 credit late drop rule in effect
- 2008: World Campus included
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-499 Level Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-499 not UP or WC</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>133,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-499 UP</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>192,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-499 WC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>18,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grades</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>103,117</td>
<td>47,135</td>
<td>35,655</td>
<td>42,550</td>
<td>23,722</td>
<td>18,127</td>
<td>26,935</td>
<td>12,638</td>
<td>11,560</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>16,105</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 0-499</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>344,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 0-399 Level Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-399 not UP or WC</strong></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>117,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-399 UP</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>141,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-399 WC</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Grades</strong></td>
<td>470</td>
<td>76,638</td>
<td>36,681</td>
<td>27,752</td>
<td>33,892</td>
<td>19,291</td>
<td>15,022</td>
<td>22,902</td>
<td>11,319</td>
<td>10,281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>14,198</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 0-399</strong></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>273,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 400-499 Level Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>400-499 not UP or WC</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>16,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>400-499 UP</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>50,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>400-499 WC</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Grades</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,479</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>7,903</td>
<td>8,658</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>4,033</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 400</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>70,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix P

### 500-599 Level Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>500-599 not UP or WC</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500-599 UP</strong></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>10,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500-599 WC</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Grades</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8,816</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 500</strong></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>15,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportion of Grades Awarded in 0-399 Level Courses

**Pie Chart**: showing the proportion of grades awarded in 0-399 level courses for the entire University as follows:

- A to A minus: 41 percent
- B plus to B minus: 30 percent
- C plus to C: 14 percent
- D: 4 percent
- F: 4 percent
- Other: 7 percent

**Pie Chart** showing the proportion of grades awarded in 0-399 level courses for the University Park campus as follows:

- A to A minus: 44 percent
- B plus to B minus: 30 percent
- C plus to C: 13 percent
- D: 4 percent
- F: 3 percent
- Other: 6 percent

**Pie Chart** showing the proportion of grades awarded in 0-399 level courses for the World Campus as follows:

- A to A minus: 37 percent
- B plus to B minus: 28 percent
- C plus to C: 13 percent
- D: 4 percent
- F: 7 percent
- Other: 11 percent
Pie Chart showing the proportion of grades awarded in 0-399 level courses for Other Campuses as follows:

- A to A minus: 38 percent
- B plus to B minus: 29 percent
- C plus to C: 15 percent
- D: 5 percent
- F: 5 percent
- Other: 8 percent
### Summary of Grade Distribution for Resident Instruction
#### Spring Semester 2014 (6/27/14)
*(All Locations, All Courses for All Colleges, Except HY and DN)*

#### Total 0-300 Level Courses (GPA = 3.07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by %</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Count</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>73368</td>
<td>34787</td>
<td>26458</td>
<td>32121</td>
<td>18402</td>
<td>14322</td>
<td>21743</td>
<td>10765</td>
<td>9262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3635</td>
<td>13521</td>
<td>259731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total 400 Level Courses (GPA = 3.33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by %</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24780</td>
<td>9855</td>
<td>7530</td>
<td>8295</td>
<td>4249</td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>3853</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>66670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Courses Level 0-499 (GPA = 3.12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by %</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Count</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>98148</td>
<td>44642</td>
<td>33988</td>
<td>40416</td>
<td>22651</td>
<td>17298</td>
<td>25596</td>
<td>12012</td>
<td>10367</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4207</td>
<td>15310</td>
<td>326401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total 500 Level Courses (GPA = 3.77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by %</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution by Count</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7456</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>12732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
All University Distribution of Semester Grade Point Averages for Baccalaureate Students Spring Semester

Graph showing the percent of grades awarded for baccalaureate students across the entire University during the spring semester between the years of 1992 to 2014.

2007 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>15,322</td>
<td>31,407</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>55,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2008 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>15,816</td>
<td>32,032</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>57,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2009 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>4,017</td>
<td>15,956</td>
<td>34,216</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>60,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2010 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>16,551</td>
<td>34,835</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>62,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>4,451</td>
<td>16,581</td>
<td>34,983</td>
<td>4,396</td>
<td>62,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2012 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>16,518</td>
<td>35,757</td>
<td>47,52</td>
<td>63,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>16,122</td>
<td>36,078</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>63,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>16,714</td>
<td>37,073</td>
<td>5,013</td>
<td>65,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Grade Point Averages and Dean's List
Summary by College, Spring Semester 2014
## Baccalaureate Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Number on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2009 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2009 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2004 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2004 Semester GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>2439</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>5813</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>3260</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2740</td>
<td>9079</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Development</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>5511</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Science and Tech</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-college</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>7850</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>3780</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>3173</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUS</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>6609</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21688</strong></td>
<td><strong>65333</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Associate Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Number on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2009 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2009 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2004 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2004 Semester GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Science and Tech</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>3262</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Provisional Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Number on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2009 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2009 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2004 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2004 Semester GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondegree</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements for Dean's List can be found in policy G-8.
This report, prepared by H. Ford Stryker, Associate Vice President for Physical Plant, presents photographs showing the status of several major construction projects at the University, both at University Park and at several of the Commonwealth Campuses.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Faculty Senate – Construction Report

(Informalional)

Introduction
Ford Stryker will present an informational report on the status of University construction.

Introduction slide: Construction Status Report – A Presentation to the Pennsylvania State University Faculty Senate March 2014 – March 2015

Agenda slide
Completed Capital Projects: March 2014 – March 2015
- Woodland Building – Phase I, Abington
- 2014 Summer Construction Projects
- West Campus Steam Plant Natural Gasline
- Educational Activities Building Renovation & Addition, Harrisburg
- South Frear Renovations, UP
- Old Main Renovations, UP
- Children’s Garden at the Arboretum, UP
- Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System, UP
- Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I, UP
- Shaver’s Creek Dam Rehabilitation, UP

Woodland Building Renovation slide
Abington campus – Scope included in project:
- Renovated science labs on 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors
- Improved building utility systems
- New curtain wall for affected portion of building
- 34-seat classroom

Project cost:
- $7,000,000 Authorized
- $7,000,000 Final Cost

Completed:
- September 2014

Woodland Renovations – Phase I slide
Image showing the portion of Woodland Building impacted by project

Woodland Renovations slide
Image showing a second floor general chemistry lab after renovation

Woodland Renovations slide
Image showing exterior southern facade of building section impacted before renovation
Woodland Renovations slide
   Image showing exterior southern façade of building section impacted after renovation

2014 Summer Construction Project Summary slide
   List of projects at University Park (149) and Commonwealth campuses (100)

Penn State Mont Alto – Lab Renovations slide
   Image showing outdated science/technology labs before renovation

Penn State Mont Alto – Lab Renovations slide
   Image showing second floor Zoology lab after renovation

Beautification Penn State York – Romano Entry slide
   Image showing Romano Building entrance before renovations

Beautification Penn State York – Romano Entry slide
   Image showing Romano Building entrance after renovations

Beautification – Keller Building South Patio slide
   Image showing Keller south patio before renovations

Beautification – Keller Building South Patio slide
   Image showing Keller south patio after renovations

Classroom Renovation – Willard Room 358 slide
   Image showing Willard room 358 before renovations

Classroom Renovation – Willard Room 358 slide
   Image showing Willard room 358 after renovations

West Campus Steam Plant Modifications and Turbine Replacement slide
   University Park campus – Scope included in project:
   - Modifications inside plant to install gas boilers
   - New gasline to WCSP
   - Demolish stack and baghouse
   - New shop building
   - Replacement of two turbine generators

Project cost:
   - $57,300,000 Current Estimate - Plant Modifications
   - ($57,300,000 Authorized)
   - $ 9,200,000 Current Estimate - Turbine Replacement
   - ($ 9,200,000 Authorized)

Completed:
   - Turbine Completion: December 2015
   - Plant Modification: January 2017
   - Project Complete: December 2018
West Campus Steam Plant Modifications and Turbine Replacement slide
   Table showing the project schedule milestones. Gas line was completed December 2014

Gasline Core Campus Route slide
   Image showing route for the gasline through core campus

Gasline Installation slide
   Image showing welders completing the gasline

Safety slide
   Table showing the safety elements associated with this pipeline as compared to federal pipeline requirements. This pipeline surpasses federal requirements.

Gasline – Curtin Road Transit Center slide
   Image showing Curtin Road – all impacted roads were repaved and Curtin Road Transit Center was repaired

Educational Activities Building Renovation and Addition slide
   Harrisburg campus – Scope included in project:
   - 51,405 square foot addition and 3,652 square foot renovation
   - Three 120-seat classrooms
   - Civil, electrical, and mechanical engineering labs
   - Faculty offices
   - Storage and equipment areas
   - Computer lab
   - Humanities studio

   Project cost:
   - $19,500,000 Authorized
   - $19,400,000 Final Cost

   Completed:
   - July 2014

Educational Activities Building Renovation and Addition slide
   Image showing view of Educational Activities Building from across College Drive

Educational Activities Building Renovation and Addition slide
   Image showing one of three much-needed 120-seat classrooms

Educational Activities Building Renovation and Addition slide
   Image showing an Electrical Physics class

South Frear renovations slide
   University Park campus – Scope included in project:
   - Open research lab space on 2nd and 4th floors
   - Reconfigured and modernized undergraduate teaching labs on 1st floor
   - Improved lab space on 1st floor
- Improved safety in teaching labs

Project cost:
- $18,100,000 Authorized
- $18,100,000 Final Cost

Completed:
- August 2014

**South Frear Renovations – Second Floor slide**
Image showing second floor research lab with open collaborative spaces

**South Frear Renovations – First Floor slide**
Image showing Bio-Molecular Teaching Laboratory

**Old Main renovations slide**
University Park campus – Scope included in project:
- Utility infrastructure replacements and upgrades
- Temperature and humidity controls in the main lobby
- Fresco conservation
- Restroom renovations – ADA compliance
- 2nd floor conference room air conditioning
- Historic finishes restored

Project cost:
- $11,000,000 Authorized
- $12,100,000 Final Cost

Completed:
- Summer 2014

**Old Main Renovations slide**
Image showing fresco conservation is complete / new carpeting, draperies, lighting, and furniture

**Old Main Renovations slide**
Image showing Lobby paint palette before renovations – all white

**Old Main Renovations slide**
Image showing Lobby paint palette after renovations – warmer colors

**H.O. Smith Botanic Gardens – The Children’s Garden slide**
University Park campus – Scope included in project:
- Garden spaces designed for children ages 3 to 12
- Design references Pennsylvania’s geomorphology
- Entry Court with biofiltration pool feature
- Glass House
- Limestone Grotto
- Mushroom Hollow with Discovery Tree

Project cost:
$3,600,000 Authorized  
$3,300,000 Final Cost

Completed:  
June 2014

**Childhood’s Gate – Entry Court slide**  
Image showing Entry Court colored glass canopy

**Central Valley – Farm Pump slide**  
Image showing Central Valley agrarian tribute

**Fossil Ridge - Grotto slide**  
Image showing Fossil Ridge geology

**Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System slide**  
University Park campus – Scope included in project:  
- State-of-the-art high definition videogaboards 
- Upgrade to bowl sound system 
- Closed captioning boards 
- Modifications to steel structure

Project cost:  
- $10,000,000 Authorized  
- $10,000,000 Final Cost

Completed:  
August 2014

**Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System slide**  
Image showing the North Videoboard

**Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System slide**  
Image showing the Nittany Lion LED logo at night

**Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I slide**  
University Park campus – Scope included in project:  
- 47,925sf addition / 14,200sf renovation 
- Expanded fitness area, group exercise studios 
- Multipurpose rooms 
- Welcoming lobby with access control / lounge/ desk area 
- Relocated administrative offices 
- Enhanced presence on Curtin Road

Project cost:  
- $26,100,000 Authorized  
- $26,100,000 Final Cost

Completed:  
March 2014
Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I slide
   Image showing the glass curtain wall surrounding the mezzanine level fitness center facing Curtin Road

Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I slide
   Image showing the mezzanine level – holds 92 pieces of equipment and is equipped with wifi

Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I slide
   Image showing a view into the weightroom

Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I slide
   Image showing one of three multi-purpose rooms

Shaver Creek Dam Rehabilitation slide
   Lake Perez – Scope included in project:
   - Grout “curtain” to bedrock along crest of dam
   - Interceptor trench and drains
   - Seepage monitoring system
   - Earthfill materials along seepway replaced
   - 72 acre Lake Perez refilled

Project cost:
   - $5,500,000 Authorized
   - $5,100,000 Final Cost

Completed:
   - December 2014

Stone Valley Recreation Area slide
   Image showing an aerial map including University Park and Shavers Creek Dam

Shaver’s Creek Dam Rehabilitation slide
   Image showing an aerial of Lake Perez with these locations identified:
   - Shaver’s Creek Environmental Center
   - Stone Valley Recreation
   - Civil Engineering Camp
   - Shavers’s Creek Dam

Dam Repair project slide
   Graphic illustrating project elements:
   - Reduce seepage through rock foundation via installation of grout curtain along crest of dam
   - Collect and convey seepage through an interceptor trench, drains and monitoring system
   - Repair / replace fill materials along the spillway wall
Shaver’s Creek Dam Rehabilitation slide
   Image showing completed dam rehabilitation

Shaver’s Creek Dam Rehabilitation slide
   Image showing dam spillway

Shaver’s Creek Dam Rehabilitation slide
   Image showing Lake Perez refilled
Construction Status Report

A Presentation to The Pennsylvania State University Faculty Senate
March 2014 – March 2015
Completed Capital Projects: March 2014 - March 2015

- Woodland Building – Phase I, Abington
- 2014 Summer Construction Projects
- West Campus Steam Plant Natural Gasline
- Educational Activities Building Renovation & Addition, Harrisburg
- South Frear Renovations, UP
- Old Main Renovations, UP
- Children’s Garden at the Arboretum, UP
- Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System, UP
- Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I, UP
- Shaver’s Creek Dam Rehabilitation, UP
Woodland Building Renovation

Abington

Scope: Included in project:
- Renovated science labs on 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors
- Improved building utility systems
- New curtain wall for affected portion of building
- 34-seat classroom

Project Cost: $7,000,000 Authorized
- $7,000,000 Final Cost

Completed: September 2014
Woodland Building Renovations – Phase I
Woodland Building Renovation

Second floor general chemistry lab
Woodland Building Existing

Exterior southern façade BEFORE
Woodland Building Renovation

Exterior southern façade AFTER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>University Park Projects</th>
<th>Commonwealth Services Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Roadway &amp; Parking Improvements</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework and Utilities Projects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry Repair Projects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Buildings/Additions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Replacement/Repair Projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation Projects</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Penn State Mont Alto – Lab Renovations

Outdated Science/Technology labs BEFORE
Beautification Penn State York – Romano Entry

Romano Building entrance BEFORE
University Park

**Scope:**

- Modifications inside plant to install gas boilers
- New gasoline to WCSP
- Demolish stack and baghouse
- New shop building
- Replacement of two turbine generators

**Total Project Cost:**

- $57,300,000 Current Estimate - Plant Modifications ($57,300,000 Authorized)
- $9,200,000 Current Estimate - Turbine Replacement ($9,200,000 Authorized)

**Schedule:**

- Turbine Completion: December 2015
- Plant Modification: January 2017
- Project Complete: December 2018
### WCSP Modifications and Turbine Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestones</th>
<th>July 2013</th>
<th>January 2014</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOT Final Plan Approval</td>
<td>11/2012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP permit approval</td>
<td>04/2013</td>
<td>01/2014</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin removal of 2 boilers</td>
<td>10/2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>03/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas line complete</td>
<td>10/2013</td>
<td>12/2014</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin using 1st new boiler</td>
<td>10/2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbine complete</td>
<td>11/2014</td>
<td>07/2015</td>
<td>12/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Mod complete</td>
<td>01/2015</td>
<td>12/2016</td>
<td>01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA Compliance Date</td>
<td>01/2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP/EPA 1 year extension</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>01/2017</td>
<td>01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo stack &amp; baghouse</td>
<td>06/2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>06/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New building complete</td>
<td>12/2017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gasline Core Campus Route
Gas Line Installation

On-campus run of natural gas pipeline is complete
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Pipeline Requirements</th>
<th>This Pipeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can operate at 1300 pounds per square inch pressure (192.105)</td>
<td>Will operate at a maximum of 400 psig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not required to be “Smart Pig” compatible (192.150)</td>
<td>Is “Smart Pig” compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welds must be visually inspected (192.241)</td>
<td>100% of welds have had a full circumference radiographic inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathodic protection required to use either sacrificial anodes or rectifiers (192.455)</td>
<td>Has both sacrificial anodes and rectifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leak survey every 5 years (192.723)</td>
<td>Leak survey quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No required inspection for pipeline shut-off valve</td>
<td>Pipeline shut-off valve will be inspected annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All impacted roads were repaved and Curtin Road Transit Center was repaired.
Educational Activities Building Renovation & Addition

Harrisburg

**Scope:** 51,405sf addition; 3,652sf renovation includes:
- Three 120-seat classrooms
- Civil, electrical, and mechanical engineering labs
- Faculty offices
- Storage and equipment areas
- Computer lab
- Humanities studio

**Total Project Cost:** $19,500,000 Authorized
$19,400,000 Final Cost

**Completed:** July 2014
Educational Activities Building Renovation & Addition

View across College Drive
Educational Activities Building Renovation & Addition

One of three much-needed 120-seat classrooms
University Park

**Scope:** Included in project:
- Open research lab space on 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} floors
- Reconfigured and modernized undergraduate teaching labs on 1\textsuperscript{st} floor
- Improved lab space on 1\textsuperscript{st} floor
- Improved safety in teaching labs

**Project Cost:** $18,100,000 Authorized
$18,100,000 Final Cost

**Completed:** August 2014
South Frear Renovations – Second Floor

Second floor research lab with open collaborative spaces
South Frear Renovations – First Floor

Bio-Molecular Teaching Laboratory
Old Main Renovations

University Park

Scope:

Upgrades include:

- Utility infrastructure replacements and upgrades
- Temperature and humidity controls in the main lobby
- Fresco conservation
- Restroom renovations – ADA compliance
- 2nd floor conference room air conditioning
- Historic finishes restored

Project Cost:

- $11,000,000 Authorized
- $12,100,000 Final Cost

Completed: Summer 2014
Old Main Renovations

Fresco conservation is complete / new carpeting, draperies, lighting, and furniture
Old Main Renovations

Lobby paint palette before renovations
The H.O. Smith Botanic Gardens – The Children’s Garden

Scope:

Children’s Garden includes:

- Garden spaces designed for children ages 3 to 12
- Design references Pennsylvania’s geomorphology
- Entry Court with biofiltration pool feature
- Glass House
- Limestone Grotto
- Mushroom Hollow with Discovery Tree

Project Cost:

$3,600,000 Reported
$3,300,000 Final Cost

Schedule:

June 2014
Childhood’s Gate – Entry Court

Entry Court colored glass canopy
Central Valley – Farm Pump
Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System

University Park

Scope: Replacement includes:
• State-of-the-art high definition videoboards
• Upgrade to bowl sound system
• Closed captioning boards
• Modifications to steel structure

Project Cost: $10,000,000 Authorized
$10,000,000 Final Cost

Completed: August 2014
Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System

North videogboard
Beaver Stadium Videoboards and Sound System

Nittany Lion LED logo at night
Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I

University Park

Scope: 47,925sf addition / 14,200sf renovation includes:
• Expanded fitness area, group exercise studios
• Multipurpose rooms
• Welcoming lobby with access control / lounge/ desk area
• Relocated administrative offices
• Enhanced presence on Curtin Road

Project Cost: $26,100,000 Authorized
$26,100,000 Final Cost

Completed: March 2014
Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I

Glass curtain wall surrounds the mezzanine level fitness center facing Curtin Road
Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I

Mezzanine level holds 92 pieces of equipment and is equipped w/ wifi
Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I

View into the weightroom
Intramural Building Expansion – Phase I

One of three multipurpose rooms
Lake Perez

**Scope:** Included in project:
- Grout “curtain” to bedrock along crest of dam
- Interceptor trench and drains
- Seepage monitoring system
- Earthfill materials along seepway replaced
- 72 acre Lake Perez refilled

**Project Cost:**
- $5,500,000 Authorized
- $5,100,000 Final Cost

**Completion:** December 2014
Shaver’s Creek Dam Rehabilitation

Shavers Creek Environmental Center
Civil Engineering Camp
Shavers Creek Dam
Lake Perez
Stone Valley Recreation
Scare Pond Road
Lodge Lane
1- Reduce seepage through rock foundation via installation of grout curtain along crest of dam

2- Collect and convey seepage through dam via interceptor trench, drains and monitoring system

3- Repair / replace fill materials along spillway wall
Shavers Creek Dam Rehabilitation
This report, prepared by David Lieb, Senior Associate Vice President for Development, will update the Senate on the final results of the “For the Future” fundraising campaign and present the development strategies of the University going forward.
Division of Development and Alumni Relations
Update to the Senate Committee

Introduction
The purpose of this report is to advise the Senate Committee of the *For the Future* Campaign totals as well as the Road Ahead.

Slide 2
Overall Progress of the Campaign: $2,188,361,752.00.

Slide 3
Campaign Objectives
- Sustaining a Tradition of Quality: $947M
- Ensuring Student Opportunity: $495M
- Enhancing Honors Education: $76M
- Enriching the Student Experience: $137M
- Building Faculty Strength & Capacity: $185M
- Fostering Discovery & Creativity: $348M

Slide 4
Snapshot of Giving
- Facilities: 22%
- Endowments: 37%
- Current Use: 41%

Slide 5
Annual Commitments
- FY07-08 $277M
- FY08-09 $265M
- FY09-10 $273M
- FY10-11 $353M
- FY11-12 $223M
- FY12-13 $263M
- FY13-14 $342M

Slide 6
Annual Receipts
- FY07-08 $181M
- FY08-09 $182M
- FY09-10 $203M
- FY10-11 $274M
- FY11-12 $208M
- FY12-13 $237M
Slide 7
Largest Campaigns in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>GOAL/TOTAL RAISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>$6.5B/$2.8B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>$6B/$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>$5B/$5.87B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>$4.75B/$4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>$4.5B/$4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>$4.3B/$6.2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$3.5B/$4.3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>$3.5B/$3.881B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>$3.25B/$1.7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>$2.5B/$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>$2B/$2.188B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slide 8
Trustee Matching Scholarship Program
- Total raised **$135 million**
- Impact
  - 26,000 students benefitted
  - Program status moving forward
    - Goal raised to **$140 million**
    - Gifts of **$100,000** or more matched at 5%

Slide 9
Early Career Professorships
- 40 new Early Career Professorships were created during the campaign

Slide 10
Alumni Donors
176,058 – Most alumni donors to any public university campaign, ever.

Slide 11
Trustee Giving
$112 Million

Slide 12
Faculty & Staff Support
- Original goal - $42M
- Raised goal to $50M
- Final Total: $63M

Slide 13
The Road Ahead
- As the result of an extensive study conducted during/post *For The Future*, it was identified that there were several areas of opportunity where the Office of University Development (OUD) could increase the involvement of volunteers and improve
operations. To that end, OUD leadership has completed a staff reorganization as well as created the following task forces in preparation for the July 2016 quiet launch of its next campaign.

**Slide 14**
Penn State Communications and Marketing Committee:
- Will serve as counsel to the Offices of University Development and Strategic Communications with respect to the creation of strategic messaging and development of a communications program to advance fundraising priorities. The committee’s expertise will help lay the communications groundwork for the next University-wide campaign.

**Slide 15**
Parent’s Philanthropy Committee:
- Will review parent fundraising priorities, establish appropriate fundraising and programmatic goals and develop persuasive messaging and fundraising communications to potential parent donors. This committee will be integral to the University’s next campaign.

**Slide 16**
Volunteer Engagement Task Force:
- Will assess current practices and develop and promote new practices, stimulate the expansion of volunteer involvement in philanthropy across the University, and increase expectations and standards of volunteer management.

**Slide 17**
Prospect Management and Campaign Counting Task Force:
- Will review and make recommendations on possible modifications to current prospect management and campaign counting methodologies to include, but not be limited to, recommendations which may encourage more cross-unit fundraising collaborations.

**Slide 18**
Endowment Levels Task Force
- Will benchmark with peer institutions to evaluate if new endowment categories should be considered and make recommendations on existing endowment levels to ensure gifts for this purpose are meeting the needs of the University.

**Slide 19**
Campaign Case for Support Task Force:
- Will assist in the development of the University case for support as well as provide feedback on the case statements and needs submitted by the individual units.

**Slide 20**
- Will work with University Leadership to review funding and staffing benchmarking data and to provide guidance and reaction to a campaign budget and staffing needs.
University Planning Committee Update
March 2015

Division of Development and Alumni Relations Update
Overall Progress of the Campaign

$2,188,361,752
Campaign Objectives

- Sustaining a Tradition of Quality: $947 million
- Ensuring Student Opportunity: $495 million
- Enhancing Honors Education: $76 million
- Enriching the Student Experience: $137 million
- Building Faculty Strength and Capacity: $185 million
- Fostering Discovery and Creativity: $348 million
Snapshot of Campaign Giving

- Current Use: 41%
- Endowments: 37%
- Facilities: 22%
Annual Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY07-08</td>
<td>$277,449,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08-09</td>
<td>$265,173,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09-10</td>
<td>$273,809,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10-11</td>
<td>$353,291,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11-12</td>
<td>$223,735,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12-13</td>
<td>$263,552,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13-14</td>
<td>$342,469,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penn State
University Development
Annual Receipts

- FY07-08: $181,470,741
- FY08-09: $182,112,779
- FY09-10: $203,387,779
- FY10-11: $274,832,041
- FY11-12: $208,677,042
- FY12-13: $237,779,280
- FY13-14: $271,101,131

Penn State University Development
## Largest Campaigns in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>GOAL/TOTAL RAISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>$6.5B/$2.8B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>$6B/$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>$5B/$5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>$4.75B/$4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>$4.5B/$2.25B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>$4.3B/$6.2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$3.5B/$4.3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>$3.5 B/$3.881B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>$3.25 B/$1.7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>$2.5B/$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>$2B/$2.188B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amounts provided by CASE as of January 2014.*
Trustee Matching Scholarship Program

- Total raised $135 million
- Impact
  - 26,000 students benefitted
- Program status moving forward
  - Goal raised to $140 million
  - Gifts of $100,000 or more matched at 5%
Early Career Professorships

- 40 new Early Career Professorships were created during the campaign
Alumni Donors

176,058

Most alumni donors to any public university campaign, ever.
Trustee Giving

$112 million
Faculty & Staff Support

- Original goal - $42 million
- Raised to $50 million
- Final total: $63 million
The Road Ahead

- As the result of an extensive study conducted during/post *For The Future*, it was identified that there were several areas of opportunity where the Office of University Development (OUD) could increase the involvement of volunteers and improve operations. To that end, OUD leadership has completed a staff reorganization as well as created the following task forces in preparation for the July 2016 quiet launch of its next campaign.
Penn State Communications and Marketing Committee:

- Will serve as counsel to the Offices of University Development and Strategic Communications with respect to the creation of strategic messaging and development of a communications program to advance fundraising priorities. The committee's expertise will help lay the communications groundwork for the next University-wide campaign.
Parent’s Philanthropy Committee:

- Will review parent fundraising priorities, establish appropriate fundraising and programmatic goals and develop persuasive messaging and fundraising communications to potential parent donors. This committee will be integral to the University’s next campaign.
Volunteer Engagement Task Force:

- Will assess current practices and develop and promote new practices, stimulate the expansion of volunteer involvement in philanthropy across the University, and increase expectations and standards of volunteer management.
Prospect Management and Campaign Counting Task Force:

- Will review and make recommendations on possible modifications to current prospect management and campaign counting methodologies to include, but not be limited to, recommendations which may encourage more cross-unit fundraising collaborations.
Endowment Levels Task Force:

- Will benchmark with peer institutions to evaluate if new endowment categories should be considered and make recommendations on existing endowment levels to ensure gifts for this purpose are meeting the needs of the University.
Campaign Case for Support Task Force:

- Will assist in the development of the University case for support as well as provide feedback on the case statements and needs submitted by the individual units.
**Campaign Budget and Staffing Task Force:**

- Will work with University Leadership to review funding and staffing benchmarking data and to provide guidance and reaction to a campaign budget and staffing needs.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Swing Space Report

(Informational Report)

H. Ford Stryker, Associate Vice President for Physical Plant will present a report explaining the University’s strategy for providing temporary space for laboratories and offices while research and teaching facilities are under renovation or replacement.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

- Mark A. Brennan
- Anthony M. Christina
- Andy Dessel
- Michael J. Dooris
- Roger A. Egolf, Chair
- Dennis L. GIngrich
- David J. Gray
- Kane M. High
- Joseph F. Horn
- Rodney P. Kirsch
- David J. Lieb
- John Messner
- Keith E. Nelson
- W. Brian Reeves
- Cynthia K. Robinson
- Stephen C. Ross
- Ira S. Saltz
- Shuang Shen
- Rachel E. Smith
- H. Ford Stryker
- Hemant P. Yennawar
SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Faculty Senate – Swing Space Report

(Informational)

Introduction
Ford Stryker will present an informational report on construction swing space.

Introduction slide: Faculty Senate – Swing Space Report March 17, 2015

Agenda slide
- Capital Plan
- Swing Space Philosophy
- Swing Space Assets
- Upcoming Projects

Campus Age Profile slide
Charts showing that 68% of buildings at University Park campus are 25-50 years old and that 59% of Commonwealth campus buildings are 25-50 years old. These buildings are at highest risks for failures.

Allocation Distribution by Unit slide
Pie chart showing that 59% of the total $2.77 billion capital plan, or $1,620,600,000, goes to Education & General. 17%, or $480,400,000 goes to Auxiliary and Business Services, 2% or $51,500,000 goes to Intercollegiate Athletics, 15%, or $422,200,000 goes to Hershey, 2%, or $60,000,000 goes to Energy Savings Programs, and 5%, or $135,600,000 goes to future commitments.

E&G: Allocation by Project Type slide
Pie chart showing that 32% or the total Education and General capital plan spending, or $495,000,000 goes to new buildings and additions, 25%, or $390,000,000 goes to renewals and additions, 12%, or $189,000,000 goes to infrastructure, 9%, or $138,800,000 goes to system upgrades, 11%, or $179,900,000 goes to IT/Res Equipment, and 11%, or $175,000,000 goes to major maintenance projects.

Swing Space Philosophy slide
Construction is disruptive. Construction options, in order of preference:
- Empty building
- Phased construction

Swing space options, in order of preference:
- available university-owned facilities first with classrooms and labs as the top priority for core of campus
- If university-owned facilities unavailable – rent
- Last resort – build
Campus Renewal – Construction slide
- Images showing Steidel renovation – UP
- Health & Human Development – UP
- Woodland Building Renovation – Abington
- Educational Activities Building - Harrisburg

University-owned Facilities slide
- Thomas Building – basement
- Greenberg
- Ritenour

Rental space slide
- Verizon Building downtown State College
- Harrisburg trailers rented – classrooms bought for bookstore to be relocated to SEC

Built Swing Space slide
- Lab Trailer for Luerssen renovation – Berks
- Research A temporary trailers

Built swing space slide
- HUB Lawn bookstore trailers

Built swing space slide
Graphic map showing the limit of work on the HUB Lawn area

Swing space Scheduling
Gant chart showing the staggering of projects due to swing space availability

Closing slide
Questions?
Agenda

Capital Plan
Swing Space Philosophy
Swing Space Assets
Upcoming Projects
Campus Renovation Age by Category

- **UP**:
  - **Under 10**: 23% (Low Risk)
  - **10 to 25**: 19% (Medium Risk)
  - **25 to 50**: 9% (High Risk)
  - **Over 50**: 68% (Highest Risk)

- **Commonwealth**:
  - **Under 10**: 22% (Low Risk)
  - **10 to 25**: 19% (Medium Risk)
  - **25 to 50**: 9% (High Risk)
  - **Over 50**: 68% (Highest Risk)

- **Buildings Under 10**:
  - Little work. "Honeymoon" period. Low Risk
- **Buildings 10 to 25**:
  - Short life-cycle needs; primarily space renewal. Medium Risk
- **Buildings 25 to 50**:
  - Major envelope and mechanical life cycles come due. Higher Risk
- **Buildings over 50**:
  - Life cycles of major building components are past due. Failures are possible. Highest risk

Campus Age Profile
Swing Space

Allocation Distribution by Unit (in millions)

Future Commitments
- $135.6 (5%)

ESP
- $60.0 (2%)

HY
- $422.2 (15%)

ICA
- $51.5 (2%)

A&BS
- $480.4 (17%)

E&G
- $1,620.6 (59%)

Total Value = $2.77B

Education and General
Auxiliary and Business Services
Intercollegiate Athletics
Hershey
Energy Savings Program
Future Commitments
Swing Space

E&G: Allocations by Project Type (in millions)

- **New/Additions**: 495.0 (32%)
- **Renewals/Renovations**: 390.0 (25%)
- **Infrastructure**: 189.9 (12%)
- **IT/Res Equipment**: 179.9 (11%)
- **System Upgrades**: 138.8 (9%)
- **Major Maintenance**: 175.0 (11%)

Total Value = $1.57B

Note: Does not include $52M in Program Contingencies.
Construction is disruptive

Construction Options (in order of preference):
- Empty building
- Phased construction

Swing Space Options (in order of preference):
- Available University-owned facilities first
  - Classrooms and labs are top priority for core of campus
- If University-owned facilities unavailable - rent
- Last resort - build
Swing Space

Campus Renewal - Construction

- Steidle Renovation - UP
- Health & Human Development - UP
- Woodland Building Renovation - Abington
- Educational Activities Building - Harrisburg
Swing Space

Verizon Building downtown State College

Rental Space

Harrisburg trailers rented - classrooms / bought for bookstore to be relocated to SEC
Swing Space

Lab Trailer for Luerssen renovation - Berks

Built Swing Space

Research A temporary trailers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HUB</th>
<th>Steidle</th>
<th>Ag Engineering</th>
<th>Hosler</th>
<th>TBD</th>
<th>Whitmore</th>
<th>Chemical &amp; Bio Engineering</th>
<th>Henning</th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>HHD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*HHD Completion*
QUESTIONS?
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, February 24, 2015 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Absent: C. Weidemann

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Kulikowich called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 24, 2015, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 13, 2015
The minutes of the January 13, 2015, meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS
Chair Kulikowich welcomed Sudarshan Nelatury, who has replaced Bill Lasher as Senate Councilor from Penn State Erie.

Additional announcements by Chair Kulikowich:
- The Faculty Advisory Committee met this morning with Provost Jones and discussed the following topics: per diem news story draft; Faculty Athletics Representative percent appointment; progress on revising campus budget model; admissions update; update on dean searches; update on strategic planning; and campus visits.
- The Senate officers will visit the Division of Undergraduate Studies and Earth and Mineral Sciences on February 27 and complete their spring visits on March 27 with the Graduate School. They will debrief with Provost Jones on April 21.
- Kadi Corter, currently the Curriculum Recorder, has accepted the offer of the Curriculum Coordinator position. Kadi will be working with Julie Gibboney to transition before Julie retires on April 1. Provost Jones has approved the filling of Kadi’s current position.
• The link to the online Committee Preference Form will be sent to 2015-2016 Senators in mid-March. Councilors were encouraged to discuss committee assignments with their caucuses.

• Senate Councilors were asked to consider the number of reports that have been submitted and the time needed to entertain nominations from the floor for officer positions, the academic trustee nominee, and for several committee slots during the Senate meeting on March 17, when making decisions on whether an informational report should be presented at the March 17 Senate meeting, or posted online.

Executive Vice President and Provost Nick Jones commented on the campus visits he is conducting. Six campuses were visited last week; two more are scheduled for later this week. The campus visits will conclude in March. He discussed the importance of maintaining the security of electronic information. Two external reviews have provided input on areas that need to be addressed. The strategic planning process continues. The reports of six of the eight working groups have been discussed. They will be incorporated into the plan. Councilors commented on the need to address information security in a thorough manner and pointed out that several Penn State faculty are experts in this area. A question was asked about the status of the discussions regarding a new campus budget model. That process is ongoing.

Vice Provost Blannie Bowen reported that the Middle States accreditation visits are underway. The team will visit University Park on March 22-25. Multiple administrator searches are underway and a 5-year review of one college dean is being conducted. Vice President Madlyn Hanes reported three campus administrator searches are underway. Vice President Rob Pangborn reported an additional 1000 offers for admission to Commonwealth Campuses have been made. Offers for University Park have decreased by 300 compared with last year, to adjust enrollment at UP after an unexpected increase in enrollment for 2014-15. Offers to minority applicants and transfer students are 9% and 19% higher, respectively. Acting Vice Provost Marcus Whitehurst mentioned efforts underway with the Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force and a state legislator who is interested in equity issues.

Councilor comments
Ryan Belz mentioned some faculty have been invited an academic dinner as a way to increase interactions of faculty and students.

**ACTION ITEMS**

On a Brunsden/Wilson motion, the Penn State Harrisburg proposal to phase out the Baccalaureate degree in Applied Behavioral Science was supported. The Office of Undergraduate Education will be notified of this action.

Revision to the Penn State Abington Constitution. Senate Council voted to approve the revision. The chair of the unit faculty organization and the Abington chancellor will be notified.

The following five senators were elected for two-year terms to the Committee on Committees and Rules:
Dawn Blasko (Erie), Pamela Hufnagel (Dubois), Christopher Long (Liberal Arts), Richard Robinett (Eberly College of Science), and Matthew Woessner (Harrisburg). The first alternate is Krishna Jayaker (Communications).
DISCUSSION ITEMS

Larry Kolbe and Brian Beiswenger gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Curriculum Review and Consultation System, which has been under development for some time. Councilors made suggestions of improvements to the system.

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Minutes from the January 21, 2105, Graduate Council meetings are posted on the Graduate School website at http://www.gradschool.psu.edu/gradcouncil/2014-15-graduate-council-meetings/.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR MARCH 17, 2015

Forensic Business

Student Life—21st Century Student Life Skills. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Nousek/Koch motion. Twenty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion. Chair Mary Miles will make suggested revisions to the report prior to the Senate meeting on March 17.

Legislative Reports

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid—Revisions to Senate Policy 34-20 (Registration). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Taylor motion.

Committees and Rules—Revision to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6b (Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid). This report was placed on the Agenda on an Egolf/Eckhardt motion.

Advisory/Consultative Reports

Faculty Affairs—Report on Policy AD-77, Engaging in Outside Professional Activities (Conflict of Commitment). This report was placed on the Agenda on an Egolf/Wilson motion.

Faculty Benefits—Employee Contributions to Penn State’s Self-Insured Health Care Costs. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Belz motion.

Faculty Benefits—Employee Life Insurance Policy. This report was returned to committee for revision and subsequent resubmission for Senate Council consideration.

Informational Reports

Committees and Rules—How to Bring a Concern to the University Faculty Senate. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhardt/Nousek motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Committees and Rules—Nominating Report for 2015-2016: Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; Standing Joint Committee on Tenure; University Promotion and Tenure Review
Committee. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Aynardi/Taylor motion. The report will be presented and nominations from the floor will be accepted at the meeting.

_Educational Equity and Campus Environment_— Update on the Activities of the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Equity Update on the Activities of the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Equity. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Brunsden motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

_Elections Commissions_— Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2015-2016. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Radhakrishna/Koch motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

_Faculty Affairs_— Report on Resolution on Faculty Contracts Referred by the Full Senate to the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs at the September 9, 2014 Senate Meeting. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Taylor motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

_Faculty Benefits_—2014-2015 Report on Faculty Salaries. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Wilson motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

_Senate Council_— Nominating Committee Report for 2015-2016. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Nousek/Taylor motion. The report will be presented and nominations from the floor will be accepted at the meeting.

_Senate Council_—Report on Fall 2014 Campus Visit. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhardt/ Radhakrishna motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

_Undergraduate Education_— Grade Distribution Report.. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Taylor motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

_University Planning_— Construction Status Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Ansari/Wilson motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

_University Planning_— Development and Alumni Relations Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Taylor motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

_University Planning_— Swing Status Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhardt/Wilson motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR MARCH 17, 2015**

The Agenda was approved on a Brunsden/Koch motion.
NEW BUSINESS
Immediate Past Chair Yarnal suggested that in Senate plenary sessions the substance of each motion be projected on a slide so it is clear what is being voted upon. This suggestion was well-received.

ADJOURNMENT
Chair Kulikowich thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Daniel R. Hagen
Executive Director
Date: March 10, 2015

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings for March 16 and 17. Please notify the Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2015

6:30 p.m. Officers and Chairs Meeting 102 Kern Graduate Building

8:15 p.m. Commonwealth Caucus Meeting 112 Kern Graduate Building

[*Note location change]*

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2015

8:00 a.m. Intercollegiate Athletics 502 Keller Building

8:30 a.m. Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid 112 Shields Building

Committees and Rules 201 Kern Graduate Building

Curricular Affairs 102 Kern Graduate Building

Educational Equity and Campus Environment 315 Grange Building

Faculty Affairs 118 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building

Faculty Benefits 519 Elliott Building

Intra-University Relations 215 Business Building

Outreach 214 Business Building

Research 217 Business Building

Undergraduate Education 110C Chandlee Lab

University Planning 217 Forest Resources Building

An Equal Opportunity University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Global Programs</td>
<td>412 Boucke Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries, Information Systems and Technology</td>
<td>510A Paterno Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>409H Keller Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Student Senators Caucus</td>
<td>114 Kern Graduate Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Commonwealth Caucus Meeting</td>
<td>Assembly Room, Nittany Lion Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Faculty Senate</td>
<td>112 Kern Graduate Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: March 10, 2015

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

From: Roger Egolf and James Ruiz, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2015 – 8:15 PM
112 KERN BUILDING
[*NOTE LOCATION CHANGE]

A Conversation with President Barron
President Barron

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2015 – 11:15 AM
NITTANY LION INN, ASSEMBLY ROOM

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

Agenda

I. Call to Order

II. Announcements
   Nominations for Caucus Co-Chairs

III. Introduction of, and discussion with, nominees for the following positions:

   Senate Chair-Elect (3 minutes allotted)
   - Thomas Beebee, Liberal Arts
   - Robin Bower, Beaver
   - Chester Ray, Medicine
   - James Strauss, Science

   Senate Secretary (2 minutes allotted)
   - Patricia Hinchey, Worthington-Scranton
   - Keefe Manning, Engineering
   - Laura Pauley, Engineering
   - Ann Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences
   - Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture

   Academic Trustee Nominee (3 minutes allotted)
   - Martha Aynardi, Berks
   - Larry Backer, Law
   - Ingrid Blood, Health and Human Development
   - Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley
   - David Han, Medicine
   - Jeffrey Laman, Engineering
   - Kim Steiner, Agricultural Sciences

An Equal Opportunity University
Discussion of Nominations for Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; University Promotion and Tenure; Standing Joint Committee on Tenure

IV. Committee Reports

V. Adjournment and Lunch