A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the April 28, 2015, Meeting in The Senate Record 48:6

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Seating Chart for 2015-2016

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – Meeting of June 30 and August 25, 2015

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Comments by the Executive Vice President and Provost

F. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force  
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Update on Implementation of LionPATH  
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Update on Background Checks  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Penn State Values  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

G. UNFINISHED LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
H. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid

Revisions to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal) Appendix G

Special Senate Committee on The Implementation of LionPath

Change to Senate Policy 34-60 (Prerequisites and Concurrent Courses) Appendix H

I. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Faculty Affairs

Revision of HR25 Emeritus Status Appendix I

J. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Faculty Affairs

Report on Protection of Faculty during Budgetary Contractions Appendix J
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Annual Report for 2014-2015* Appendix K

Intercollegiate Athletics

Annual Report of Academic Eligibility and Athletic Scholarships for 2014-2015* Appendix L

Senate Council

Report on Spring 2015 College Visits Appendix M
[10 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

*No presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.

K. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

L. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 27, 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: August 26, 2015

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

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

The Senate Curriculum Report dated August 25, 2015 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, curriculum coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before September 24, 2015.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web and may be found at: http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/
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**PRESENTERS**
August 19, 2015

To: Mohamad Ansari, Chair University Faculty Senate

Fr: Larry Catá Backer, Senator

Memo
Re: Introduction of Forensic business for the September 15, 2015 Senate Meeting

Article I, § 7 of the Senate Standing rules provides, in relevant part: “To introduce forensic business a senator must present in writing a title and brief summary of the matter to be discussed at least seven days before the meeting at which the matter is to be considered. The senator’s name will be placed on the agenda together with the title and summary.”

Notice is hereby given by the undersigned, a member of the Penn State University Faculty Senate, and the Chair of the University Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force, of an intention to introduce the following forensic business at the September 15, 2015 meeting of the University Faculty Senate:

Title: Moving Forward on the University’s Diversity Objectives

Brief Summary: The University Joint Diversity Task Force was charged by the University Provost and the Senate Chair to meet a number of objectives touching on the objectives of Penn State’s Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State (2010-2015) and its seven challenges, and fully embracing President Barron’s call, reported March 20, 2015, in which he stressed: “three imperatives: moral, educational and business. The University has a duty to teach all people, a diverse campus is a richer learning environment, and a welcoming and inclusive campus responding to changing demographics is crucial in attracting students. “At many universities, diversity is an assigned responsibility,” he said, “when in fact, we won’t be successful unless it is everybody’s job.” Penn State’s diversity will need to grow if the University is to mirror the racial makeup of Pennsylvania and beyond, according to Barron.”. (“Barron stresses demographics’, diversity’s importance in future of Penn State,” Penn State News, March 20, 2015, available http://news.psu.edu/story/349208/2015/03/20/administration/barron-stresses-demographics-diversity%E2%80%99s-importance-future):

The objective of this forensic session is to acquaint the Senate with the objectives of the JDATF and to seek consult with Senators on its approach to those objectives with specific regard to the following:

1. What is diversity?
2. What should be the faculty’s role in fostering diversity?
3. How should diversity issues be incorporated into General education?
With respect to these it might be helpful to review the Framework to Foster Diversity (2010-2015) strategic indicators arranged around its 7 challenges (http://equity.psu.edu/indicators/list-indicators):

Penn State Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive excellence:
The Pennsylvania State University strives to be fully committed to and accountable for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion in all of its forms, embracing differences and individual uniqueness, and creating a culture of inclusive excellence that supports both broad and specific diversity initiatives, leverages the educational and institutional benefits of diversity, and engages all individuals in reaching their highest potential. We value this inclusive excellence as one of our core strengths and as an essential element of our public service mission.

- We will create a safe environment of respect and inclusion for faculty, staff, students, and members of the communities we serve;

- We will educate our faculty, staff, and students, to become the next generation of social justice advocates by creatively providing curricula, programs and environments that reflect the diversity of our communities, raise broad cultural awareness, and challenge oppression;

- We will ensure equitable and inclusive access to our facilities, programs, resources, and services, and ensure that all of our policies and practices are inclusive and equitable;

- We will advance and build our workforce by assessing hiring practices and performance review procedures to attract, retain, and develop talented faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds; and

- We will address intergroup disparities in areas such as representation, retention, learning outcomes, and graduation rates.
Memo

To: Dr. Mohamad Ansari, Chair, Faculty Senate
From: Michael Büsges, Enterprise Project Director
Date: August 18, 2015
Re: September 15 LionPATH Update to the Full Academic Senate

The LionPATH Update to the full Faculty Senate on August 15 will cover the following topics:

- Review of the timeline and critical milestones throughout the academic year 2015-2016, particularly as it pertains to faculty interaction with and transition to Lion PATH

- Representative screenshots of the Lion PATH faculty self-service pages, mobile app, and student registration interface

- Summary of policy changes recommended by the special LionPATH Faculty Senate Committee, including:
  - Recommendation to pilot and implement pre-requisite checking

- Impact of LionPATH on switching from course suffixes to course attributes

- Discussion of new vocabulary in LionPATH, its visibility to students and faculty, and cost estimate to customize and maintain Penn State vernacular throughout the new system

cc: David Babb, Bob Kubat, Karen Duncan
Project LionPATH

Michael Büsges, Enterprise Project Director
David Babb, Assistant Professor/Research Associate, Department of Meteorology
Robert A. Kubat, University Registrar

Faculty Senate
Tuesday, September 15, 2015
High-Level Implementation Timeline

- **Project Launch**
  - February 2014

- **2014**

- **2015**
  - **Catalog & Schedule**
    - September 2015
  - **Admissions**
    - August 2015
  - **Financial Aid**
    - January 2016
  - **We are here!**

- **2016**
  - **Registration**
    - March 2016
  - **Degree Audit**
    - February 2016
  - **Student Billing**
    - June 2016
  - **Grades, Transcripts & Advising**
    - September 2016
Special Senate Committee on the Implementation of LionPATH

Senate policies currently undergoing review:

- Policy 34-60: Prerequisites (before the Senate)
- Policy 37-30: Entrance/Change Major (final approval)
- Policy 34-89: Course Drop (out for consultation)
- Policy 34-87: Course Add (out for consultation)
- Policy 47-80: Repeating Courses (out for consultation)
- Policy 58-60: Academic Renewal (draft stage)
Prerequisite Checking and Course Suffixes and Attributes

Prerequisite checking

- Four subjects/disciplines identified as early adapters to implement for fall 2016 preregistration — IST, Math, Meteorology, Nursing
- Long term strategy: Two-tiered system of prerequisites— “hard” enforced prerequisites and “soft” non-enforced prerequisites; timeline TBD

Course Suffixes and Attributes

- LionPATH is using course attributes and topics to reduce the dependency on course suffixes
  - Course Attributes
    - General Education
    - Bachelor of Arts requirements
    - Honors
  - Topics
    - Can be used to identify different foci of a course (i.e. Special Topics)
My Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Requirements</th>
<th>View my advisement report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What-If Report</td>
<td>Create a what-if scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td>View my advisors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transfer Credit
- Evaluate my transfer credits
- View my transfer credit report

Course History
- View my course history

Transcript
- View my unofficial transcript
- Request official transcript

Enrollment Verification
- Request enrollment verification

Graduation
- Apply for graduation
- View my graduation status

My Program:
- Institution: The Pennsylvania State Univ
- Career: Undergraduate
- Program: Science
- Major: Biology (BS)
# Faculty Center

## Class Roster

**Fall 2015 | Regular Academic Session | The Pennsylvania State Univ | Undergraduate**

![Math 140-003 (1331)](change_class)

### Enrollment Status

- **Enrolled**

### Enrollment Capacity

- **30**
- **Enrolled** **4**

### Select display option:

- ![Link to Photos](link_to_photos)
- ![Include photos in list](include_photos_in_list)

### Enrolled Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notify</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade Basis</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Program and Plan</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="notify" alt="Notify" /> <img src="photo" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>900005029</td>
<td>Brown, Adam</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Liberal Arts - Liberal Arts (PMAJ)</td>
<td>3rd Sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="notify" alt="Notify" /> <img src="photo" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>900005049</td>
<td>Jones, Matthew</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Altoona College - Criminal Justice (BS)</td>
<td>8th Sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="notify" alt="Notify" /> <img src="photo" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>900006697</td>
<td>Smith, Joseph</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Information Sciences and Tech - Info Sciences &amp; Tech (BS)</td>
<td>7th Sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="notify" alt="Notify" /> <img src="photo" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>900000218</td>
<td>White, Lisa</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Div of Undergraduate Studies - Div of Ug Studies (PMAJ)</td>
<td>1st Sem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select All   Clear All

[Printer Friendly Version](printer_friendly_version)
New Requirements for Background Clearances

Faculty Senate Presentation
September 15, 2015

Regis Becker
Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer
Office of Ethics & Compliance
rwb32@psu.edu

Sandy Weaver
Youth Program Compliance Specialist
Office of Ethics & Compliance
stw126@psu.edu
Clearance Requirements

Current Employees

Effective December 31, 2014, then current employees who were not required to have clearances in the past, but are now required due to interaction with dual enrolled students, have until December 31, 2015 to obtain the 3 publically available clearances. Dual enrolled students will not be allowed to enroll in any class taught by an employee hired on or after January 1, 2015 until all current clearances are in place. (23 PA. C.S. § 6344.4. Recertification)
Clearance Requirements
New Hires

The 3 publically available background clearances are required for all school employees hired after January 1, 2015 who have direct contact with children through a program, activity or service sponsored by Penn State. This includes individuals who are:

- responsible for the care, supervision, guidance or control of children OR routine interaction with children

- Routine interaction is regular and repeated contact that is integral to a person's employment responsibilities
Employee Exceptions

**School Employee** - An individual who is employed by a school or who provides a program, activity or service sponsored by a school. *The term does not apply to administrative or other support personnel unless the administrative or other support personnel has direct contact with children.*

→ Individuals whose direct contact with children in the course of employment is *limited to matriculated* students who are enrolled with the institution, are not required to obtain the 3 clearances *unless* otherwise directed by the University.
  • This Exception **DOES NOT APPLY** to those individuals who have direct contact with students under the age of 18 who are also enrolled in a secondary school (dual enrolled).

→ Individuals whose direct contact with children, in the course of employment is with prospective students visiting a campus operated by the institution of higher education, are not required to obtain the 3 clearances *unless* otherwise directed by the University.
  • At Penn State, this Exception **DOES NOT APPLY** to those employees who have direct contact with prospective students under the age of 18 through regular and repeated contact in the course of pre-college recruitment activities (admissions, athletics, specific units/colleges, etc.) that are integral to their responsibilities as direct contact often occurs *outside* of the university setting.

*Matriculated Students*: A student who is enrolled in an institution of higher education and pursuing a program of study that results in a postsecondary credential, such as a certificate, diploma or degree.
Portability of Clearances - Overview

- YES  EMPLOYMENT TO EMPLOYMENT
- YES  VOLUNTEER TO VOLUNTEER
- YES  EMPLOYMENT TO VOLUNTEER
- NO   VOLUNTEER TO EMPLOYMENT
Dual Enrollment Options

1. Limit dual enrollment registration to the sections of courses that typically enroll the most high school students and for which faculty are available who have completed the background checks.

2. Have all faculty who teach general, introductory courses complete the clearances. This would offer dual enrolled students a broader range of courses to choose from.

- Unit heads are responsible for ensuring that any faculty members teaching courses in which dual enrolled students are registered have completed the clearances above. Teaching assistants assigned to courses in which dual enrolled students are registered also are required to have the clearances.

- In addition, dual enrolled students may wish to make use of student support services, such as advising and learning centers or other forms of tutoring. If you provide support related to the courses in which dual enrolled students are registered, then professional and student staff in those areas also will need to complete the clearances.
Criminal Penalties for Not Requiring Clearances

• An employer, administrator, supervisor or other person responsible for employment decisions or selection of volunteers that intentionally fails to require the submission of the three clearances commits a misdemeanor of the third degree*

• Punishable to a maximum of 1 year imprisonment and $1,000 fine†

*[23 Pa. C.S. § 6344(B)(2), 23 Pa. C.S. § 6344.2(B)]
†[15 Pa. C.S. § 15.66(a)(7), 15 Pa. C.S. § 15.66(b)(8)]
Thank you!
Date: August 18, 2015

From: Timothy Balliett, University Ethics Officer, Office of Ethics and Compliance

To: Mohamad A. Ansari, Chair, University Faculty Senate
    Daniel R. Hagan, Executive Director, University Faculty Senate

RE: Forensic session on the Penn State Values

At the meeting of the University Faculty Senate on September 9, 2014, a forensic session on the proposed Penn State Values was facilitated by Christian Brady, Dean of the Schreyer Honors College and Timothy Balliett, University Ethics Officer, Office of Ethics and Compliance.

During Spring 2015, 46 town-hall meetings were held across all campuses, nearly all academic colleges and several administrative units to encourage discussion of the proposed Values, including refinement and implementation. Utilizing the feedback of the 2,205 participants and 336 small group discussions from the town halls, the Advisory Council for Continued Excellence (ACCE) recommended changes to the Penn State Values. President’s Council approved the final version of the Values on June 15, and the Board of Trustees reviewed the Values on July 17.

The forensic session, facilitated by Tim Balliett, will introduce the final version of the Penn State Values and findings of the town halls. It is hoped that the forensic session may be held during the September 15 University Faculty Senate meeting.

Discussion will center on two questions:

1. What can the University Faculty Senate do to support and endorse the Penn State Values?

2. What practices can the University Faculty Senate promote for successful implementation of the Penn State Values, particularly within the academic life of the University?

It is hoped that this session will provide the necessary background for University Faculty Senate deliberation and action regarding the Values, including the recommendations of the University Faculty Student Conduct Code Task Force (2012-2013): that a Senate committee work with relevant university constituents to implement and incorporate the statement into university life, a sub group of faculty focus on policies and procedures aimed at the implementation of these statements in practice, revisions to Senate Policy 49-20 and AAPPM G9 can be contemplated and implemented, and conduct relevant reviews of policies and procedures for faculty in light of the statement (Student Conduct Code Task Force final report to University Faculty Senate, April 22, 2013).
Penn State Values: Implementation

University Faculty Senate
Forensic Session
September 15, 2015

Tim Balliett, University Ethics Officer
Office of Ethics & Compliance
INTEGRITY: We act with integrity and honesty in accordance with the highest academic, professional, and ethical standards.

RESPECT: We respect and honor the dignity of each person, embrace civil discourse, and foster a diverse and inclusive community.

RESPONSIBILITY: We act responsibly, and we are accountable for our decisions, actions, and their consequences.

DISCOVERY: We seek and create new knowledge and understanding, and foster creativity and innovation, for the benefit of our communities, society, and the environment.

EXCELLENCE: We strive for excellence in all our endeavors as individuals, an institution, and a leader in higher education.

COMMUNITY: We work together for the betterment of the University the communities we serve, and the world.
Forensic Questions

1. What can the University Faculty Senate do to support and endorse the *Penn State Values*?

2. What practices can the University Faculty Senate promote for successful implementation of the *Penn State Values*, particularly within the academic life of the University?
Values Town Halls – Spring 2015

• 46 open meetings held across all campuses, nearly all colleges, several administrative units
• 2,205 participants
• 336 small group discussions
• Feedback utilized in revising Values, implementation, enculturation
Town Hall Feedback

• Liked organic process of values development
• Prefer short, succinct statements, but need examples & application to avoid being too vague, generic
• Generated good examples of values-in-action
• Provided specific areas of perceived disconnect between values and University daily life
• Desire accountability for & enculturation of Values, while recognizing difficulty in assessing them
• Confusion over relationship of Values to Mission
• Draft of “Community” descriptive, not action-oriented
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID

Revisions to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal)

(Legislative)

Introduction & Rationale

This recently revised policy (9/9/2014) suggests that academic renewal and re-enrollment is only available to students who have been academically dismissed by the University when, in fact, it is also available to students who have been academically warned or suspended or who step away from the University for four or more years.

In addition, mention of which office approves academic renewal and re-enrollment was removed from the policy since, at least at University Park, re-enrollment is not approved by the Registrar but by the college or Division of Undergraduate Studies in which the students expects to re-enroll.

Recommendations

Approve the revised policy as submitted to include students who have been academically warned, suspended, or who step away from the University for four or more years to request Academic Renewal and Re-enrollment.

Revised Policy: 54-90 Academic Renewal

Students, including those who have been academically warned, suspended, or dismissed, may request the Registrar to approve Academic Renewal and Re-enrollment. To be approved, the student must have had an absence of at least four calendar years during which they were not enrolled in any Penn State credit courses. If:

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

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

K-2 Re-enrollment with Academic Renewal Procedure
• Initial Legislation: 4/3/84
• Revised: 5/5/75
• Revised: 10/14/75
• Revised: 11/11/75

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

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

• Richard W. Robinett, Chair
• David Han, Vice Chair
• Martha W. Aynardi
• Albert L. Bartlett
• Clark Brigger
• Stephen H. Browne
• Joseph T. Chlentzos
• Rachel L. Fore
• Anna M. Griswold
• David C. Han
• Robert A. Kubat
• John Marsh
• Eugene L. McFeely
• Richard Singer
• Douglas E. Wolfe
SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LIONPATH

Change to Senate Policy 34-60 (Prerequisites and Concurrent Courses)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Rationale:

LionPATH is the student information system that will be replacing ISIS in the 2016/2017 academic year. The recent Project LionPATH Faculty Advisory Committee (PLP-FAC) report on prerequisite checking recommends that LionPATH enforce prerequisites for undergraduate courses at the point of registration. With this feature activated, a student would not be able to register for a course if they did not already have the prerequisite course on their transcript or on their current semester schedule.

This new functionality provides a unique opportunity to communicate to students the importance of prerequisite knowledge. Enforcement of prerequisites promotes student success while insuring curricular integrity. Furthermore, rather than having a reactive system, in which the burden is on the faculty member to remove a student in violation of stated prerequisites, a proactive registration system shifts the burden to the student to ask for an exception to a stated prerequisite.

Some units of the university still wish to retain the option to recommend preparatory work or companion courses without prohibiting registration, so it is proposed that new categories of non-mandatory recommendations be made. The official course description must clearly indicate which courses are enforced prerequisites and enforced concurrent courses and which are simply recommended preparatory or companion courses. This two-tiered approach has worked successfully at other institutions that enforce prerequisites at the time of registration.

The PLP-FAC report includes a recommendation to change senate policy 34-60 to accommodate the changes described above.
CURRENT POLICY:

34-60 Prerequisites and Concurrent Courses
Prerequisites are approximations of the necessary specific or general academic knowledge, background, or semester classification required to succeed academically in a specific course. Concurrent courses are courses required to be taken in the same semester. The course instructor has the right to limit the students in the course to those who have the stated prerequisites. If this limitation is exercised, it must occur before the end of the course add period.

REOMENDATION:

34-60 Prerequisites and Concurrent Courses
Prerequisites are approximations of the necessary specific or general academic knowledge, background, or semester classification required to succeed academically in a specific course. Concurrent courses are courses required to be taken in the same semester. The course instructor has the right to limit the students in the course to those who have the stated prerequisites. If this limitation is exercised, it must occur before the end of the course add period.

34-60 Prerequisites, Concurrent Courses, Co-requisite Courses, and Recommended Preparation

Prerequisites, concurrent courses, and co-requisite courses approximate the necessary specific coursework or general academic knowledge, background, or semester classification required to succeed academically in a given course.

Prerequisites are courses or other requirements that must be completed prior to the start of a given course.

Concurrent Courses are similar to prerequisites except that they may be taken prior to, or in the same semester as, the given course.

Co-requisite Courses are pairs of courses required to be taken together in the same semester.

Registration in a given course is limited to students who have satisfied the stated prerequisite, concurrent, or co-requisite requirements. The course instructor has the right to permit students to take the course without having the stated prerequisite,
concurrent, or co-requisite requirements, if the student demonstrates mastery of the material through some other means.

*Recommended Preparation* relates to preparatory skills or companion courses deemed useful, but not necessary, for successful completion of a course. Recommended preparation has no bearing on registration in a given course.

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

Revision of HR25 Emeritus Status

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the President

Introduction

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs was charged for the 2014-2015 academic year to review Policy HR25 Emeritus Status and make recommendations regarding its clarity and criteria. After careful review and consideration of this policy, the Committee submits this Advisory/Consultative Report.

Rationale

In its review, the committee agrees with the HR25 Policy statement that Emeritus Status should be, “given in recognition of meritorious service to The Pennsylvania State University” (https://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr25.html). However, this policy has traditionally only been extended to faculty with standing academic appointments who have undergone university-level review and academic administrators. Thus, the policy has excluded faculty with fixed-term appointments. Yet, as reported in the 2014-15 Annual Report on Faculty Tenure Rates, of the 6,000 full-time faculty members at Penn State, 2,239 (37.3%) are tenured and 640 (10.7%) are tenure track-not tenured, whereas 3,121 (52.0%) have other types of faculty appointments.

In light of the current faculty demographics, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs believes that the HR25 policy, as currently written, does not fulfill its stated purpose since it excludes full-time faculty members with fixed-term appointments from being considered for Emeritus status even though they might meet all other requirements of the policy. Many of these excluded faculty members have achieved distinction as teachers and researchers and have provided many years of service to Penn State. Thus, the policy deprives recognition for faculty members who have provided dedicated service to Penn State and simultaneously deprives Penn State of the benefits of continued affiliation with these faculty members. In sum, many of these faculty members are recognized leaders in their fields so it is mutually beneficial for the university and the faculty member to maintain their affiliation.

We recognize that many of the recommended expanded pool of eligible retirees will not have undergone a standardized university level review since the highest level of review for fixed-term faculty is review by a dean or chancellor. We found no currently established appropriate mechanism for university level review of these faculty. If additional university level review is deemed necessary for the awarding of Emeritus Status, we believe that such a procedure should be developed so that all meritorious faculty members will have a pathway to achieving this status.
In addition, upon careful review of Policy HR25 Emeritus Status, we clarified a number of other sections of the policy, including:

- Enumeration of the eligibility criteria, which were previously stated in paragraph form;
- Addition of a description of the process for initiating Emeritus Status; and
- Listing only those benefits associated solely with Emeritus Status and eliminating the listing of benefits afforded to all other retirees.

As stated, the benefits to be removed from the list are redundant with those offered to all retirees. The redundancies have been confirmed with Employee Relations in the Office of Human Resources, the Penn State id+ office, and the Parking Office. It should be noted than no additional resources for faculty benefits are required to implement the expanded list of eligible meritorious retirees.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1:** The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs recommends the following revisions to Policy HR25 as currently written ([https://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr25.html](https://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr25.html)).

(Note: Deletions are marked by strike-through and insertions are italicized in the revised policy below)

**Recommendation 2:**
The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs recommends that the Provost’s Office, in consultation with the appropriate University Faculty Senate Committee(s), develop a pathway for Emeritus Status, consistent with the type of appointment, for all full-time faculty who meet the three criteria.

Policy HR25 EMERITUS STATUS

POLICY’S INITIAL DATE: June 13, 1964
THIS VERSION EFFECTIVE: October 11, 2013

Contents:

- Purpose
- Normal Eligibility
- Approval of Emeritus Status
- Designated Title Continuation
- Notification of Award of Emeritus Status
- Privileges of Emeritus Status
- Revocation of Emeritus Status
- Cross References
PURPOSE:

This policy provides the criteria for eligibility and privileges of Emeritus Status.

NORMAL ELIGIBILITY:

Emeritus Status is a privilege, not a right, given in recognition of sustained meritorious academic service to The Pennsylvania State University.

Unless specifically not recommended, Emeritus Status is normally awarded upon leaving the University to personnel classified as academic or academic administrator who either (1) hold the rank of professor, associate professor, librarian, or associate librarian, where such appointment to that rank was authorized by the President in accordance with the promotion and tenure process; or, (2) hold a standing position and the rank of senior scientist or senior research associate in interdisciplinary and defense-related research units in accordance with HR23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations; or to personnel classified as executive, associate dean, or director of an academic unit.

To be eligible, individuals in the above ranks or positions must be either age sixty or older with ten or more years of service at the University or have completed twenty-five years or more of service at the University, AND have held an eligible rank at The Pennsylvania State University for a period of at least five years prior to leaving the University.

To be eligible for Emeritus Status individuals must meet the following three eligibility criteria:

(1) Hold a full-time academic appointment as a(n):
   a) university faculty member with primary responsibility of teaching, research, or service (or any combination of the three)
      or
   b) academic administrator.

(2) Hold any of the following ranks for at least five years prior to leaving the University:
   - professor or associate professor
   - professor or associate professor of practice
   - clinical professor or associate professor
   - librarian or associate librarian
   - senior scientist or senior research associate
   - senior lecturer or senior instructor
   - executive, associate dean, or director of an academic unit

(3) Meet one of the following requirements for age/years of University employment:
   a) age sixty or older with ten or more years in a full-time appointment
   or
   b) twenty-five or more years in a full-time appointment
A dean, chancellor, or academic vice president may request Emeritus Status for an individual who meets the above three criteria. Any individual who meets the eligibility criteria may also submit a request for Emeritus Status to the appropriate administrator.

The President may approve or disapprove the award of Emeritus Status apart from the normal eligibility criteria described above, and will notify the Board of Trustees' Subcommittee on Human Resources in such circumstances.

APPROVAL OF EMERITUS STATUS:

Emeritus Status is awarded by the President after reviewing any action by the appropriate officer request from a dean, chancellor, or academic vice president. Emeritus Status may be awarded to the President by the Board of Trustees.

DESIGNATED TITLE CONTINUATION:

Individuals holding Distinguished Professorships or University-Named titles will continue such title designations into Emeritus Status. Such continuation of title designation does not carry with it any supplemental or other privileges that were associated with the University-Named appointment during active employment.

NOTIFICATION OF AWARD OF EMERITUS STATUS:

A letter and a certificate are sent by the President to each individual awarded Emeritus Status. Copies of these letters are sent to the appropriate dean, or administrative officer chancellor, or academic vice president.

PRIVILEGES OF EMERITUS STATUS:

The following privileges are available to a recipient of Emeritus Status in addition to the privileges accorded all retirees*:

1. Penn State Emeritus ID Card
2. Listing of title, department, campus, and educational affiliation in the Faculty/Staff Directory
3. Registration of a vehicle for parking on campus at the normal faculty/staff rates Additional parking options may be available through the Parking Office.
4. Penn State Access Account for Internet services
5. Regular Faculty/Staff privileges at University Libraries
6. Receipt of Penn State Newswire services
7. Access to University recreational facilities
8. Faculty/Staff discount at Penn State Bookstores
9. Educational Privileges for self and eligible dependents

Office or laboratory space will be assigned as appropriate to an emeritus faculty member by the home academic department or college in accordance with space available, the emeritus faculty
member’s productivity and contributions to the teaching and research programs, and policies of the individual units regarding space assignments.

*Note: The eligibility requirements for the award of Emeritus Status are not intended to supersede the eligibility requirements of HR54, Continuation of Group Insurance After Age 60, Age 65, and After Retirement or Death. The specific eligibility requirements of HR54 must be met in order to qualify for the benefits outlined in that policy.

REVOCATION OF EMERITUS STATUS:

At the sole discretion of the University, Emeritus Status may be revoked at any time. Without limiting such discretion, revocation may occur when it is determined that the individual's conduct, before or after receiving the Emeritus designation, conflicts with the intent and spirit of the designation and/or causes harm to the University's reputation. The President is authorized to make the decision to revoke Emeritus Status. The President shall inform the affected individual, and shall notify the Board of Trustees, for information purposes, as well as the appropriate dean or administrative officer. A determination specific to the position of President shall be made by the Board of Trustees. This section is intended to confirm the existing "at will" nature of Emeritus Status and thus applies to all individuals who currently hold Emeritus Status or may be granted such status in the future.
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I. Introduction

At the beginning of the 2013-2014 academic year, the Committee on Faculty Affairs (the “Committee”) was asked to prepare an advisory and consultative report on “Protection of Faculty during Budgetary Contractions: HR/70/HR23/HR76/P3 & P6.”\(^1\) The task topic was continued in the 2014-2015 academic year, but the task is now listed as an informational report (rather than an advisory and consultative report).\(^2\) The goal is to collect and present all of the relevant policies in one report so that faculty can more easily access and digest these policies.

The task appears to have arisen from frustration—on the part of this Committee, Senate Council, and others—with the process by which the University Administration (the “Administration”) made one program-closure decision and one division-closure decision.\(^3\) The first was the Administration’s 2011 decision to close the Program on Science, Technology, and Society at University Park.\(^4\) The second was the Administration’s 2012 decision to close the Education Division at Great Valley.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Senate Committee Priority Form, Committee on Faculty Affairs, 2013-2014. The relevant portions of these policies—and, where relevant, their replacements—are all attached as Appendixes to this report:

   - Appendix 1: Relevant Portion of HR-23
   - Appendix 2: HR-70
   - Appendix 3: HR-76
   - Appendix 4: Prior version of P-3
   - Appendix 5: Current version of P-3
   - Appendix 6: Prior version of P-6 (since replaced by P-4)
   - Appendix 7: Current version of P-4 (replacing former P-6)

Two other appendixes are also included:

   - Appendix 8: Penn State Faculty Senate, Consultation Standards (January 24, 2012).
   - Appendix 9: President Erickson’s Oct. 24, 2013 memo accepting Consultation Standards.

\(^2\) Senate Committee Priority Form, Committee on Faculty Affairs, 2014-2015.

\(^3\) In both cases, the ultimate program-closure decision was of course made by the Board of Trustees (BOT). However, the focus of this report is on the process by which the University Administration (the “Administration”) made the decision recommend this action to the BOT.

\(^4\) At the time of the relevant events, the Science, Technology, and Society program was administered jointly by the College of Engineering and the College of Liberal Arts. In letters dated October 20, 2010 (to the College of Engineering) and February 18, 2011 (to the College of Liberal Arts) the Core Council recommended “that the Science, Technology and Society (STS)
program be discontinued.” The January 25, 2011 minutes of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs reflect discussion of this proposal, including the following:

“Chair Sims: Conducts straw poll. The committee voted unanimously to recommend that the proposal not be implemented and in light of identified concerns, in particular, the lack of faculty consultation by the two College Deans.”

Senate Council voted against on the proposal to discontinue the Science, Technology, and Society Program on April 12, 2011. Here is the action as reflected in the minutes:

“Proposal from the College of Engineering and the College of the Liberal Arts to discontinue the Science, Technology, and Society Program. On a Turner/Brunsden motion, Senate Council voted that the above referenced proposal, ‘not be implemented at the present time, or in the present form, in view of the following perceived difficulties:’ lack of faculty consultation. Provost Erickson will be notified of this action.”

Despite Senate Council’s recommendation against the closure of STS, the Board of Trustees approved the proposal to close STS at its May 13, 2011 meeting. A report prepared by the American Association of University Professors describes the effect of this decision on tenured and tenure-eligible faculty as follows:

At Pennsylvania State University, the termination of the university’s science, technology, and society program— itself created, in 1969–70, by faculty members from the colleges of earth and mineral sciences, engineering, liberal arts, and science—affected five tenure-track professors working on a wide variety of subjects, such as the history of autism and networks created by families with autistic children, the politics of food security, and the history of Chinese ecological science and environmental governance, with a focus on climate policy and urban development. The faculty members involved clearly can be housed in any number of academic units, from the traditional Department of Human Development and Family Studies to newer interdisciplinary units such as the Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, the Penn State Institutes of Energy and the Environment, and the International Center for the Study of Terrorism.

American Association of University Professors, The Role of the Faculty in Conditions of Financial Exigency 15-16 (2013). A footnote to this paragraph states:

Penn State conducted its program closures, which were announced in 2011, by means of a “Core Council” that included minimal faculty input, none of which concerned the financial state of the university. There was no attempt to find “another suitable location” for the probationary faculty members in the science, technology, and society program until after its closure had been decreed, though arrangements were eventually made for some—not all—of the faculty members affected.

The Role of the Faculty in Conditions of Financial Exigency at 16 n.41 (2013).

The Faculty Affairs Committee acted on a proposal to discontinue the Education Division at Penn State Great Valley (as well as a proposal to eliminate the Department of Integrated Arts in the College of Arts and Architecture) on March 13, 2012. The minutes reflect the following motion passed unanimously:
In preparing this report, the committee has reviewed four sets of documents: (1) the HR policies listed in the original charge (HR-23, HR-70, and HR-76); (2) the curricular policies listed in the original charge (P-3 and P-6) and their successor policies that apply today (P-3 and P-4); (3) certain publicly-available documents relating to the Administration’s decision to close the Science, Technology, and Society Program; and (4) certain publicly-available documents relating to the Administration’s decision to close the Education Division at Great Valley.

The Committee hopes that this report will provide the Senate with the information it needs to determine whether to recommend substantive revisions to existing policies.

II. Policies

A. Relationship between HR-category Administrative Policies and P-Category Curricular Policies

Provisions directly relating to the dismissal of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members on grounds of financial exigency are located in HR-23 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations) and HR 70 (Dismissal of Tenured or Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members). HR 76 (Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), which the committee was also asked to examine, does not appear to apply to dismissals based on financial exigency.6

Procedures relating to the broader, university-level policy decisions that can result in eventual dismissal of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members are located in Category P of Penn State’s Academic Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual (AAPPM).7 At the time this task was assigned to the Committee, the relevant policies were Policies P-3 (Moving/Discontinuing Degree Programs Among Colleges and Campuses) and P-6 (Academic Program and Minor Phase-Out).

The relevant portion of the AAUPM (Category P – Undergraduate Curricular Procedures) has since been renumbered and substantively reorganized.8 The relevant policies are now Policies P-3 (Moving/Sharing/Discontinuing Degree Programs Among Colleges and Campuses) and P-4 (Academic Program or Minor Closure).

B. HR-Category Administrative Policies

“Approval of the proposal to discontinue the Education Division at Penn State Great Valley with reservation; and that next year the Senate revisits the policies involved in program/unit discontinuations so that they don’t unduly restrict faculty rights. Passed unanimously.”

Senate Council approved the proposal on April 10, 2012. The Board of Trustees approved the proposal at its May 4, 2012 meeting.

6 See discussion in part II.B.3, below.

7 The current version of Penn State’s Academic Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual (AAPPM) is located at http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/. Unless otherwise noted, references to PSU policies in this report refer to the page where the current, active policy was displayed at the time this report was written.

1. HR-23

HR-23 states that both tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members may be terminated either “for demonstrated financial exigency” or “on the basis of program elimination or revision.” In either situation, tenured faculty members have more protection than tenure-eligible faculty members.

The standard for termination of tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members based on financial exigency is that the financial exigency is “demonstrably bona fide.” If a decision to terminate a tenured or tenure-eligible appointment is made, the affected faculty member “may seek review” of the termination decision “by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the ‘Committee Procedural Rules’ described in HR-70.”

The standard for termination of a tenured or tenure-eligible faculty member based on program elimination or revision is that the university demonstrate that: (a) it is one of “the most extreme cases”; (b) where “for compelling reasons”; (c) “after due academic consideration, including consultation with an appropriate Faculty Senate body”; (d) “elimination or substantial revision of the program in which the faculty member's normal range of duties falls is necessary.”

Tenured faculty members have four additional protections. First, HR-23 provides that: “Careful advance program and academic personnel planning, with phased adjustments over time, should operate to limit the necessity of terminating a tenured appointment.” Second, HR-23 requires that the university make “a good faith effort . . . to continue the faculty member concerned in a comparable capacity with the University in any of its campuses based upon the individual's competencies and the capabilities of the University.” Third, tenured faculty “shall receive one year's notification prior to the date of the impending termination and may seek review of this termination by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the ‘Committee Procedural Rules’ described in HR-70. Fourth, “the released faculty member's position shall not be filled by a new appointee within a period of three years from the date of actual termination unless the released faculty member first has been offered and has not accepted reappointment.”

2. HR-70

HR-70 defines “the conditions and procedures under which tenured faculty members, or tenure eligible faculty members against whom ‘out of time’ dismissal is sought, may be dismissed from the University on grounds of . . . financial exigency[] or program elimination or revision.”

---

9 HR-23, Part IV.10. Tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members may also be terminated for “adequate cause,” HR-23, Part IV.11, but those provisions are outside the scope of this report.
10 The phrase used here is those on “a continuous appointment.” HR-23, Part IV.10.
11 HR-23, Part IV.10.
12 HR-23, Part IV.10.
13 The phrase used here is “tenured or tenure eligible appointment[s].” HR-23, Part IV.10.
14 HR-23, Part IV.10.
15 HR-23, Part IV.10.
16 HR-70. This policy also sets out procedures for termination based on “be terminated for ‘adequate cause,’” but those provisions are outside the scope of this report.”
For tenure-eligible faculty members, the policy applies when the University seeks to dismiss the faculty member “during the provisional appointment period with less advance notice than that specified in HR-23 Section IV.8.” In such a situation, “the [tenure-eligible] faculty member shall be accorded due process, as is required by applicable law as specified in this HR-70 Policy, including an opportunity for a hearing before the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure [SJCT], prior to termination.” For tenured faculty members, “[c]ases of substantive dispute involving the termination of a tenured appointment for reasons of financial exigency or program elimination or revision also shall be considered at a hearing by the [Standing Joint] Committee [on Tenure].”

The SJCT “acts solely in an advisory capacity to the President on matters pertinent to the dismissal of tenured or tenure-eligible faculty.” The committee “holds hearings to receive evidence and adjudicate the matter and to provide the President with a reasoned opinion and recommendation for action with respect to the request to dismiss a faculty member.” The President of the University is “the final decision-maker in all cases considered by the [SJCT].” There is no further review.

In proceedings before the SJCT, the university bears the burden of proof. It may satisfy that burden “only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole.” HR-70 provides that “[t]he faculty member against whom dismissal is sought has: (1) “the opportunity to be heard”; (2) “the opportunity to present his or her own defense”; (3) the right to be present at the hearing; and (4) the right to have his or her “advisor or legal representative” present at the hearing. The committee operates under fairly detailed procedural rules.

SJCT hearings are “not open to the public” and “the proceedings, reports, recommendations and other work product of the Committee in relation to dismissal shall be kept strictly confidential.” HR-70 also contains three paragraphs on program elimination or revision that are highly similar to the three paragraphs on the same topic in HR-23.

---

17 The advance notice specified in Paragraph IV.8 of HR-23 is as follows: “Notification must come no later than March 1 of the first academic year of tenure eligibility if termination is to occur by June 30 of that year. Thereafter, notification must come at least 12 months before June 30 of the following academic year.” HR-23, Part IV.8.
18 HR-70.
19 HR-70.
20 HR-70. The relevant sentence refers to “adequate cause” dismissals, but nothing in the document suggests that there is any further review in financial exigency or program elimination or revision dismissals. (“Once the President has made a final determination as to whether adequate cause for termination exists, the matter shall be closed and not subject to further review.” HR-70.)
21 “The burden of proof . . . that substantial grounds exist justifying dismissal for financial exigency and program elimination, or revision, rests with the University.” HR-70.
22 HR-70.
23 See the extensive discussion of these procedural rules in HR-70.
24 HR-70.
3. HR-76

It does not appear that HR-76 applies to terminations based on financial exigency or program elimination or revision. Some broad language is included early in the policy stating that the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities’ jurisdiction includes reviewing petitions from faculty members with respect to “Any situation in which a faculty member asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of . . . procedural fairness . . . .” 26 However, later language appears to exclude “[c]ases of substantive dispute involving the termination of tenured appointment for cause or for reasons of financial exigency or program elimination or revision.” 27 These cases are to “be considered at a hearing by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the ‘Committee Procedural Rules’ described in the Policy HR70 Dismissal of Tenured or Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members.” 28

B. P-Category Curricular Policies

1. Moving/Sharing/Closing Programs among Colleges and Campuses (P-3 under both current and former rules)

The P-3 process is used to: (1) “enable a second college or multiple colleges or campuses (including World Campus and Continuing Education) to deliver programs already authorized in another college”; (2) “authorize the closure of a major in a college or campus as long as that program will continue to be offered elsewhere at the University”; or (3) “authorize the delivery of extended programs.” 29

The P-3 process “should begin in the academic unit and adhere to the processes required by that unit.” 30 Following unit approval, seven steps are required before the change can be implemented. These steps “should be initiated at least one year in advance of the desired changes.” 31 The seven steps are: (1) “Preliminary college and disciplinary consultation and consultation between appropriate campus chancellor(s) and Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, World Campus, or Continuing Education”; (2) “Submission of prospectus to ACUE by College Associate Dean/Campus Associate Dean”; (3) “ACUE prospectus deliberation and written response to submitting college/campus”; (4) “College development of formal proposal, including appropriate consultation, data collection, and research”; (5) “Submission of P-3 proposal by College Dean (University Park) or the Vice President of Commonwealth Campuses to Office of Undergraduate Education”; (6) “Office of Undergraduate Education review”; and (7) “Provost review of Office of Undergraduate Education action.” 32 Following these 7 steps, the

25 See the paragraphs in HR-23 and HR-70 under the heading “FINANCIAL EXIGENCEY AND PROGRAM ELIMINATION OR REVISION.”
26 HR-76.
27 HR-76.
28 HR-76.
29 PSU Policy P-3 (current).
30 PSU Policy P-3.
31 PSU Policy P-3.
32 PSU Policy P-3.
Office of Undergraduate Education sends a “memo to implement” that is “distributed to appropriate offices.” Implementation takes place “the following semester or later.” A “program review” must be conducted “[f]our years after a program has been authorized for delivery by an additional campus/college or through World Campus or Continuing Education.”

2. Closing Degree Programs and Minors (former P-6, now P-4)

The P-4 process is “used to close an academic program or minor from the university.” The P-4 process “should begin in the academic unit and adhere to the processes required by that unit.” Following unit approval, twelve steps are required before the relevant program or minor can be closed. To provide adequate time, “these steps should be initiated at least one year in advance of the desired changes.”

The twelve steps are:

(1) “Formal requests for an academic closure begin with preliminary college and disciplinary consultation between appropriate units”;

(2) “Submission of prospectus to ACUE by the College Associate Dean/Campus Associate Dean”;

(3) “ACUE prospectus deliberation and written response to submitting college/campus”;

(4) “College/Campus development of formal proposal, including appropriate consultation, data collection, and research”;

(5) “Submission of P-4 proposal by College Dean (University Park) or the Vice President of Commonwealth Campuses to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, along with supporting documentation. [In this context, academic program is defined as a major or a minor and not an option. P-4 does not apply to IUG programs unless the major itself is closed at the university].”

(6) “Decision to consider the request is made in consultation with the Provost. In the event that the Provost considers the documentation insufficient, the request is returned to the college dean. If the Provost decides the information is complete and the request should be considered, the Vice President transmits the request and supporting documentation to the University Faculty Senate Chair.”;

(7) “Senate Chair forwards the material to the Senate Council for review and recommendation. The Council should have at least sixty (60) but no more than (90) days to complete its review and report to the Senate.”;

(8) “Senate Council reviews the procedures used by the college in reaching its recommendation and determines whether a) there has been consultation with personnel

---

33 PSU Policy P-3.
34 PSU Policy P-4 (current).
35 PSU Policy P-4.
36 PSU Policy P-4.
37 Brackets in P-4 itself.
responsible for academic programs that are affected; b) consideration has been given to
effects on students, tenured and untenured faculty, and the community; and c) appropriate
organizational units of the University have been consulted. In all cases of requests
involving instruction, including associate degree programs, the Senate Committee on
Curricular Affairs will be consulted. In all cases, other standing committees of the Senate
will be consulted as appropriate.”;

(9) “Senate Council transmits a report and recommendation to the Vice President and
Dean for Undergraduate Education and so informs the Senate.”;

(10) “Following receipt of the Senate report and the recommendation in consultation with
the Provost, the Vice President acts on the request of the college dean.”;

(11) “Office of Undergraduate Education memo to Board of Trustees informing of
program closure”;

(12) “Office of Undergraduate Education memo to the college dean, the Provost, and the
Senate Executive Director informing of program closure.”

The Board of Trustees then makes the final decision on whether to close the program or minor.

C. Consultation Standards

At its January 24, 2012 meeting, the Faculty Senate adopted an Advisory/Consultative report
titled “Consultation Standards.” The Consultation Standards state that they are “interim
guidance” applying “to consultation about proposed curricular changes and unit organization,
reorganization, and discontinuation.” The standards address: (1) when there is a “consultation
duty”; (2) the type of “consultation independence” that is required for consultation to be
meaningful; (3) what constitutes a “reasonable consultation process” rather than “perfunctory or
pro-forma consultation”; and (4) the type of “consultation record” that must be created and
preserved.

In an October 24, 2013 memo, President Erickson indicated that he “concur[red] with
implementation of the report” and had “asked Vice Provost Blannie Bowen to assist Senate
leadership with the implementation” of the report.

The November 6, 2014 changes to P-3 and P-4/P-6 appear to be an attempt by the Office of
Undergraduate Education to adopt procedures closer to those recommended in the Senate’s
Consultation Standards.

V. Conclusion

The Committee concludes:

38 Penn State Faculty Senate, Consultation Standards (January 24, 2012).
39 Penn State Faculty Senate, Consultation Standards.
40 Penn State Faculty Senate, Consultation Standards.
41 Penn State Faculty Senate, Consultation Standards.
42 President Erickson’s Oct. 24, 2013 memo accepting Consultation Standards.
1. On paper, University Policies HR-23 and HR-70 appear to provide a robust system for protection of tenured and tenure-track faculty during periods of budgetary contraction.

2. University Policy HR-76 does not appear to be applicable to protection of faculty during periods of budgetary contraction.

3. Policies governing curricular actions that can result in restructuring or closure of units can be as important, and at times more important, than HR-23 and HR-70.

4. The protections of HR-23 and HR-70 are substantially reduced to the extent a decision to restructure or close a unit has been made before an individual faculty member is notified that his or her position is at risk.

5. The current versions of Curricular Policies P-3 and P-4 (promulgated on November 6, 2014) appear likely to result in more robust consultation than the immediately-prior versions of Policies P-3 and P-6 (promulgated May 11, 2012).

6. The Consultation Standards approved by the Senate on January 24, 2012 and accepted by President Erickson on October 24, 2013 implicate a core aspect of the Faculty’s role in University Governance. Accordingly, the Senate should consider:
a. Posting the Consultation Standards more prominently on its website.
b. Examining the degree to which the Consultations Standards have been incorporated into appropriate areas of the University’s policies more generally.
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Appendix 1. Portion of HR-23 (as revised Jan 1, 2010) Addressing Financial Exigency and Program Elimination or Revision

This document is available at: https://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr23.html.

Policy HR23 PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

FINANCIAL EXIGENCY AND PROGRAM ELIMINATION OR REVISION:

10. A tenured or tenure eligible appointment may be terminated for demonstrated financial exigency and the affected faculty member may seek review of this termination by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the "Committee Procedural Rules" described in HR-70. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide. If a tenured appointment is terminated because of financial exigency, the released faculty member's place shall not be filled by a new appointee within a period of three years from the date of actual termination unless the released faculty member first has been offered and has not accepted the reappointment.

A tenured or tenure eligible appointment may also be terminated on the basis of program elimination or revision. Elimination on this ground may be effected only in the most extreme cases where the University demonstrates that for compelling reasons and after due academic consideration, including consultation with an appropriate Faculty Senate body, elimination or substantial revision of the program in which the faculty member's normal range of duties falls is necessary. Careful advance program and academic personnel planning, with phased adjustments over time, should operate to limit the necessity of terminating a tenured appointment. In the case of program elimination or substantial revision affecting a tenured faculty member's appointment, a good faith effort shall be made to continue the faculty member concerned in a comparable capacity with the University in any of its campuses based upon the individual's competencies and the capabilities of the University.

A tenured faculty member terminated for reasons of program elimination or revision shall receive one year's notification prior to the date of the impending termination and may seek review of this termination by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the "Committee Procedural Rules" described in HR-70. If a tenured appointment is terminated because of elimination or substantial revision, the released faculty member's position shall not be filled by a new appointee within a period of three years from the date of actual termination unless the released faculty member first has been offered and has not accepted reappointment.

...
Appendix 2. HR-70 (as revised Nov 23, 2015)

This document is available at: https://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr70.html.

Policy HR-70 DISMISSAL OF TENURED OR TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY MEMBERS

PURPOSE:

This policy is written to define the conditions and procedures under which tenured faculty members, or tenure eligible faculty members against whom "out of time" dismissal is sought, may be dismissed from the University on grounds of adequate cause, financial exigency, or program elimination or revision.

SCOPE:

In the event that the University Administration seeks to dismiss a tenured faculty member for adequate cause, or seeks to dismiss a tenure-eligible faculty member during the provisional appointment period with less advance notice than that specified in HR-23 Section IV.8, the faculty member shall be accorded due process, as is required by applicable law as specified in this HR-70 Policy, including an opportunity for a hearing before the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, prior to termination. Cases of substantive dispute involving the termination of a tenured appointment for reasons of financial exigency or program elimination or revision also shall be considered at a hearing by the Committee.

ADEQUATE CAUSE:

A tenured or tenure eligible faculty member may be dismissed for adequate cause as determined in accordance with this policy. Adequate cause shall mean any one of the following: (i) lack of competence or failure to perform in relation to the functions required by the appointment, (ii) excessive absenteeism, (iii) moral turpitude, or (iv) grave misconduct. Dismissal for adequate cause will not be used to restrain or otherwise affect faculty members in the exercise of their individual or collective academic freedom or in contravention of other legal rights. Standards of notice as specified in HR-23 Section IV.8 are not required in cases of dismissal for adequate cause.

INITIATION OF DISMISSAL PROCESS

A. The Steps That Shall be Followed to Initiate the Dismissal Process

1. Within a reasonable time after the occurrence of events that might give rise to termination for adequate cause are made known to the appropriate administrator(s), the faculty member will be provided with written notice from the administrator(s) of the alleged misconduct constituting adequate cause. The notice shall include a copy of or references to this HR-70 policy and sufficient information concerning the allegations to enable the faculty member to make a meaningful response.

2. The faculty member will be given an opportunity to respond to the allegations either in writing or at a meeting with the appropriate administrator(s), or both, at the discretion of the
faculty member against whom allegations of misconduct have been made. The affected faculty member shall be accorded a reasonable amount of time to prepare a response to the allegations.

3. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to meet with the appropriate administrator(s) and he or she will be given an explanation of the alleged misconduct. The administrator, at his or her discretion, may respond to the written submissions of the faculty member at this meeting. The appropriate ombudsman shall be present as an objective, informational resource at the meeting unless the faculty member waives, in writing, the right to have the ombudsman present. The meeting may be continued at the discretion of the administrator(s) should there be a need for additional time to resolve the matter or to obtain additional information or otherwise for other good cause.

4. Following this meeting, the faculty member will again be given an opportunity to respond in writing to the administrator(s).

B. Process After Initial Meeting

The purpose of the meeting(s) and responses listed above is to provide both parties with an understanding of the other party's position, as well as an opportunity to settle the matter without formal action.

1. If after the initial meeting an agreement is reached between the appropriate administrator(s) and the faculty member, then the matter will be resolved in accordance with the agreement.

2. If after the initial meeting(s) the matter remains unresolved, the appropriate administrator(s) may choose to dismiss the matter if no serious concerns remain regarding the faculty member's alleged misconduct. If serious concerns remain, the appropriate Dean will consult with the Executive Vice President and Provost about what further action, if any, should be taken.

C. Referral to Standing Joint Committee on Tenure

If both the Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost concur that the disciplinary sanction of termination for adequate cause is warranted under the circumstances, the matter will be referred to the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. The Dean will promptly advise the faculty member of that determination in writing by letter addressed to the affected faculty member and the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. The Dean's letter shall set forth the specific basis for seeking adequate cause termination and the specific conduct which serves as the basis for the termination. Such written notification will advise the faculty member that the matter will be referred to the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, unless the faculty member requests the opportunity to resign in lieu of termination.

D. Suspension Pending Ruling by Standing Joint Committee on Tenure

Ordinarily, the affected faculty member shall not be suspended prior to a final decision by the President. Suspension of the faculty member prior to a final decision by the President is justified
only if there is reason to believe that material harm to the University, its faculty, staff, or students will occur or be threatened by the faculty member's continued active status during the proceedings. The suspension decision shall be made by the appropriate Dean with the concurrence of the Executive Vice President and Provost. The suspended faculty member shall be informed of the reasons warranting his or her suspension and may make a written objection to the suspension to the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. Any such suspension shall be with full pay and benefits.

E. Burden of Proof

The burden of proof that adequate cause exists for the dismissal of the faculty member, or that substantial grounds exist justifying dismissal for financial exigency and program elimination, or revision, rests with the University and shall be satisfied only by clear and convincing evidence in the record considered as a whole.

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE ON TENURE:

- Role of the Committee

The Standing Joint Committee on Tenure acts solely in an advisory capacity to the President on matters pertinent to the dismissal of tenured or tenure-eligible faculty. It holds hearings to receive evidence and adjudicate the matter and to provide the President with a reasoned opinion and recommendation for action with respect to the request to dismiss a faculty member. The Standing Joint Committee on Tenure shall exercise its obligations in accordance with the procedural rules described in this HR-70.

- Establishment of the Committee

The Standing Joint Committee on Tenure shall consist of five members: two members selected by the administration, and three tenured faculty members selected by the elected faculty members of the University Senate. The Chair will be chosen by the Committee from the elected tenured faculty members.

- Committee Procedural Rules

1. Preliminary Evaluation. The Standing Joint Committee on Tenure will first evaluate whether or not the charges of misconduct described in the Dean's letter, if true, constitute adequate cause for dismissal. If the Committee rules that the charges, taken as true, do not constitute adequate cause for dismissal, the Committee will issue a pre-hearing report, recommending to the President that no further proceedings occur. If the President agrees with the Committee's pre-hearing report, he or she will terminate the dismissal process. However, should the President disagree with this initial determination, he or she shall so notify the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure and the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure shall, promptly upon receipt of this notice, conduct the hearing described below.

Should the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure rule that the charges may, if proven, constitute adequate cause for dismissal, the hearing will be conducted and all parties will be notified in writing.
2. **Commencement of Hearing.** The faculty member against whom dismissal is sought shall have the opportunity to be heard and present his or her own defense before the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. The Standing Joint Committee on Tenure shall convene a hearing within sixty (60) days, if reasonably possible, after the date of the Dean's letter referring the matter to the Committee. The hearing shall be limited to the matters described in the letter relating to the grounds on which termination of the faculty member is sought. Except in extenuating circumstances and subject to the concurrence of both parties, all members of the Committee must be present when the Committee meets at the hearing, including any continuance of the hearing, and during all deliberations of the Committee in connection with the hearing.

3. **Persons Present.** The persons entitled to be present at the hearing shall include:

   a. the faculty member,
   
   b. faculty member's advisor or legal representative,
   
   c. Committee members,
   
   d. legal advisor for the Committee,
   
   e. representative from the University Administration, and
   
   f. legal representative of the University Administration.

   Other persons may be present at the discretion of the Committee. Witnesses, if any, may not be present during any portion of the hearing other than during the time they are providing testimony to the Committee, absent a compelling reason noted in writing by the Committee.

4. **Presiding Official.** The Committee Chair shall conduct the hearing and the subsequent deliberations of the Committee.

5. **Pre-hearing Submissions.** The administration and the faculty member shall each submit to the Committee and to the other party the following items:

   i. At least fourteen (14) days prior to the commencement of the hearing, a complete list of witnesses intended to be called at the hearing, and a complete list of documents and copies of exhibits intended to be offered at the hearing. Except in extenuating circumstances, or where fairness requires, only those witnesses and exhibits listed may be called or offered at the hearing.

   ii. At least seven (7) days prior to the commencement of the hearing, a statement of the case including a brief summary of the content of each witness' expected testimony, a reference to the material exhibits, a reference to any controlling legal authorities, and a summary of the factual and legal argument of the party.

   iii. Such other items and documents, exhibits and other materials as the Committee might reasonably request before, during, or after the hearing.
iv. The parties shall use utmost good faith to meet the deadlines specified herein; however, the failure to meet such deadlines shall not serve as a basis for refusing to accept late submissions of materials absent substantial prejudice to the other party.

6. Conduct of Hearing. Only sworn or affirmed witness testimony may be accepted at the hearing. Formal rules of evidence do not apply, but irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence may be excluded at the discretion of the Committee. Hearsay evidence may be introduced with caution, at the discretion of the Committee, but the hearsay nature of such evidence shall be taken into account by the Committee in determining the weight to be assigned to it. The Committee may rely on its legal advisor in making any determinations on the admissibility of evidence. The Committee Chair may modify these evidentiary guidelines and the procedures for the conduct of the hearing in the interest of conducting the proceedings in a fair and timely manner.

7. Hearing Schedule. After consultation with the parties, a date and time for the initial hearing and any subsequent hearings shall be determined by the Committee. Normally, the hearing shall be concluded in two days or less, except in extenuating circumstances as determined by the Committee. The parties shall present their respective positions and testimony from relevant witnesses in a concise, clear and focused manner, with due regard to completion of the hearing in an efficient, fair, and timely manner.

8. Presentation of Evidence. The parties are entitled to representation of counsel of their choosing at the hearing, and are entitled to cross-examine the other party's witnesses. The parties are entitled to offer their own witnesses and exhibits. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to be heard by the Committee to present his or her own position, but may not be compelled to give testimony if he or she chooses not to testify. In a hearing on charges of incompetence, the testimony shall include that of faculty members and other scholars from this or other institutions. The Committee shall determine, in its sole discretion, the means by which this testimony may be obtained, mindful of the need to provide all of the parties with the opportunity to obtain relevant information from such witnesses.

9. Stenographic or Other Recording. A stenographic or other recording of the proceedings shall be made. The Committee Chair or the Committee legal advisor shall arrange for the presence of the reporter or recorder. The full stenographic record of the hearing or a complete copy of the recording shall be provided to all parties promptly upon completion of the hearing, unless a party waives, in writing, the right to receive the transcript.

10. Ex-Parte Communications Prohibited. Any communication, direct or indirect, between parties and Committee members shall be prohibited, unless all parties are given notice and an opportunity to participate. No notice may be taken by the Committee of written materials unless all parties are given an opportunity to review or contest the materials, except written advice or opinions from the Committee legal advisor.

11. Confidentiality. The hearing shall not be open to the public, and the proceedings, reports, recommendations and other work product of the Committee in relation to dismissal
shall be kept strictly confidential by the Committee members and all participants, except to the extent required by law or by court order.

12. Committee Recommendations. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Committee shall close the record and meet in executive session, along with the Committee's legal advisor, in order to deliberate. There shall be no post-hearing submissions by either party, unless directed by the Committee. The Committee shall issue a report on the hearing to the President, with a copy to the faculty members and the appropriate Dean, within 30 days from the date of completion of the hearing, unless extenuating circumstances require otherwise. The report shall set forth the Committee's findings based on the evidence presented at the hearing and its recommendation with respect to termination for adequate cause. Where the conclusion of the Committee is not unanimous, the report must fairly reflect the minority views expressed by the members. Dissenting or concurring opinions may be included at the request of any Committee member.

13. Final Decision by President. The President shall be the final decision-maker in all cases considered by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure. The President shall notify the faculty member, the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, and the appropriate Dean of his or her decision in writing. Once the President has made a final determination as to whether adequate cause for termination exists, the matter shall be closed and not subject to further review.

FINANCIAL EXIGENCY AND PROGRAM ELIMINATION OR REVISION:

A tenured or tenure-eligible appointment may be terminated for demonstrated financial exigency, and the affected faculty member may seek review of this termination by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the "Committee Procedural Rules" described in this HR-70. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide. If a tenured appointment is terminated because of financial exigency, the released faculty member's position shall not be filled by a new appointee within a period of three years from the date of actual termination unless the released faculty member first has been offered and has not accepted reappointment.

A tenured or tenure-eligible appointment may also be terminated on the basis of program elimination or revision. Elimination on this ground may be effected only in the most extreme cases where the University demonstrates that for compelling reasons and after due academic consideration, including consultation with an appropriate Faculty Senate body, elimination or substantial revision of the program in which the faculty member's normal range of duties falls is necessary. Careful advance program and academic personnel planning, with phased adjustments over time, should operate to limit the necessity of terminating a tenured appointment in these circumstances. In the case of program elimination or substantial revision affecting a tenured faculty member's appointment, a good faith effort shall be made to continue the faculty member concerned in a comparable capacity with the University in any of its campuses, based upon the individual's competencies and the capabilities of the University.
A tenured faculty member terminated for reasons of program elimination or revision shall receive one year's notification prior to the date of the impending termination and may seek review of this termination by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the "Committee Procedural Rules" described in this HR-70. If a tenured appointment is terminated because of elimination or substantial revision, the released faculty member's position shall not be filled by a new appointee within a period of three years from the date of actual termination unless the released faculty member first has been offered and has not accepted reappointment.
Policy HR76 FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

PURPOSE:
This policy defines the procedures to be followed when issues involving faculty rights and responsibilities have not been successfully resolved through the normal channels of administrative responsibility and procedure. Disputes are best addressed through direct discussions among the parties to the disputes. When such direct discussions fail to resolve the dispute, the parties should avail themselves of the Ombudsperson process. All Penn State faculty and administrators are strongly urged to make use of the unit or University ombudsperson as appropriate. Only when matters cannot be resolved through that process, should the formal procedures described in this policy be used.

SCOPE:
A. In these procedures the term "faculty member" refers to members of the University faculty as defined in the University Faculty Senate Constitution (Article II, Section 1) plus any other University employees in academic positions which lead to permanent tenure. (This definition is subject to the clarifications of the Guidelines for Implementation section of this policy.)
B. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities established by the procedures may review petitions from faculty members and administrators involving:
   1. Any situation in which a faculty member asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of: a) academic freedom; b) procedural fairness; or c) professional ethics. The Committee does not review cases of alleged discrimination or of sexual harassment as defined in AD41 (see section F below). However, claims that involve discrimination or harassment plus one of the three areas named above will be investigated simultaneously by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and by the Office of Affirmative Action. Each body will examine the part(s) of the claim within its respective area of competence, will share evidence where appropriate, and will inform the other of its findings. (See "Consultation Between Review Bodies" below).
   2. Any situation in which an administrator seeks a Committee judgment as to appropriate action toward a faculty member who, in his or her judgment, may be failing to meet his or her responsibilities.
C. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will normally consider only petitions which involve, as a direct party, faculty members as defined above. Exceptions to this restriction apply to University academic employees (a University academic employee is a person whose duties include instructional, research or creative responsibilities) as follows:

NOTE: This definition of academic employee excludes graduate assistants.
1. Dismissal. Any University academic employee may make use of these procedures upon receipt of notice of dismissal. A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.

2. Nonreappointment. Any University academic employee who can demonstrate that considerations violative of academic freedom significantly contributed to a decision of nonreappointment may make use of these procedures.

3. Other matters. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities may, as it deems appropriate, review petitions or appeals of any University academic employee in matters beyond the above limitation. In such cases, the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will review the petition according to their usual procedures, but formal hearings will not be held except in rare cases where there are compelling reasons for them.

D. Cases of substantive dispute involving the termination of tenured appointment for cause or for reasons of financial exigency or program elimination or revision, or the release of a faculty member during the provisional appointment period with less advance notice than that specified in University policy, shall be considered at a hearing by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the "Committee Procedural Rules" described in the Policy HR70 Dismissal of Tenured or Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members.

E. Cases involving questions of ethics related to research and other scholarly activities shall be referred to the Vice President for Research (See RA10).

F. Cases involving a claim of discrimination or sexual harassment will be referred to the Office of Affirmative Action (See B1 above). Should a multipart petition be filed that claims discrimination or harassment and also one of the grievances for which the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and/or the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure is responsible, each reviewing body will conduct an independent investigation on those claim(s) within its area of competence. (See "Consultation Between Review Bodies" below.)

CONCILIATION:

Colleges and campuses should have a person or group to serve in the role of ombudsperson. The objective is to enhance communication and clarify possible misunderstandings in situations which involve potential disputes, to advise faculty members and administrators as to appropriate courses of action, and to help settle matters before they become hardened into serious disputes. The individual or group should be selected by procedures approved by a majority of the faculty in the unit.

OMBUDSPERSON:

Selection and Responsibilities of Ombudspersons

A. An Ombudsperson shall be appointed in each of the colleges, campuses and academic units. For those not associated with an academic unit, or in cases where the appropriate ombudsperson may be in doubt, the following policy shall be applied:
1. Where appropriate, the ombudsperson will be from the same academic unit to which the employee is most closely associated. For example, research associates in the Applied Research Laboratory will have access to the ombudsperson for the College of Engineering.

2. In cases where there is disagreement or doubt as to the appropriate ombudsperson, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall make the determination.
3. In cases where the ombudsperson is in doubt as to his or her jurisdiction, he or she shall ask the Executive Vice President and Provost for a determination.

B. The Dean, Chancellor, or other appropriate campus official and the faculty shall jointly develop selection procedures for the ombudsperson. Normally, the role of ombudsperson will be performed by a single person, with a designated alternate. In unusual circumstances, a group of not more than three persons may be selected. No one who is a member of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities shall serve as ombudsperson.

C. Functions for the ombudsperson are:
   1. Clarification of misunderstandings;
   2. Advising faculty and administrators as to appropriate courses of action;
   3. Assisting in the informal resolution of differences;
   4. Assuring that appropriate department, college and/or campus procedures are exhausted before referring the case to higher levels;
   5. Informing the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and appropriate college or campus officials if a matter cannot be resolved at the lower level and the case is to be referred to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

   6. The ombudsperson shall not:
      ▫ Hold hearings;
      ▫ Exceed the role of conciliator and advisor;
      ▫ Substitute his or her judgment for that of appropriate administrative and/or faculty bodies;
      ▫ Serve as counsel for either party to a complaint before the Hearing Board.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Establishment of the Committee

The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will have nine members elected by the Senate: six faculty members and three members of the Academic Leadership Council. Two of the faculty members shall be from academic voting units other than those at University Park. The Chair will be chosen by the committee from the elected faculty members and will serve a one-year term as chair.
Six faculty members and three deans will be elected as alternates for three-year terms. Two of the faculty members shall be from academic voting units other than those at University Park.

The term of office for members and alternates will be three years commencing on July 1. The terms will be staggered to provide for continuity.

The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules will present a list of nominees to fill vacancies and expiring terms on the Committee at the next to last meeting of the Senate each academic year. Additional nominations may be made from the floor at that time.

Election of Committee members and alternates will be by secret ballot. No member of this Committee may serve concurrently on the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure and/or the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

**Operation of the Committee**

The Committee Chair will be elected by the Committee from among its elected faculty members. The term of office will be for one year -- from July 1 through June 30.

A quorum of the Committee will be a majority of those remaining after disqualifications on a matter at issue, subject to a minimum of three members. A majority of those voting on a matter at issue will be faculty.

Upon receiving a petition, the Committee will make a preliminary determination as to the extent of its review of the matter. The Committee will reserve the right not to take up a complaint that it judges unsubstantial or without merit or where it appears that other remedies should be sought before coming to the Committee. The Committee may decide to perform an Informal Review or to establish a Hearing Board. As a result of an Informal Review, the Committee may decide to reject a petition, to use its good offices in an attempt to bring about a satisfactory settlement, to bring recommendations to the Committee for a Full Committee Review and vote, and/or to establish a Hearing Board. In a Full Committee Review, the Committee shall reach its conclusions and recommendations by a majority vote of those present and voting (subject to the conditions set forth in the preceding paragraph).

A Hearing Board will be established only when the issue is clearly serious, a prima facie case has been established by the complaining party, and the Committee finds that reasonable efforts have already been made to solve the problem, and that no alternative way of attempting to settle the matter is appropriate in the circumstances.

The burden of proof in establishing a prima facie case will be on the complaining party. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities should attempt to settle matters brought to it as quickly as possible without sacrificing fairness to all parties. Only in extraordinary circumstances should there be a time span longer than 90 days between the receipt of a complaint by the Committee and a decision as to whether there will be a formal hearing.
The Role of a Hearing Board

For a particular case, a Hearing Board, consisting of two faculty members and one Dean to be chosen from the Committee by methods of its own selection, will be established to hear the case. The Hearing Board will elect its chairman from among its members. A member will remove himself or herself from a case if he or she deems himself or herself disqualified by reason of bias or interest. Each party will have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause. If disqualifications and challenges make it impossible to set up a Board with 3 members from the Committee or elected alternates, the Senate Council will select substitutes for a particular case. Each party will have a maximum of two challenges of such substitutes without stated cause.

If a hearing is scheduled, notice will be served with a specific statement of the complaint at least 20 days prior to the hearing. The party complained against may waive a hearing or may respond to the complaint in writing at any time before the hearing.

Hearings before a Hearing Board will not be public. Publicity and public statements about the case by either the faculty member or administrative officers will be avoided until the proceedings have been completed. The Hearing Board may have present at the hearing such assistance as it deems necessary.

During the proceedings the parties will be entitled to have an advisor and counsel of their own choice. The Hearing Board will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence, and may admit any evidence of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available and to avoid excessively legalistic procedures.

A verbatim record of the hearings will be taken and both parties will receive a copy of that record.

The Hearing Board will grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.

The parties will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence. The University administration will make reasonable efforts to cooperate with the Hearing Board in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence.

Parties will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses.

The Hearing Board's findings of fact and conclusions will be based solely on the hearing record. The Hearing Board shall reach its conclusions by majority vote.

Decision of the Executive Vice President and Provost

Conclusions and recommendations from the Committee or a Hearing Board shall be submitted to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University through the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall notify the Chair of the decision that has been reached.
In the event that the Executive Vice President and Provost's decision is not in accord with the conclusions of the Committee or the Hearing Board, the reasons for that decision shall be specified to the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities who will inform the Committee and the parties directly involved. (See also Notification of the Executive Vice President and Provost's Decision in the "Guidelines for Implementation" section of this policy.)

At the first regular Senate meeting of each academic year, the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will present a brief general report of the Committee's activities.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

The Senate Report

A report "Procedures on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities" was adopted by the University Faculty Senate on May 8, 1973. These procedures became effective as University policy as of September 1, 1973. The Preamble of the Senate report is not included as part of this policy, but should be used for guidance on such matters as the meaning of academic freedom, professional ethics, and procedural fairness. University policy begins with Section II - Scope of the Senate report.

Definition of Faculty

The term faculty member shall include the Senate's definition of its electorate plus all research equivalent ranks as specified in the Policy Manual HR21. The definition is as follows: All persons who are not candidates for degrees at Penn State, who hold full-time academic appointments, and who fall into one of the following categories -- those holding professorial, research or librarian titles, those who are full-time instructors or assistant librarians, and those other full-time academic employees who are members of the Graduate Faculty, but who do not fall into either of the above categories.

Issues for Review: Limitations

Section B under Scope defines the kinds of issues which the Committee may review. The Committee shall not consider the substantive academic judgment aspects of such matters as promotion, tenure, compensation, and evaluation of performance. In such matters as these, only procedural fairness may be reviewed.

Section C. 4. under Scope describes other matters that may come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

Application of Policy to Other Professionals

Some persons who are not included in the definition of faculty members should also have access to these procedures for those matters specified in Scope, Section C. This provision shall apply to professional employees involved in teaching, research or creative activities who are attached to a research unit or an academic college. This would also include the following categories: part-time (with at least a six-month appointment), visiting, clinical, and adjunct academic personnel.

Obligations of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
The preliminary determination referred to in the third paragraph of Operation of the Committee must include a Committee judgment that the appropriate department, college and/or other unit administrative procedures have been exhausted prior to the point the Committee decides whether or not to review the petition further. In making such a judgment, the Committee shall consult with the ombudsperson in the appropriate college or campus.

In the event the Committee decides to informally review the case or hold a hearing, the petitioner, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, the appropriate college and/or campus official, and the college or campus ombudsperson shall be notified immediately.

**Consultation Between Review Bodies**

Should a multipart petition be filed that contains claims for which both the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, and/or the Office of Affirmative Action is responsible, each reviewing body will conduct an independent investigation on the claim(s) within its area of competence. Each reviewing body will consult with the other(s) during the process, will share evidence where appropriate, and will inform the other(s) of its findings.

**Notification of the Executive Vice President and Provost's Decision**

After receiving the conclusions and recommendations on a case from a Hearing Board, the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University shall notify the parties directly involved, appropriate University administrative officers, and the Chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee as to his or her decision. The Chair shall be responsible for informing the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.
Appendix 4. Prior Version of P-3 (as revised May 11, 2012; no longer in effect)

This document is does not appear to be currently available online.

P-3: MOVING/DISCONTINUING DEGREE PROGRAMS AMONG COLLEGES AND CAMPUSES

P-3 proposals are the basis of the administrative review and approval process that enable a second college or multiple colleges to deliver programs already authorized in another college; that enable a college to deliver an existing program at an additional campus within its purview or through the WorldCampus or Continuing Education or through the Video Learning Network (VLN); that authorize the closure of a major or minor program in a college or campus so long as that program will continue to be offered elsewhere at the University; that authorize dropping an option within a program so long as the program in which the option was located will continue to be offered; and that, under extraordinary circumstances, may authorize the delivery of extended degrees. Note that a P-6 proposal is required to terminate a program when doing so will completely remove it from the University's offerings. As with P-1 and P-6 proposals, P-3 proposals must be preceded by submission of an ACUE Curricular Program Prospectus. Following the completion of the prospectus process, a P-3 proposal may be submitted to the Office of Undergraduate Education. It must address all relevant strategic and academic issues, including those outlined in Academic Administrative Policy P, Section V: Common Program Justification Criteria.

P-3 Proposals

One or more colleges may be authorized to offer degree programs. This authorization has sometimes been referred to as academic program sponsorship or program sponsorship transfer. The Provost is responsible for administratively authorizing the moving, sharing, and discontinuance of academic sponsorship of existing degree programs for all colleges and campuses. The University Faculty Senate does not take part in this authorization.

Three types of sharing and transferring of sponsorship may occur:

(1) Joint sponsorship in which, in addition to the original sponsoring college, one or more additional colleges also are awarded authority to offer the existing program. Graduates in these programs belong to and are certified for graduation by the college in which they are enrolled.

(2) Handoff sponsorship in which the authority to offer an academic program is transferred from one college to another. Here, an original sponsoring college withdraws its academic authority for a program and another college or group of colleges is awarded authority in its place.

(3) Extended programs are discussed below.

In every case in which a program is transferred or shared, every effort must be made to insure curricular integrity by minimizing the number of core course substitutions at the newly offering campus or college. Disciplinary communities are nonetheless encouraged to consider the development of program options beyond the core that reflect local expertise, student demand, and market need. In all instances, colleges adopting programs through the P-3 process are subject
to the originating program's entrance requirements. When those requirements are amended, they are amended for all colleges operating under the original P-1 and for all colleges delivering under the authority of P-3.

Deans retain the authority to move a degree program within a college without initiating the P-3 process. When such actions are taken, the college must notify the Office of Undergraduate Education, which will then inform other offices as appropriate.

**Extended Programs**

There is a third type of shared program referred to as an "extended degree." Based upon extraordinary circumstances, such as specialized licensing and/or accreditation requirements, a single college may offer its programs by extending their availability to additional campuses. In this arrangement, only the "extending" college has the authority to award the program degree, although the degree may be delivered at multiple campuses. A college must submit a P-3 proposal to the Office of Undergraduate Education that includes endorsement from both the extending college and the unit(s) at which the extended degree will be offered.

**P-3 Extended Program Probationary Period**

Four years after a program has been authorized for delivery by an additional campus/college or through World Campus or Continuing Education through a P-3 process, a program review will be conducted. The review will be conducted by the authorizing college in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Education. The review may consist of requests for evidence, including items 1-7 below, and additional evaluations or data as necessary. The review may be conducted through site visits, outside evaluations, or other appropriate means as determined by the authorizing college in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Education and the delivering unit.

The additional location offering the program will provide evidence to the authorizing college and to the Office of Undergraduate Education that the following criteria are being achieved:

1. Adequate faculty and staff resources exist
2. The program aligns with university and unit missions
3. Market need and demand exists to maintain sufficient student enrollments
4. Students are able to maintain timely academic progress
5. Adequate equipment, library and information technology resources, clinical and cooperative arrangements, or other special facilities exist
6. Adequate financial resources have been established to assure program continuation
7. Assessment data indicate that students are achieving the program's learning objectives

The provost may, through the Office of Undergraduate Education, end the P-3 probationary period by granting joint or hand off program sponsorship status to the unit(s); or the provost
may, based upon an unsatisfactory evaluation of the reviewed criteria, require the P-3 offering to be phased out; or conditions may be established, including a limited time period to complete them, that must be met to avoid P-3 program phase out.

The four year review of extended programs triggers an additional set of questions and possible administrative responses. Assuming a positive evaluation of criteria 1-7 above (and/or other review criteria as appropriate), a determination will be made by the Office of Undergraduate Education in consultation with the authorizing college and the delivering unit as to whether (a) extended status should be continued or (b) extended status will be replaced by joint or handoff program sponsorship status. The decision will include elements such as licensing, accreditation rules, and other unique circumstances.

If the extended status is maintained, the next consideration of extended status will take place five years hence.

If the authorizing college determines that an extended status should not be continued and that the program should not be continued by the delivering unit, then the college will work in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Education and the delivering unit to phase out the program at that location through the P-3 process.

**P-3 Timeline**

- Preliminary college and disciplinary consultation and consultation between appropriate campus chancellor(s) and Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses
- Submission of prospectus to ACUE by College Associate Dean
- ACUE Prospectus deliberation and written response to submitting college
- College development of formal proposal, including appropriate consultation, data collection, and research
- Submission of P-3 proposal by College Dean to Office of Undergraduate Education
- Office of Undergraduate Education review
- Provost review of Office of Undergraduate Education action
- Office of Undergraduate Education memo to implement distributed to appropriate offices
- Implementation the following semester or later
- Year Four P-3 probationary review
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P-3: MOVING/SHARING/DISCONTINUING DEGREE PROGRAMS AMONG COLLEGES AND CAMPUSSES

P-3 Curricular Program Prospectus submission form

P-3 proposals are the basis of the administrative review and approval process that:

- enable a second college or multiple colleges or campuses (including World Campus and Continuing Education) to deliver programs already authorized in another college;
- authorize the closure of a major in a college or campus as long as that program will continue to be offered elsewhere at the University;
- may authorize the delivery of extended programs.

P-3 proposals must be preceded by submission of an ACUE Curricular Program Prospectus. Following the completion of the prospectus process, a P-3 proposal may be submitted by the academic unit to the Office of Undergraduate Education.

P-3 Principles

One or more colleges or campuses may be authorized to offer degree programs. This authorization has sometimes been referred to as an academic program partnership or an extended program. The Provost is responsible for administratively authorizing the moving, sharing, and discontinuance of academic sponsorship of existing degree programs for all colleges and campuses. The University Faculty Senate does not take part in this authorization.

Three types of agreements may occur:

- Joint partnership or consortia in which, in addition to the original sponsoring college or campus, one or more additional colleges or campuses are also awarded authority to offer the existing program. Graduates in these programs belong to and are certified for graduation by the college or campus in which they are enrolled.

- Handoff agreement in which the authority to offer an academic program is transferred from one college and/or campus to another. Here, the originating college withdraws its academic authority for a program and another college/campus or group of colleges/campuses is awarded authority in its place.

- Extended program agreements are those in which the sponsoring college or campus extends a program to an additional campus or campuses where only the originating college or campus has the authority to award the program degree. Extended programs include:
programs offered through the World Campus and/or Continuing Education because these delivery units do not have academic authority independent of an academic unit;

circumstances where specialized licensing and/or accreditation requirements are involved, such as Nursing programs, in which the originating college retains the academic authority.

A college or campus must submit a P-3 proposal that includes endorsement from both the extending college and the unit(s) at which the extended degree will be offered to the Office of Undergraduate Education. If the extending college does not endorse the P-3 proposal, the Office of Undergraduate Education may authorize a joint partnership or consortium, handoff agreement, or extended program agreement. All proposals originating from a Commonwealth Campus must include a memo of endorsement from the Office of the Vice President of Commonwealth Campuses.

In every case in which a program is transferred or shared, every effort must be made to insure curricular integrity by minimizing the number of core course substitutions at the newly offering campus or college. Disciplinary communities are nonetheless encouraged to consider the development of program options beyond the core that reflect local expertise, student demand, and market need. In all instances, colleges or campuses adopting programs through the P-3 process are subject to the originating program's entrance requirements. When those requirements are amended, they are amended for all colleges operating under the original P-1 and for all colleges delivering under the authority of P-3.

Deans or chancellors retain the authority to move a degree program within a college or campus without initiating the P-3 process. When such actions are taken, the college must notify the Office of Undergraduate Education, which will then inform other offices as appropriate.

**P-3 Review and Approval Process:**

The process for moving/sharing/discontinuing degree programs among colleges and campuses should begin in the academic unit and adhere to the processes required by that unit. Once unit approval is obtained, the steps listed below must be taken. Proposal approval times may vary based on unit requirements, consultation, and committee meeting schedules; therefore, these steps should be initiated at least one year in advance of the desired changes.

Preliminary college and disciplinary consultation and consultation between appropriate campus chancellor(s) and Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, World Campus, or Continuing Education

Submission of prospectus to ACUE by College Associate Dean/Campus Associate Dean

ACUE prospectus deliberation and written response to submitting college/campus
College development of formal proposal, including appropriate consultation, data collection, and research

Submission of P-3 proposal by College Dean (University Park) or the Vice President of Commonwealth Campuses to Office of Undergraduate Education

Office of Undergraduate Education review

Provost review of Office of Undergraduate Education action

Office of Undergraduate Education memo to implement distributed to appropriate offices

Implementation the following semester or later

Year Four P-3 probationary review

**P-3 Proposal Elements**

After the P-3 prospectus has been discussed at ACUE, a memo will be issued from the Office of Undergraduate Education authorizing the P-3 proposal process to begin. The P-3 proposal must include the following:

1. A statement of clear, measurable and rigorous program objectives and learning outcomes.
2. Relationship of proposal to university and college mission.
3. Program quality indicators such as:
   a. On-going involvement of a minimum of three or more full-time faculty aligned academically and disciplinarily with the program. These faculty may be located at a single campus, or in the case of shared programs, across multiple campus locations;
   b. Program leadership by senior-level faculty;
   c. Ability to move student program cohorts through in a timely manner;
   d. Availability of a sufficient number of program electives within the discipline and in supporting area of study;
   e. University-wide curricular integrity that includes disciplinary community engagement and the avoidance of curricular drift;
   f. Ability to minimize the need for core course substitutions and explicit rationale for, and justification of, necessary core substitutions.
4. Impact on Penn State college and campus enrollments and flow of students among campuses.
5. Market need and demand documented by current, valid, and reliable evidence.
6. Physical and fiscal resource availability (please include the official University Budget Office costing analysis form as well as other relevant information).
7. Strategic and academic approval and support demonstrated by the signature of the appropriate chancellor and/or dean.

8. Disciplinary community and administrative consultation (see Curricular Consultation Statement in the Faculty Senate Guide to Curricular Procedures).

9. Signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) of all parties (when applicable). An MOU is typically required for a joint partnership or consortia, and it typically includes items related to administration of the program, teaching assignments, and exit strategies.

**P-3 Program Probationary Review**

Four years after a program has been authorized for delivery by an additional campus/college or through World Campus or Continuing Education through a P-3 process, a program review will be conducted.

The review will be conducted by the authorizing college or campus in collaboration with the Office of Undergraduate Education.

The review may consist of requests for evidence, including items 1-7 below, and additional evaluations or data as necessary.

The review may be conducted through site visits, outside evaluations, or other appropriate means as determined by the authorizing college or campus in collaboration with the Office of Undergraduate Education and the delivering unit.

The additional location offering the program will provide evidence to the authorizing college or campus and to the Office of Undergraduate Education that the following criteria are being achieved:

1. Adequate faculty and staff resources exist.
2. The program aligns with university and unit missions.
3. Market need and demand exists to maintain sufficient student enrollments.
4. Students are able to maintain timely academic progress.
5. Adequate equipment, library and information technology resources, clinical and cooperative arrangements, or other special facilities exist.
6. Adequate financial resources have been established to assure program continuation.
7. Assessment data indicate that students are achieving the program’s learning objectives.

The Provost may, through the Office of Undergraduate Education, end the P-3 probationary period by granting a joint partnership or handoff agreement to the unit(s); or the Provost may, based upon an unsatisfactory evaluation of the reviewed criteria, require the P-3 offering to be
phased out; or conditions may be established, including a limited time period to complete them, that must be met to avoid P-3 program phase out.

The year four review of extended programs triggers an additional set of questions and possible administrative responses. Assuming a positive evaluation of criteria 1-7 above (and/or other review criteria as appropriate), a determination will be made by the Office of Undergraduate Education in consultation with the authorizing college and the delivering unit as to whether (a) extended status should be continued or (b) extended status will be replaced by joint partnership or handoff agreement. The decision will include elements such as licensing, accreditation rules, and other unique circumstances.

If the extended status is maintained, the next consideration of extended status will take place four years hence.

If the authorizing college determines that an extended status should be ended and that the program should not be continued by the delivering unit, then the college will work in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Education and the delivering unit to phase out the program at that location through the P-3 process.
Appendix 6. P-6 (as revised May 11, 2012—has since been replaced with P-4)

This document is does not appear to be currently available online.

P-6: ACADEMIC PROGRAM PHASE-OUT

Procedure:

1. All formal requests for academic program phase-out are forwarded to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education by the appropriate college dean along with supporting documentation. [In this context, academic program is defined as a major and not an option or a minor. P-6 does not apply to IUG programs unless the major itself is being phased out.]
2. The decision to consider the request of the college dean is made in consultation with the Provost. In the event that the Provost considers the documentation insufficient, the request is returned to the college dean. If the Provost decides the information is complete and the request should be considered, the Vice President transmits the request and supporting documentation to the University Faculty Senate Chair.
3. Upon receipt of the request and related documentation, the Senate Chair forwards the material to the Senate Council for review and recommendation. The Council should have at least sixty (60) but no more than (90) days to complete its review and report to the Senate.
4. The Senate Council reviews the procedures used by the college in reaching its recommendation and determines whether a) there has been consultation with personnel responsible for academic programs that are affected; b) consideration has been given to effects on students, tenured and untenured faculty, and the community; and c) appropriate organizational units of the University have been consulted. In all cases of requests involving instruction, including associate degree programs, the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs will be consulted. In all cases, other standing committees of the Senate will be consulted as appropriate.
5. After the review is completed, the Senate Council transmits a report and recommendation to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education and so informs the Senate.
6. Following receipt of the Senate report and the recommendation in consultation with the Provost, the Vice President acts on the request of the college dean.
7. The Vice President informs the college dean, the President, the Board of Trustees, and the Senate Executive Secretary whenever a decision is made to phase-out an academic program.

(Ref: Senate Agenda, 5-5-81, Appendix I)

NOTE: This procedure is used for complete program phase-out from University offerings. If a program is to be phased out only at particular locations, procedures in Section P-3 should be followed. The placement of a hold on entrance to a major is viewed as the initial action in academic program phase-out and must be accompanied by a formal request to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education.
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P-4: ACADEMIC PROGRAM OR MINOR CLOSURE

P-4 Curricular Program Prospectus submission form

P-4 proposals are the basis of Administrative and University Faculty Senate curricular approval and are used to close an academic program or minor from the university. These decisions may be made based on enrollment trends, resources, or disciplinary needs. If a major or minor is undergoing substantial curricular revision and a name change, a P-4 should be used to close the existing major or minor and a P-1 should be used to initiate a new major or minor.

P-4 Review and Approval Process

The process for closing an academic program or minor at colleges and campuses should begin in the academic unit and adhere to the processes required by that unit. Once unit approval is obtained, the steps listed below may be taken. Proposal approval times may vary based on unit requirements, consultation, and committee meeting schedules; therefore, these steps should be initiated at least one year in advance of the desired changes.

Formal requests for an academic closure begin with preliminary college and disciplinary consultation between appropriate units

Submission of prospectus to ACUE by the College Associate Dean/Campus Associate Dean

ACUE prospectus deliberation and written response to submitting college/campus

College/Campus development of formal proposal, including appropriate consultation, data collection, and research

Submission of P-4 proposal by College Dean (University Park) or the Vice President of Commonwealth Campuses to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education, along with supporting documentation. [In this context, academic program is defined as a major or a minor and not an option. P-4 does not apply to IUG programs unless the major itself is closed at the university].

Decision to consider the request is made in consultation with the Provost. In the event that the Provost considers the documentation insufficient, the request is returned to the college dean. If the Provost decides the information is complete and the request should be considered, the Vice President transmits the request and supporting documentation to the University Faculty Senate Chair.

Senate Chair forwards the material to the Senate Council for review and recommendation. The Council should have at least sixty (60) but no more than (90) days to complete its review and report to the Senate.
Senate Council reviews the procedures used by the college in reaching its recommendation and determines whether a) there has been consultation with personnel responsible for academic programs that are affected; b) consideration has been given to effects on students, tenured and untenured faculty, and the community; and c) appropriate organizational units of the University have been consulted. In all cases of requests involving instruction, including associate degree programs, the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs will be consulted. In all cases, other standing committees of the Senate will be consulted as appropriate.

Senate Council transmits a report and recommendation to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education and so informs the Senate.

Following receipt of the Senate report and the recommendation in consultation with the Provost, the Vice President acts on the request of the college dean.

Office of Undergraduate Education memo to Board of Trustees informing of program closure

Office of Undergraduate Education memo to the college dean, the Provost, and the Senate Executive Director informing of program closure.

**P-4 Proposal Elements**

After the P-4 prospectus has been discussed at ACUE, a memo will be issued from the Office of Undergraduate Education authorizing the P-4 proposal process to begin. The P-4 proposal must include the following:

1. A brief definition of the proposal and its rationale, including the objectives that the proposal will address and/or problems that the proposal will solve. Indicate curricular implications, faculty affected, and enrollment implications.
2. Relationships between the proposed change and other University programs and functions, including the general education function.
3. Anticipated impact on all University locations.
4. Disciplinary community and administrative consultation.
5. If applicable, indicate how promotion and tenure will be addressed.
6. Indicate a timetable for the proposal.
7. Indicate whether the proposal will have implications for certification, licensure, etc.

**NOTE:** This procedure is used for complete program closure from University offerings. If a program is to be discontinued only at particular locations, procedures in Section P-3 should be followed. The placement of a hold on entrance to a major is viewed as the initial action in academic program discontinuation or closure and must be accompanied by a formal request from the college associate dean to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
Consultation Standards
(Advisory and Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Introduction

Committees of The Pennsylvania State University Faculty Senate frequently receive charges to consult on matters including academic and curricular proposals and administrative structural change proposals. The University often expends considerable resources on consultation and this consultation frequently influences the quality of decision-making. This report is intended to assist all parties involved with solicitation, conduct, and use of consultation in the instances of proposed curricular changes and of unit organization, reorganization, and discontinuation. It prescribes consultation purpose, clarifies consultation duties, and standardizes consultation procedures to streamline this process and improve results.

All parties engaged in consultation should strive to attain a collegial, deliberative process of critical inquiry that precedes decision-making. Proposals with insufficient or untimely consultation waste resources. Quality standards for consultation influence due diligence and contribute to building consensus, assuring effective implementation, and improving results.

Consultation serves various important purposes for coursework and programs, including quality assurance and due process. Past flexibility in Penn State’s consultation fostered experimentation in forms of consultation and process design. However, the centrality of consultation in times of financial or other stress demands clarity of and minimum standards for process steps, timing, response opportunity, and outcomes.

Consultation is most convincingly justified as reducing the probability of decision-making risk, because consultation can contribute to refining proposals in a forthright, collegial manner. Consultation can correct errors, provide new evidence, and generate competing proposals that challenge the primary proposal.

The standards and justifications provided above are interim guidance. Further research into the Penn State consultation experience as enriched with an outside benchmarking is clearly warranted. A content analysis of Penn State consultation experience would likely inform the revision of these interim standards greatly. First, these practices form precedents that define consultation for most experienced participants. Second, it should be expected that exemplars of consultation would be revealed, showing a range of consultation quality. Several key variables appear evident: timeliness of replies; reasonable opportunity to evaluate proposals that inform consultation; number and range of participants solicited or omitted; and forthrightness in
consideration of consultations. The four standards you will find below are intended to optimize these variables.

**Consultation Standards**

These standards apply to consultation about proposed curricular changes and unit organization, reorganization, and discontinuation. In these contexts, there are four standards of consultation: (1) consultation duty, (2) consultation independence, (3) reasonable consultation process, and (4) the consultation record.

1. **“The Consultation Duty.”** Faculty and administration have a duty to consult with appropriate personnel, including faculty, units, and other entities, when consultation is part of the procedures for the specified action. Furthermore, where consultation is a specified part of procedure, it must precede the taking of irrevocable actions.

Although the duty to consult is mandatory in some situations, it has developed as an important practice in other situations. Shared governance provisions of the Senate Constitution and By-Laws and various Senate rules require consultation before finalizing any execution of action (e.g., P-6, Academic Program Phase-Out.) In situations where consultation is not explicitly required, it is nevertheless strongly recommended so as to achieve the consultation benefits noted above.

2. **“Consultation Independence.”** Consultation is to provide an independent assessment of the proposed action. Consultation participants must be given independence from pressure caused by unreasonable constraints and demands, including excessive constraints of time, in the consultation process.

Conflicts of interest can arise in consultation well apart from the disciplinary or unit self-interest that legitimately inspires some forms of consultation. Consultation is unlikely to assume a veto power. That is, unless otherwise provided in Senate rules, unit constitutions, bylaws, or other authoritative governing documents, the content of a consultation, whether expressed as facts, interpretive opinion, or argument, is unlikely to work as a veto of the proposed action. Instead, consultation provides assessment independent of those entities proposing an action.

3. **“Reasonable Consultation Process.”** Reasonable opportunity, under the circumstances, must be afforded the solicitor of consultation as well as those solicited to provide consultation. This opportunity requires timely communication and reasonable deadlines for consultation responses. In no case does consultation satisfy the reasonable consultation process standards with excessively short deadlines that de facto dispense with or obviate the opportunity to respond.

Consultation is a fundamental component of shared governance. Perfunctory or pro forma consultation provides no useful contribution. Adequate time and open communication channels are required to achieve these benefits. Furthermore, sufficiently broad dissemination of consultation requests is needed to avoid biased outcomes.

Consultation requests, appended proposals, and responses form the consultation record that is essential to effective results. This record must include all documents underlying and representing proposals, the underlying evidence, the communications among participating parties, charges given to committees, and the replies of all parties. Committee meetings at which consultation is considered must keep complete, accurate, and robust minutes to facilitate review of consultation to satisfy consultation standards.

The University Faculty Senate, units, and individuals providing consultation, the units directly affected, and the IT systems used to collect consultation should maintain records of their consultation letters. Furthermore, decision-making bodies soliciting and receiving consultation letters should maintain requests soliciting consultation, logs of the consultation, and copies of the consultation content.
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DATE: October 24, 2013
FROM: Rodney A. Erickson
TO: Brenton M. Yarnal

I have reviewed the advisory and consultative report (Consultation Standards) that was passed by the University Faculty Senate on January 24, 2012, and concur with implementation of the report. I have asked Vice Provost Blannie Bowen to assist the Senate leadership with the implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this item.

cc: Blannie E. Bowen
Nicholas P. Jones
Susan C. Youtz
University policy HR76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” establishes the Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and defines the committee’s scope and operation. The committee may review petitions from a faculty member who asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of academic freedom, procedural fairness, or professional ethics. The 2014-2015 committee received seven petitions, a number consistent with recent years (four petitions in 2013-2014, eight petitions in each of the three previous years, and nine in 2009-2010). Four of the seven petitions claimed violations of procedural fairness. One petition claimed violations of procedural fairness and professional ethics, another petition claimed violations of procedural fairness, professional ethics, and academic freedom, and one claimed harassment in addition to violations of procedural fairness and professional ethics. Two petitioners withdrew their petitions shortly after submission prior to committee consideration, one due to a satisfactory resolution of the concerns among the parties involved, the other because the petitioner left the university.

Of the remaining five petitions that were considered by the committee, three related to reviews for final tenure and promotion. The other two petitions concerned a promotion review and termination of an administrative appointment respectively. The committee found sufficient evidence in one petition to investigate. Upon investigation, the committee found procedural unfairness in the conduct of a review for final tenure and promotion. Provost Nicholas Jones and Vice Provost Blannie Bowen accepted the committee’s findings and directed the appropriate administrator to implement the recommended remedy. The committee did not take up the other four petitions because upon initial review, the committee determined the claims were without merit or fell outside the committee’s defined scope of purview.

Near the end of the 2013-2014 cycle, last year’s committee received a petition whose outcome was not known when the 2013-2014 annual report was submitted. The committee had investigated a claim of unfair procedure related to a promotion review, and the committee found procedural unfairness. Shortly after last year’s annual report was submitted, the committee was informed that Provost Nicholas Jones and Vice Provost Blannie Bowen accepted the committee’s findings and directed the appropriate administrator to implement the recommended remedy.

The chair wishes to thank the members of the 2014-2015 committee, each of whom devoted significant time and thoughtful consideration to each petition. The committee members express our appreciation to all ombudspersons across the University for their contributions toward resolving conflicts and disputes. Additionally, the committee acknowledges the efforts of Blannie Bowen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to improve awareness of the policies and procedures related to promotion and tenure. These combined endeavors provide thoughtful and responsive support for faculty members and administrators and help to resolve disputes before they result in petitions submitted to this committee.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES 2014-2015

- Lori J. Bechtel-Wherry
- Dawn G. Blasko
- Victoria A. Braithwaite
- Lee D. Coraor
- Amanda L. Maple (Chair)
- Paula Mione-Nuzzo
- Linda R. Musser
- James M. Ruiz
- Karen Wiley Sandler
SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS


(Informational)

Introduction

Each year the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is mandated to provide a report on Penn State athletic activities to the Senate. This report focuses on Division 1 athletics at University Park. Included in this report are basic descriptive data, a summary of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics activities and related legislation passed during AY 2014-15, student-athlete academic highlights, team-by-team data on the Academic Progress Rate (APR), reports on the Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and the Federal Graduation Rate (FGR).

Information

Descriptive Data of Student-Athletes (31 Varsity Teams)

1. Total number of student-athletes for academic year 2014-15* = 895
2. Total number of student-athletes not eligible* = 29
3. Total number of scholarship student-athletes for academic year 2014-15* = 545
4. Total number of medical non-counter student-athletes (both Fall 2014 and Spring 2015) = 2
5. Total number of exhausted eligibility student-athletes* = 7

*Based on those student-athletes enrolled at the end of Spring 2015

Summary of Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics Activities during AY 2014-15

1. Self-monitoring of Student-Athlete Academic Excellence

The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics continues to monitor various metrics of student-athlete academic performance. Historically the Committee has reviewed two types of monitoring reports that are reported on an every other year basis. These reports include (1) student-athlete distribution in majors and colleges and enrollment data and (2) student-athlete grade distribution data. This year we added a third metric focused on academic performance of student-athletes admitted to UP through the reserved spaces mechanism. Over the 2014-15 academic year the IAC reviewed data on all of these metrics.

Student-athlete distribution by college and major and enrollment data. Table 1 contains a summary of distribution of student-athletes by college. As in the past, the Colleges of Communications and Health and Human Development had higher percentages of student-athletes than the general student body. In addition, the Division of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) had a higher percentage of student-athletes. The IAC deemed these differences to be understandable given the aspirations of many student-athletes who are interested in careers regarding sport management, sport broadcasting, event management, sport media, and so on. The DUS percentage is also understandable given the difficulty, due to NCAA regulations on academic progress, of changing majors once a major is declared. Being in DUS at the beginning of their academic career allows student-athletes to explore and choose majors that fit with
their career aspirations. Furthermore, the IAC reviewed a report on student-athlete distribution by major, as well as a review of student-athlete major distribution by team. The committee concluded that there was no clustering of majors among the student-athlete population.

Student-athlete grade distribution data. Every other year, courses with 20% or more student-athletes are flagged and examined for unusually high grade distributions or grades skewed in favor of student-athletes, reoccurring courses or instructors, and continuing education offerings. This year’s review included 9 semesters, beginning with Summer 2010 and ending with Spring 2013. Out of 5,500 total courses, 242 were flagged. Upon examination of those courses it appeared there was nothing alarming or concerning with the courses or instructors.

Academic performance of student-athletes admitted via reserved spaces. This year the IAC added an examination of student-athletes who had been granted a reserved space admission to University Park campus. We reviewed the cumulative GPAs at the end of the first year of enrollment for student-athletes during calendar years 2012 and 2013. The IAC concluded that those enrolled via a reserved space mechanism performed at expected GPA levels.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>FALL 2014</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>FALL 2014</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td>5723</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
<td>2666</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
<td>3619</td>
<td>7.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>8961</td>
<td>19.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Development</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>21.85%</td>
<td>4863</td>
<td>10.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences and Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Liberal Arts</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14.23%</td>
<td>5612</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.62%</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP COLLEGES TOTAL COUNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>801</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45367</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official University Data and Athletic Team Rosters as of November 6, 2014

Data obtained using the Penn State Institutional Insight System (ITwo) and the Integrated Student Information System (ISIS)
### Table 1 Overview

**Agricultural Sciences**: UP Student Athlete 21 (2.62%); UP Student 2185 (4.82%)

**Arts and Architecture**: UP Student Athlete 1 (0.12%); UP Student 1420 (3.13%)

**Business**: UP Student Athlete 82 (10.24%); UP Student 5723 (12.61%)

**Communications**: UP Student Athlete 86 (10.74%); UP Student 2666 (5.88%)

**Division of Undergraduate Studies**: UP Student Athlete 161 (20.10%); UP Student 3619 (7.98%)

**Earth and Mineral Sciences**: UP Student Athlete 27 (3.37%); UP Student 2465 (5.43%)

**Engineering**: UP Student Athlete 51 (6.37%); UP Student 8961 (19.75%)

**Health and Human Development**: UP Student Athlete 175 (21.85%); UP Student 4863 (10.72%)

**Information Sciences and Technology**: UP Student Athlete 6 (0.75%); UP Student 1097 (2.42%)

**The Liberal Arts**: UP Student Athlete 114 (14.23%); UP Student 5612 (12.37%)

**College of Nursing**: UP Student Athlete 0 (0.00%); UP Student 652 (1.44%)

**Science**: UP Student Athlete 45 (5.62%); UP Student 3993 (8.80%)

**UP COLLEGES TOTAL COUNT**: UP Student Athlete 801; UP Student 45367

[Official University Data and Athletic Team Rosters as of November 6, 2014

Data obtained using the Penn State Institutional Insight System (iTwo) and the Integrated Student Information System (ISIS)]

2. **The Faculty Partner Program (FPP)**

   The FPP is a joint venture between IAC and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics to increase contact and collaboration between faculty members, coaches and student-athletes. It is in its third year of operation and has grown into a strong program. Only two of the 31 teams do not have faculty partners due to lack of an interested faculty member. Coaches and faculty met at the beginning of the Fall semester and shared ideas for collaboration in the upcoming year. These partnerships resulted in various activities from seminars and workshops for student-athletes on networking and other professional skills to an Easter egg hunt at a faculty member’s farm. Another benefit is that faculty partners have the opportunity to interact with student-athlete’s parents.

3. **Coach Visits**

   Coaches Cooper (Baseball), Doherty (W Lacrosse), Gondack (M & W Indoor/Outdoor Track and Cross-Country), Lehotek (Softball), Morett (Field Hockey), Tambroni (M Lacrosse), Thompson (W Gymnastics), and Zinn (M Tennis) all attended part of IAC meetings during 2014-15.
   These visits were scheduled so that coaches could discuss their recruitment strategies, how they assist and support their student-athletes’ academic success, and any issues they had meeting the 8-day rule.
   These visits provided an excellent forum through which coaches and committee members could discuss student-athlete support and requirements.

4. **Student-Athlete Appeals and Hearing Process for Elimination or Reduction of Student Aid**

   Members of the IAC committee worked with the Faculty Athletics Representative, the Executive Director of Faculty Senate, the Intercollegiate Athletics Compliance Office, and the Registrar’s Office/Financial Aid to update the procedures for hearing appeals from student-athletes whose financial aid was eliminated or reduced. In particular the need for a pool of faculty members with some knowledge of Intercollegiate Athletics and who could be trained in related compliance issues was identified.
5. Approval of Competition Schedules and Waivers for Competitions on Study Days

IAC routinely approves competition schedules for each of the 31 ICA teams, paying particular attention to making sure the 8-day rule has been followed.

Waivers for competitions on study days are also considered and approved as appropriate if adequate study time is built into the schedule before, during and after the competition period.


Annually student-athletes are surveyed to better understand their experiences and concerns around topics such as academics, coaching, equipment, competitive schedule, travel, facilities, medical care, and so on. A 2014 survey of all 825 student-athletes (using Survey Monkey) resulted in 646 returned surveys (78% response rate). Highlights of the survey related to academics and general welfare follow.

Note: the following percentages are those student-athletes endorsing “good” or “excellent” in response to the query.

- 94% - Overall experience at Penn State as a student-athlete
- 80% - Instructors understand the challenges with being a student-athlete
- 81% - Instructors provide flexibility in making up missed work due to athletic practices and games
- 90% - Instructors provide clear expectations
- 89% - Instructors empower them to gain a quality education
- 69% - Opportunity to study while traveling for competitions
- 91% - Experience with training and medical staff
- 96% - Penn State Athletics is committed to providing a positive experience for its student-athletes

7. General Topics of Discussion over 2014-15

a. iPad initiative for student-athletes, led by Senior Woman Administrator and Associate Athletic Director Charmelle Green.
b. Discussions and updates as the NCAA granted the Power 5 Conferences more autonomy.
c. Issues brought forth by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) presented by John Nichols.
d. The IAC heard a report on the number of student-athlete waivers for outside competition granted by the Faculty Athletics Representative.

Student-Athlete Academic Highlights

1. Post-graduate Scholarships

- Two student-athletes were awarded Big Ten post-graduate scholarships: Matthew Brown, wrestling and Katie Rodden, cross-country/track and field.
- Two student-athletes were awarded NCAA post-graduate scholarships: Matthew Brown, wrestling and Connor Curry, men’s volleyball.
2. **Fall 2014 Semester – Academic Highlights**

- Penn State’s 31 varsity athletic teams had an average Fall 2014 semester team GPA of 3.08. (This number counts indoor track, outdoor track, and cross-country as separate teams, even though many student-athletes are members of all three teams.)

- 23 Penn State varsity athletic teams (out of 31) had a Fall 2014 semester GPA over a 3.00. (This number counts indoor track, outdoor track, and cross-country as separate teams, even though many student-athletes are members of all three teams.)

- 241 Penn State student-athletes made the Dean’s List after the Fall 2014 semester (3.50 GPA with at least 12 credits earned for the semester).

- 500 Penn State student-athletes earned a GPA of 3.00 or above in the Fall 2014 semester. This is 61.73% of the 810 overall Penn State student-athletes (this counts student-athletes only once even if they are on more than one team roster). (This includes student-athletes enrolled in less than 12 credits during the Fall 2014 semester.)

3. **Spring 2015 Semester – Academic Highlights**

- Penn State’s 31 varsity athletic teams had an average Spring 2015 semester team GPA of 3.11. (This number counts indoor track, outdoor track, and cross-country as separate teams, even though many student-athletes are members of all three teams.)

- 21 Penn State varsity athletic teams (out of 31) had a Spring 2015 semester GPA over a 3.00. (This number counts indoor track, outdoor track, and cross-country as separate teams, even though many student-athletes are members of all three teams.)

- 221 Penn State student-athletes made the Dean’s List after the Spring 2015 semester (3.50 GPA with at least 12 credits earned for the semester).

- 474 Penn State student-athletes earned a GPA of 3.00 or above in the Spring 2015 semester. This is 62.04% of the 764 Penn State student-athletes (this counts student-athletes only once even if they are on more than one team roster).

- This includes student-athletes enrolled in less than 12 credits during the Spring 2015 semester.

- **Spring 2015 Academic All-Americans:**
  1. Matt Brown, Wrestling
  2. Laura Gebhart, Field Hockey
  3. Robby Creese, M. In/Out Track & Field

*Overall, (3) Academic All-Americans during the 2014-2015 academic year, (Fall 2014 (0) and Spring 2015 (3).*

*Overall, (189) Academic All-Americans all-time at Penn State.*
Note: The statistical information outlined above for the Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 semesters include the following student-athletes:

- Student-athletes actively participating on a varsity team (eligible and ineligible)
- Student-athletes medically unable to participate, but are completing their degrees
- Student-athletes whose eligibility has been exhausted, but are receiving athletic aid and completing their degrees

4. Big Ten Conference Distinguished Scholar Award Recipient History (established in February 2008)

- *2008-2009 academic year; 62 student-athletes recognized
- *2009-2010 academic year; 57 student-athletes recognized
- *2010-2011 academic year; 45 student-athletes recognized
- *2011-2012 academic year; 51 student-athletes recognized
- *2012-2013 academic year; 68 student-athletes recognized
- *2013-2014 academic year; 73 student-athletes recognized
- *2014-2015 academic year; 69 student-athletes recognized

*Overall PSU Seven-Year Total; 425 student-athletes recognized

5. Big Ten, Academic All-Big Ten Selections Fall, Winter and Spring

- 72 Penn State student-athletes (in 7 fall sports) earned Academic All-Big Ten honors. Below is the number of selections from each team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Soccer</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Cross Country</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Cross Country</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 70 Penn State student-athletes (in 8 winter sports) earned Academic All-Big Ten honors. Below is the number of selections from each team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 135 Penn State student-athletes (in 16 spring/at-large sports) earned Academic All-Big Ten honors. Below is the number of selections from each team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Fencing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Track (In/Out)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Volleyball</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Fencing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Track (In/Out)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Overall, Penn State had 277 Academic All-Big Ten selections during the 2014-2015 academic year.

• Through (22) years of full membership in the Big Ten Conference, 5,041 Penn State student-athletes have been recognized as Academic All-Big Ten Conference selections.

Highlights of Penn State's Academic Progress Rate (APR) for the Cohort of AY 2010-11 through AY 2013-14 Federal Graduation Rate (FGR), Graduation Success Rates (GSR) for 2004-07

(See appended tables for further detail).

NOTES: The APR is based on four years of data, with the most current year's data added and the oldest year removed to create a four-year (multi-year) rolling rate. The APR scores are a measure of eligibility and retention/graduation for each student-athlete receiving athletic aid during the identified academic semester/year. Retention is evaluated for each student-athlete with the following question in mind: Did that student-athlete return to the institution the next semester (students can earn 2 points after the fall semester and 2 points after the spring and summer semesters). Eligibility is evaluated using NCAA, conference (if applicable), and institutional standards.

APR is calculated by dividing all possible points for all scholarship athletes into total points earned. The APR minimum academic standard to participate in postseason competition is 900. Beginning with 2012-13 championships, teams must earn a minimum 900 four-year APR or a 930 average over the most recent two years to be eligible to participate. For 2014-15 championships, teams must earn a 930 four-year average APR or a 940 average over the most recent two years to participate in championships. In 2015-16 and beyond, teams must earn a four-year APR of 930 to compete in championships.

The Graduation Success Rate (GSR) is a percentage of scholarship student athletes graduating during a six-year window. Each cohort includes freshmen (fall and mid-year) plus incoming transfer students less any athletes who left the institution in good academic standing.

The Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) measures the percentage of fall, first-time, full-time freshman who graduate within six years of entering their original four-year institution.
NCAA 2014 Federal Graduation Rate Information and Graduation Success Rate (GSR) Summary

(Released in October 2014)

- The class of 2007-2008 had a federal graduation rate of 77% - Division I average is 66%.
- (The 77% graduation rate is the fourth highest in the Big Ten Conference.)
- The four-class federal (2004-2007) graduation rate is 79% - Division I average is 65%.
- (The 79% four-class graduation rate is the second highest in the Big Ten Conference.)
- Penn State’s four-year (2004-2007) Graduation Success Rate (GSR) for African-American student-athletes is 89% - Division I average is 68%. (This ranked Penn State second overall in the Big Ten Conference.)
- The four-class federal (2004-2007) graduation rate for African-American student-athletes is 72% - Division I average is 55%. (The 72% four-class graduation rate is the second highest in the Big Ten Conference.)
- Penn State male student-athletes’ four-year (2004-2007) federal graduation rate is 74% - Division I average is 58%. (This graduation rate ranks second highest in the Big Ten Conference.)
- Penn State female student-athletes’ four-year (2004-2007) federal graduation rate is 86% - Division I average is 73%. (This graduation rate is tied for the third highest in the Big Ten Conference.)
- Football student-athletes’ four-year (2004-2007) federal graduation rate is 75% - Division I average (FBS) is 59%. (This graduation rate is the second highest in the Big Ten Conference.)
- Penn State’s four-year (2004-2007) Graduation Success Rate (GSR) is 89% - Division I average is 82%. (The 89% GSR is tied for second overall in the Big Ten Conference.)
- Six teams achieved APR rates of 1000 (the highest rating possible): Men’s cross-country, men’s tennis, women’s cross-country, field hockey, women’s golf, and women’s ice hockey.

Note: This report has been prepared by Dr. Linda Caldwell, Faculty Athletics Representative, and Mr. Russell Mushinsky, Director of the Morgan Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes.
# NCAA ACADEMIC PROGRESS RATE (APR) INFORMATION
## 2013-2014 (FOUR-YEAR DATA) / RELEASED IN MAY 2015
## PENN STATE RANKINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penn State Intercollegiate Athletic Teams</th>
<th>Multi-Year Team APR</th>
<th>APR Ranking w/in Big Ten Conference</th>
<th>APR All Division I Average</th>
<th>APR Public Institution Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Baseball</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (13)</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Cross Country</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (12)</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Fencing</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; (2)</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Football</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (7)</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (6)</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>Tied for 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (6)</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Soccer</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (9)</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>Tied for 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (10)</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (12)</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Indoor Track</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (12)</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Outdoor Track</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (13)</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Volleyball</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; (2)</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Wrestling</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>Tied for 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Cross Country</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Fencing</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; (3)</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Field Hockey</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (9)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Tied for 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (10)</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Ice Hockey</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (4)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Tied for 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (6)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Softball</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (13)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>Tied for 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Indoor Track</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>Tied for 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (13)</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Outdoor Track</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (13)</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>Tied for 13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (14)</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(#) = Number of schools in the Big Ten Conference who sponsor the sport.
## GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE
### 2004-2007 COHORT
### PENN STATE RANKINGS, BIG TEN CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENN STATE VARSITY TEAMS</th>
<th>FEDERAL FOUR-YEAR GRADUATION RATE</th>
<th>FEDERAL GRADUATION RATE - DIVISION I FOUR-YEAR AVERAGE</th>
<th>GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR)</th>
<th>GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR) - DIVISION I AVERAGE</th>
<th>GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR) RANKING – (BIG TEN CONFERENCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Baseball</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10th (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Fencing</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2nd (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Football</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2nd (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7th (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2nd (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Soccer</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Tied for 3rd (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5th (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Tied for 8th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Track &amp; Cross Country</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Volleyball</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2nd (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Wrestling</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tied for 9th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Fencing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Field Hockey</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Tied for 9th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Gymnastics</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10th (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Lacrosse</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Soccer</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Softball</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Tied for 4th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Tied for 1st (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Track &amp; Cross Country</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Tied for 11th (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Tied for 10th (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) Rankings, Big Ten Conference
### 2004-2007 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>Male Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>Female Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Division I</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) Rankings, Big Ten Conference

### 2004-2007 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>African American Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>African American Male Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>African American Female Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Division I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>African American Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>African American Male Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
<th>African American Female Student-Athlete GSR (4-Year Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Division I</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NCAA GRADUATION RATE RANKINGS, BIG TEN CONFERENCE
**CLASS OF 2007-2008, FEDERAL GRADUATION RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>All Students (2007-2008) %</th>
<th>All Students (4-Year Average) %</th>
<th>All Student-Athletes (2007-2008) %</th>
<th>All Student-Athletes (4-Year Average) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Division I</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NCAA GRADUATION RATE RANKINGS, BIG TEN CONFERENCE
#### CLASS OF 2007-2008, FEDERAL GRADUATION RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Division I**: 60

**Overall Division I (4-Year Average)**: 58

**Overall Division I**: 73

**Overall Division I (4-Year Average)**: 73
NCAA GRADUATION RATE RANKINGS, BIG TEN CONFERENCE
CLASS OF 2007-2008, FEDERAL GRADUATE RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>All African American Students (2007-2008)</th>
<th>All African American Students (4-Year Average)</th>
<th>All African American Student-Athletes (2007-2008)</th>
<th>All African American Student-Athletes (4-Year Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>Penn State 75.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>Ohio State 65.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Rutgers 73.0</td>
<td>Maryland 63.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Illinois 72.0</td>
<td>Purdue 59.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ohio State 72.0</td>
<td>Indiana 58.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Penn State 70.0</td>
<td>Nebraska 58.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Iowa 68.0</td>
<td>Illinois 50.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Wisconsin 64.0</td>
<td>Rutgers 50.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Michigan State 58.0</td>
<td>Michigan State 39.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Purdue 53.0</td>
<td>Wisconsin 38.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Indiana 52.0</td>
<td>Iowa 47.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nebraska 51.0</td>
<td>Michigan 46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Minnesota 48.0</td>
<td>Minnesota 37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Division I</td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2014 Federal Graduation Rate/NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) – National Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>85 (13th)</td>
<td>86 (12th)</td>
<td>77 (9th)</td>
<td>79 (4th)</td>
<td>89 (7th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION I</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Informational)

Faculty Senate Officer Report on College Visits

Our report reflects the conversations, issues, and impressions we gathered during our college visits. During each college visit, the Senate Officers met separately with Student, Faculty, and Administrative members in order to foster accurate perspectives from each stakeholder group. This report is detailed in order to give our Faculty Senate membership a complete and transparent view of the conversations, perspectives, challenges, and positive attributes heard during our very informative meetings.

1/30/15 Visit with Penn State Law and Dickinson Law Schools

Senate Officers had three joint meetings with representatives from University Park and Dickinson locations simultaneously using information technology at the Penn State Law Katz Building. This impressive technology worked in a seamless, intuitive fashion and permitted voice and video recognition of the main speaker from either the Penn State Law or the Dickinson Law locations simultaneously.

Student Meeting:

At Penn State Law, students were especially complementary about the diversity of their student body, which includes a strong international cohort. This diversity offered multiple perspectives for sharing opinions and fostering intellectual debate, which students believed was central to the pursuit of a quality law education. A majority of law students had scholarship support, with some having support from Penn State and some international students from their country of origin. Students at Penn State Law spoke highly of the quality of their building, its design, the library, and the Leads Building Certification.

Dickinson Law students were complementary about the smaller school enrollment and believed that improved student access to faculty. Students indicated their facilities were high quality and complementary that older buildings had recent technology and access upgrades. Students also discussed their geographic advantage, which includes access to Harrisburg, the seat of PA State Government, and the associated court system in the immediate area. Washington DC is also very close, giving students access to opportunities with Federal Government and associated corporate and private organizations located in that area. Some Dickinson Law students have families local to the surrounding area and are able to live at home. Overall, students from both locations expressed some concern about the future perception and name recognition of their degree, given the fall 2015 separation of the two law schools.
Students from the School of International Affairs (SIA), represent a third and distinct cohort and most were pursuing Master’s Degrees of International Affairs. These students gave high marks to their education with an interdisciplinary structure that gave exposure to diverse, important topics ranging from poverty, human rights, to climate change and its impacts at multiple societal levels. SIA students were not as pleased with their educational experience compared with either Penn State or Dickenson cohorts pursuing Law degrees. Issues discussed included the fact that their classes are scheduled in multiple buildings across University Park as opposed to a central location in the Katz Law Building and they did not feel they had priority or equal status in the Katz Building for student studying or scheduling space for student activities.

Faculty Meeting:

The Dickinson Law Faculty were very upbeat and optimistic about their new curriculum and general direction for their Law School. They had confidence in their Interim Dean, and at the time of our meeting in January, thought a timeframe for hiring their new Dean needed to be established to better chart their school’s future direction and competitiveness. Faculty echoed positive comments made by their students regarding their geographical proximity to both the Harrisburg State Capital and Washington DC area. Their location was viewed as a strategic advantage and offered synergies providing both leverage for educational opportunities and placements for student internships. While Dickinson Law is a complete law school with instruction, research, and service components, faculty thought their intentionally smaller enrollment offered distinct advantages for hands-on instruction and more mentored student experience.

Penn State Law Faculty thought their larger student enrollment, proximity to a Big Ten undergraduate campus, and college town atmosphere offered their program desirability and definition. Their program offers interdisciplinary, dual degree options, which could involve choices within the College of Business or College of Liberal Arts Political Science Program. Faculty expressed support for their current Interim Dean, but at the time of our meeting in January, echoed similar comments by Faculty at Dickinson Law, that a timeframe for hiring their new Dean needed to be established to better chart their future direction and competitiveness. Faculty also discussed challenges integrating the School of International Affairs (SIA) with their Law School, in brief, “should it be a part of our Law School or should it be a separate academic entity?” The current size of the faculty in this program is small, 10 total, with only 4 tenured and some believed that a more robust commitment to SIA should to be embraced by Penn State Law.

Administration Meeting:

The Administration of both Law School units was actively engaged in the transition of establishing separate paths and missions for each Law School. They noted tuition subsidies currently support students at both locations, enrollments are up at both locations, and both units are on track to establish two autonomous American Bar Association Law Schools by fall 2015. The two Deans reported that they meet at least once a week to coordinate this transition. All current students who initially enrolled in the Unified Law Degree Program between both campuses, will graduate under that single degree plan; as of fall 2015, students enrolled will follow separate degree tracts. At the time of our meeting in January, both Interim Deans
anticipated searches for permanent Deans in the near future. They also indicated that their Law Library is a strong information resource and efforts are being made to coordinate that resource access between both law school locations. Both Interim Deans indicated that clear campus identities and missions will be communicated to the 2015 entering classes.

**Impressions and Recommendations:**

Both Penn State Law and Dickinson Law have clear visions of their new missions, their programs, and their targeted student cohorts. While both Interim Deans are skilled at administering their programs and faculty, it was apparent from our conversations in January 2015, that faculty desired the Dean search process to proceed and believed that having permanent, Academic Deans in place would enhance the future definition and profile of their respected Law Schools.

Our impression was that the majority of Law Students in both programs were receiving significant scholarship support to maintain enrollments. While understandable in the short-term, such subsidy is likely not sustainable long-term, so building quality program reputations and establishing significant employment placements following graduation is essential for both Law Schools.

The School of International Affairs (SIA) appears to be a program that would benefit with a stronger commitment from Penn State Law, from both a student and faculty perspective. The Senate Officers shared the opinion that the SIA program could become an important, saleable point that differentiates Penn State Law from other competing Law Schools, and potentially a unique “dual graduate degree offering” that has great significance in our global community that has ever increasing international and legal intersections.

**1/30/15 Visit with The College of Education**

**Student Meeting:**

The students we met were a combination of undergraduate and graduate students. Both cohorts were most enthusiastic about their educational experience and the faculty that supports and facilitates their education. Access to quality employment opportunities in a competitive market weighed heavily on the minds of the undergraduates. These students were concerned about declining enrollments in their undergraduate college over time, reduced employment opportunities, and a low 50% retention rate in education jobs over a 5 year time period. STEM Education areas were acknowledged having more robust opportunities for employment. International Students reported that integration into normal student teaching internships is challenging due to laws at public schools, excluding their participation in such experiences.

Graduate students acknowledged the high quality reputation of the Penn State Education Graduate degrees at both Master’s and PhD levels, leading to quality jobs in Education Administration. However, many graduate students were concerned about the availability of longer-term funding supporting their fellowships, which is not guaranteed through the
completion of their degree. This situation made their financial viability tenuous and became a low morale issue for many. They acknowledged excellent support for professional development in grant writing, technology applications, and mentoring/tutoring opportunities. Some graduate students indicated that they needed improved advising and increased access for instructing undergraduates, which can be key for securing post-graduate employment. International Students reported that the transition into graduate school, its rules and expectations, along with the transition into American culture was very challenging and that improved support mechanisms should be identified, prioritized, and implemented.

**Faculty Meeting:**

Faculty noted that the number of undergraduates attending their programs is declining but the decline is parallel with national enrollment trends in similar benchmarked programs. Despite this trend, the quality of Penn State undergraduate education majors remains high and job placement is very good, especially if undergraduates are willing to travel out of state, specifically to southern states and urban locations. Undergraduate students have increasing study abroad opportunities in places ranging from India to Ireland.

Faculty were especially enthusiastic and proud regarding the highly ranked Graduate Education offered through the numerous programs they supervise. They noted growing program enrollment in Rehabilitation and Human Services, Special Education, and Education Theory and Policy. A Workforce Certification Program in Technology is very popular with returning adult students. Faculty noted excellent supporting resources for their graduate programs including library resources, an ITS Computer Center for processing large data files, and The Teaching, Learning and Innovation Center.

Some faculty indicated that it was very tedious to file course and curricular changes through the Curricular Affairs Committee process (a Faculty Senate Standing Committee). These faculty believed that the current Curricular Affairs process needed to be reviewed, streamlined, and improved. Senate Officers noted this comment and this process will be examined in 2015-2016. Faculty noted that Research initiatives are frequently supported through private contracts with Corporations and Industry. However, establishing such contracts is increasingly difficult due to red tape involved with Penn State Administrative oversight. Faculty were united around their perception that improved ways of conducting business and approving contracts with private, paying clients, should be established.

**Administrative Meeting:**

The administration outlined the College of Education organization, indicating that there are four departments, Curriculum and Instruction, with large enrollment primarily servicing undergraduates, Educational Psychology, Educational Policy Studies, and Learning and Performance Systems. The college is successful in offering Professional Master’s Degree Programs through World Campus and also offers a number of on-line Certificate Programs. Faculty were generally characterized as “research oriented”, “enjoying student instruction”, and “providing a number of innovative professional preparation programs.” Recent emphasis is placed on working with undergraduates from STEM Colleges at University Park, developing
new study abroad programs, and supporting a growing international student population at undergraduate and graduate levels.

Challenges include following a changing landscape of federal, state, and local regulations governing K-12 instruction. As one example, Pennsylvania recently implemented a basic skills test for K-4th graders, but adjacent states do not have a similar requirement. Professional advisors are increasingly used to meet the demands of students, but this adds to program overhead costs. Concern was expressed about potential “free” summer tuition being considered for PSU Students, adding that summer student enrollment currently generates considerable revenue for their College.

**Impressions and Recommendations:**

The Senate Officers were most impressed by the quality of undergraduate and graduate students and the enthusiasm they displayed during our meeting. Undergraduate students were most concerned about securing jobs following graduation; however, our discussions with faculty and administration indicated that job placement for undergraduate students is excellent, especially for those students willing to travel out of state and south for employment. Senate Officers believed that both the Faculty and Administration should improve their communication to students regarding the high employment value of the Penn State Education Bachelor’s degree and reassure students that they will be placed into competitive jobs in education, but be clear that the most robust job markets are found outside Pennsylvania, in southern states, and in urban environments. Improved communication about these positive realities should be relayed to undergraduate students and perhaps enhanced by establishing recruitment relationships that encourage students to apply to targeted, out of state, quality school districts.

Graduate students have inconsistent stipend support, and support is only guaranteed for the first year for many students. This reality results in low morale and considerable financial worry among graduate students. However, the Senate Officers were told that once these students earn their graduate degrees, the excellent reputation of the PSU Education Graduate Program greatly improves employment opportunities for their graduates. If this tenuous graduate stipend funding is a longer-term reality, it should be better communicated to graduate students prior to matriculation and students should perhaps be prepared to take loans for graduate education, with the expectation of improved employment opportunities once their degree is earned. Alternatively, if financial support is unlikely to change and graduate students demand stipend support for the entire course of their graduate degree, then the College of Education could consider downsizing their graduate enrollment with the goal of providing full financial support for their graduate students. The Senate Officers were told at our meeting with the Graduate School that the College of Liberal Arts Graduate Program made such a decision 10 years ago, and now enjoys a smaller, higher quality program, with all graduate students fully supported.

One of the committee charges for the upcoming Senate Year is to review and streamline the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs process, as this issue was indicated in our conversations with both the College of Education and the Division of Undergraduate Studies.
Our final recommendation is to examine the forms, procedures, and approvals needed for private contract work and private research initiatives. Faculty in particular thought that the “red tape” involved in securing these relationships was very restrictive and limited funding opportunities.

2/20/15 Visit to The College of Engineering

Student Meeting:

The Senate Officers were very impressed by the breadth of quantitatively demanding undergraduate programs represented by students in our meeting. As a group, these students are academically elite, enrolled in challenging programs requiring 128-136 credits for graduation, routinely take 17-18 credits loads, graduate in 4 years, and surprisingly, have an optimistic “can do” attitude and do not complain. Some of the majors represented were the mainstays of Chemical, Industrial, Mechanical, and Electrical Engineering, as well as the more discipline-specific Aerospace Engineering, Architectural Engineering, Nuclear Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Bioengineering.

Students were most complementary about their course instruction, which was “overall excellent”, their Professional Advising Center, which provided “good, knowledgeable support”, and especially Career Services, which was described as “outstanding” and “providing avenues for internships that set you up for success on the job market.”

Some of the challenges included comments that some of the core, required courses were very large and would benefit by multiple sections and more instructors. Entry into major by sophomore year was described by some students as “quantitatively challenging and stressful” with courses including Calculus 1&2, Chemistry 110, Differential Equations, Engineering Mechanics. Grades of C or higher are required in these courses along with a 3.0 GPA entrance to major requirement, and enrollment caps of 100 students in some majors. Advising was described as very good for the first two years through the professional advising center, but at times there were “not enough advisers to meet student demand” and “it took a while to schedule an appointment.” Some students said that their campus infrastructure needed improvement and a few said that West Campus locations for some labs and Central Campus locations for others made travel, especially with research equipment, challenging.

Faculty Meeting:

Faculty were very complementary about the students they instructed and the undergraduate programs they offered. They said the program goals were constructed to make their students “grounded problem solvers” and that overall, the Penn State Engineering degree has a high quality reputation nationally, based in part upon their students receiving excellent career placement following graduation. Faculty were proud of their “Learning Factory Facility” which supports “hands on learning” in a number of innovative projects including The Lunar Lion, Hydrogen and Alternative Energy Powered Car Projects, and various student engineering clubs and their associated projects. Faculty pointed out that many of their undergraduate degrees are top 5 in the country and by survey Penn State Engineering degrees are #1 ranked by employers.
The Faculty were also very supportive of their new Dean and thought he had a strong vision of the future and clear ideas and direction of where he wanted to lead their College.

Faculty indicated that limited space, especially for some laboratory experiences, coupled with high undergraduate demand for their courses resulted in enrollment controls for their majors, which some students do not appreciate. One example was Aerospace Engineering, where the enrollment cap is 100 students, but 130 students apply for entry by sophomore year. Faculty reported that for this major in particular, there is not enough space (classroom seats) or instructional support to meet demand. They reported having the highest undergraduate student enrollment per faculty member in the country 24-27:1 vs 10-15:1 for benchmarked, peer institutions. Some faculty said that current undergraduate student to faculty ratios are unsustainable, especially when coupled with faculty research demands.

Likewise, the Engineering Undergraduate Advising Center is over-subscribed with only 4 professional advisors meeting the demands for 3800 students enrolled in years 1 and 2. Faculty also expressed concern over the new legislative burdens of mandatory background checks, creating further red tape and paperwork for situations they thought had very low risk.

While older buildings such as Hammond and Sackett have recently renovated interiors with good technology support for student learning, the Engineering College has not had a new, dedicated building in over 20 years. (West Campus construction is not included in these comments as this is primarily a research location for Applied Research Laboratories and Material Sciences). Faculty were united in their support for a new building and it was discussed that a major purpose for this building could be classroom space, laboratory space, and advising space for undergraduate programs.

**Administration Meeting:**

The Administration indicated that they had excellent students, quality faculty, and strategic planning resources to handle these demands. In terms of diversity, they indicated that they are #4 in ranking for numbers of tenured Women Faculty and have a top 10 ranking for numbers of African American Faculty. The Administration notes that “we (engineers) are problem solvers, we embrace change, we share resources, we interact across departments and disciplines, and we expertly juggle multiple demands for our time.” They indicated that they have faculty who are “Serial Entrepreneurs”, which fits well with President Barron’s initiative and have a multidisciplinary approach to research that combines Engineering expertise with Medicine, Science, Agriculture, and Architecture disciplines. Over the last 10 years, research dollars have grown by a factor of three and undergraduate students have increased 27%.

Diversity is a strong point for the College in terms of both students and supporting faculty; however, funding for supporting scholarships is limiting. Currently there are 5 Bunton Waller Scholarships and 7 Millennium Scholarships given each year supporting underrepresented students.

The biggest challenge facing the College of Engineering is undoubtedly infrastructure. The administration indicated that a new building is desperately needed, along with refurbishment of
existing space, indicating that instructional space, lab space, and office space is lacking in quality. The Dean suggested that more undergraduate tuition money could be returned to the College for advising support, citing that their current ratio is 1 advisor per 700 students and other benchmarked institutions have more favorable 1:200 ratios. Enrollment caps in Engineering Programs are not ideal, but the reality is instructional space, instructors, and advisors are needed. The Dean is very worried about the combination of space issues, underfunding issues, and high advisor and faculty to student ratios. He was of the opinion that unless Penn State makes a sizable infrastructure investment, the current national rankings of the undergraduate program as a top 20 and graduate program as a top 30 ranked program will surely fall.

Another issue expressed is the issue of negotiating research contract with private, corporate/industry entities, which involves too much time, paperwork, and negotiation.

**Impressions and Recommendations:**

The College of Engineering is one of the top undergraduate programs at Penn State and benefits by having a quality and committed faculty who instruct an academically elite and prepared group of students, in a quantitatively challenging and demanding curriculum. Despite having nationally ranked programs and exceptionally positive feedback from corporate employers of graduates, the Senate Officers are very concerned that Penn State has not adequately invested in the maintenance and expansion of one of its premier undergraduate programs for many years.

Based upon the student, faculty, and administration opinions we heard, the College of Engineering would greatly benefit from a new building for instructional, laboratory, advising, and office space, but as always, Penn State’s overall financial climate needs to be considered. Ideally, more money could be earmarked for advising needs as well as for scholarships for underrepresented students. High Faculty/Student and Advisor/Student ratios imply that investment could be made in personnel to meet needs on both of these fronts. Finally, echoing comments heard in the College of Education, review of contract relationships for research should be reviewed and streamlined as business and funding dollars are being lost due to red tape and difficulty establishing these relationships.

**2/27/15 Visit with the Division of Undergraduate Studies**

**Student Meeting:**

Division of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) students are admitted to Penn State without a declared major, so the goal of this program is to give students a framework for exploration and curricular experience in order to declare a major by end of their Sophomore year. The students we met were considering majors in Business, Science, Health Policy, English, International Relations, and Human Development and Family Studies. Students were very complementary about the advising support they had in this program and the convenience of “walk in” advising appointments. They spoke highly of a “Major Quest” software program that assists with course selection related to student interest areas. Additionally, many enjoyed the “Discovery House” which is a special dormitory for DUS students.
Students can gain access to “enrollment controlled majors” at Penn State, including Business and Engineering, through DUS, which means that DUS can also serve as an important weigh point for students originally in one major, changing their mind, and now needing to accumulate credits and grades for entry into majors housed in different colleges.

Advisors Meeting:

Due to the unique structure of the DUS Program, there are no supporting or instructional faculty, so the Senate Officers met with DUS Advisors. The DUS program was founded in 1973 and by design is student friendly and service oriented. Advisors need to broadly understand today’s student, evaluate student interest areas, and most importantly, broadly understand the mechanics, rules, prerequisites, and proper course selection for majors across all colleges at University Park. Some colleges have designated DUS coordinators who are housed in Advising Centers at those colleges (College of Science, College of Business for example). One major issue is that much of the information pertaining to majors and curricula used to be found in the “Penn State Bluebook” (Undergraduate Bulletin) and it is now somewhat scattered throughout the Penn State Web System. As a result, locating current, correct, up-to-date information for majors, can be challenging.

Challenges include not having a single, “go to” location on the Penn State Web that serves as an Undergraduate Bulletin. They indicated that a unified, on-line Bulletin would have majors, course descriptions, and prerequisites displayed in a consistent fashion with current and up-to-date information. With the advent of LionPATH, it is uncertain how this e-bulletin might interface with checking student transcripts and prerequisite courses.

Advisors also discussed the issue of international students who are the last to arrive on campus for fall scheduling. As a result, many classes they need are full, especially important English as Second Language (ESL) courses. Additionally, many departments “reserve spaces” in Math, English, Chemistry, and other key freshman courses, which might also be unavailable for international students at the time of scheduling. Like many undergraduate programs on campus, there is a need for Psychological Counseling Services (CAPS), especially towards the end of fall semester and at that time, the wait time to schedule an appointment can be excessive.

Administrative Meeting:

The administration indicated that they have 32 advisors in their program that service approximately 4000 students. This is a ratio of 1 advisor to 125 students, which the Senate Officers note is far more favorable than the 1:700 ration seen in the College of Engineering. Extra advisors are hired for summer New Student Orientation (NSO) and on busy days, their advisors might have to meet with 50 or more students. Like the advisors, the administration emphasized the importance of a Unified Penn State Web Bulletin and a smooth interface with LionPATH.
Impressions and Recommendations:

In some respects, having several thousand freshman and sophomores in an “undeclared major status” is counter to President Barron’s initiative to decrease the time taken from matriculation to earned degree. While DUS advisors are very well-intended in their assistance with student schedules and exploratory pathways, an undeclared major status, by its very nature, tends to prolong the time to graduation, as not all courses taken will necessarily apply to a major in a proper time sequence.

The most salient point of our visit was the discussion about a Unified Penn State e-Bulletin, providing a complete and on-line accessible listing of majors, graduation requirements, courses, descriptions, and prerequisites. This should be developed and perhaps the advisory staff of DUS could be instrumental in helping to create this system. Ideally, this system should seamlessly interface with the new LionPATH System.

Finally, there are distinct issues scheduling international students, by virtue that they arrive at the end of summer NSO, after the majority of students have scheduled. The Senate Officers discussed the idea of using “Face Time” or “Skype”, allowing earlier remote summer meetings with these students and facilitating the creation of fall schedules that at least reserves priority ESL, math, General Education, or other likely, first semester courses.

2/27/15 Visit with Earth and Mineral Sciences

Student Meeting:

Students represented a variety of majors in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences (EMS) including Meteorology, Geography, Materials Science and Engineering, Environmental Systems Engineering, Energy, Business and Finance, and Petroleum Engineering. Most programs have small junior/senior classes in major, with 25-30 student enrollments. The exception is Petroleum Engineering, which is in expansion phase and has enrollments of 200 students. Lab facilities, first year seminar facilities, and a study lounge in Hostler Building help to build a sense of community for EMS undergraduates. Students reported a good Student Council Organization and a Dance Marathon Group that was the #1 independent organization for Thon Fundraising.

Students indicated that they would like to see the organization of an EMS Career Fair, as the larger career fairs on campus cater more to Business and Engineering students. Some EMS majors require 130 or more credits to graduate and it is challenging to achieve that goal in 4 years without taking some science-oriented courses during summer sessions. Students also said that some building facilities are spread out over a wide footprint on campus ranging from Materials Sciences buildings in West Campus, to Hostler, to Millennium Sciences that is farther away on the East side of campus. Finally, EMS students reported academic integrity issues with courses, especially those offered on-line, and suggested that an Honor Code would be useful at University Park.
**Faculty Meeting:**

EMS Faculty enjoyed their instructional roles and participation in meaningful, often interdisciplinary research. They indicated that their administration is ahead of the curve and appreciates quality, important research as opposed to simply valuing the number of research dollars generated. Non-tenure line faculty play an integral role in the department, especially in student instruction, and are valued for their contributions.

Some of the challenges include a large growth rate in numbers of undergraduates without adequate development of their employment placement needs. Unfortunately, many faculty are over-committed in teaching and research and as a result, they can not assist with important employment placement needs in a meaningful fashion. Faculty suggested that establishment of an “undergraduate employment initiative” should be prioritized.

Faculty were most concerned about the impact of AD Policies, especially with respect to international travel and research. They said Penn State has become very risk adverse and this climate inhibits the ability to negotiate contracts and research agreements in the private sector, to travel abroad with computers, to conduct research abroad, and, in general, to pursue international research, professional relationships, conferences, and investigations in an open fashion.

Faculty were not pleased with the number of “compliance initiatives” they must cooperate with as a member of Penn State. Specifics cited included the “Take Care of Your Health Initiative”, “Complex Documentation and Rules for Travel Reimbursement”, “Child Abuse Training”, and related to that, the “The Fingerprinting and Background Check Initiative”. They suggested that the message being sent is that “we are bad people”, “we are guilty”, “we are not trusted”, and “we are treated like children, told to do things”.

**Administration Meeting:**

The administration outlined the organization of the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, consisting of five major departments, Geography, Materials Science, Meteorology, Geosciences, and Mineral Engineering, the largest department that includes Petroleum Engineering and Mining Engineering. The College has 135 tenure-line faculty and all departments are linked with the study, use, and application of earth’s resources.

Some of the noteworthy activities include Weatherworld, a longstanding, student operated weather reporting show, the current renovation of the Steidle Building, which will greatly improve Materials Science facilities, and a Water Research Initiative, recognizing that water is a very important and often limiting resource in many regions around our globe. The rapid growth and demand for Petroleum Engineering graduates in the last 5 years has created enrollment capacity challenges and recently, the sudden collapse of oil prices has negatively impacted hiring in this sector in rapidly trending ways that are not fully appreciated.

Educational Equity is a Dean’s level position in the College to demonstrate commitment and importance to this hiring and enrollment issue. Very positive improvement has been achieved in this area, as twelve years ago, international students were less than 1% and underrepresented
students were less than 4% of enrollment. Currently, the International Student population has risen to 18% of enrollment and Underrepresented Students are 13% of enrollment.

Team building exercises are undertaken to build faculty-student relationships for 4 days prior to the start of fall semester and the faculty routinely help new EMS students move into the Penn State dormitories in an effort to foster positive relationships early in their academic degree.

**Impressions and Recommendations:**

The College of Earth and Mineral Sciences offers diverse and respected curricula in earth resource disciplines with a strong commitment to quality undergraduate and graduate instruction. Attributes include a strong international research reputation and robust enrollment in Petroleum Engineering, along with significant research and program reputations in Material Science and Meteorology. Senate Officers were most impressed by the significant strides made to improve international and underrepresented student enrollment and credit is likely due to the creation of and commitment for a Dean’s level administrative position in Educational Equity.

Faculty were most vocal about the negative impact they believed various AD policies were having on their ability to travel and conduct research internationally. In a similar vein, faculty thought the number of healthcare, background check, travel reimbursement, and child abuse initiatives were collectively counter-productive and created morale issues among faculty, staff, and students.

**3/27/15 Visit with the Graduate School**

**Student Meeting:**

The students we met were very bright, articulate, passionate, and divided into two distinct groups. One group was reasonably content with their financial support and actively working in research and the pursuit of their graduate degrees. The other group was actively engaged in the organization and representation of graduate students and very concerned about their welfare from healthcare, financial support, and representation perspectives.

Representation of graduate students has shifted from the former Graduate Student Association (GSA) to a new, administration recommended, Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA). The later incorporation better describes and represents all students seeking graduate education, adding to the title, those seeking degrees in Law and Medical areas.

Healthcare insurance and more uniform stipend compensation were the dominant issues discussed by students. Additionally, students voiced concern about the inability to control their own e-mail list serve, with only 2 mass e-mail contacts permitted a semester, both of which had to be approved. From their perspective, asking permission to contact other graduate students and limiting the number of contacts per semester are both salient issues. Their current platform includes:
1. “Living wage stipends” for all graduate students
2. Quality health insurance with reasonable deductibles
3. Free communication among graduate students and communication between graduate students and members of graduate council
4. Participation in the review of graduate faculty
5. Increased graduate student representation on Faculty Senate (currently only 1 member)

**Faculty Meeting (we met with members of Graduate Council Executive Committee):**

The Senate Officers discussed many of the issues brought to our attention at the graduate student meeting. Regarding graduate assistantships, stipends ranged from $12-$14,000 per year to $26-$32,000 per year. The MBA Program in the College of Business was described as a “lost leader” and has some of the lowest stipends. Many of the graduate students in this program are international students, apparently willing to accept lower stipends that were not viewed as competitive with more prestigious programs. It was reported that graduate students with higher application credentials seek “Prestige MBA Programs” such as those found at University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School, Columbia, and Harvard. Additionally, it was noted that a growing trend is to pursue MBAs part-time through night courses after work or through on-line MBA Programs. For these reasons, more robust stipend support for the Penn State MBA was recommended to maintain program viability and enrollment.

Many graduate students are supported by tuition dollars generated from General Education Instruction, including graduate students in the College of Arts and Architecture and the College of Liberal Arts. It was acknowledged that graduate stipend support is problematic in some programs, in particular graduate students in the College of Education, as the Senate Officers confirmed during our visit to that college. The Senate Officers were told that stipend support for graduate students in the College of Liberal Arts was in a similar situation 10 years ago and that College made the difficult decision to reduce graduate student enrollments. Longer term, this action resulted in fewer graduate students, but with higher quality credentials, and full stipend support.

Some of the future policy issues that should be addressed include a policy allowing graduate students to instruct graduate level courses. This is necessary for some of the laboratory-based courses in Engineering, for example. Additionally, the policy on graduate faculty membership needs to be clarified to allow both research faculty and professional/clinical faculty to participate.

Two other issues include increasing the diversity of resident graduate students and balancing degree quality issues in on-line graduate programs verses the cash flow potential such programs can generate.

**Administration Meeting:**

The Graduate School controls only a limited amount of funding and most graduate stipend monies are generated and controlled by the degree-granting units. Twenty new Graduate
Fellowships were added this past year, at a pay rate of $26,000 per year, bringing the total number of fellowships offered to 100. NSF Fellows have increased from 20-90 over the last decade, but Penn State still ranks behind top tier institutions in this metric.

Despite an increasing research budget at Penn State, the slow growth in funding for graduate student stipends was blamed, in part, on increasing reliance on Post Doctorates to oversee laboratories and research programs, verses more traditional models where graduate students perform these tasks. In the current, ultra-competitive grant-funding climate, Post Doctorates are more efficient financial models, as graduate students rely heavily on the principle investigative faculty to provide considerable time for their supervision and mentoring.

Penn State has a 60% completion rate for PhD degrees, which ranks above the national average of 50%. The average time to degree completion is 5.3 years.

The Graduate School is developing a new plan for diversity recruitment. The last 10 years have been flat in terms of underrepresented enrollments, 5-6% for resident students (7% national average) and 10% for on-line degrees.

**Impressions and Recommendations:**

The graduate student’s efforts to organize is impressive but also problematic in that it indicates that their collective needs are likely not being met, especially in areas of financial compensation and health care. The administration indicated that use of the graduate students list serve was being limited in part because efforts were being made to utilize this list serve with an underlining goal to unionize graduate students.

Like many colleges we visited, the future competitiveness and success of the Graduate School depends upon funding. Competitive stipends and reasonable health insurance plans are essential for recruiting quality and diverse graduate students. Lacking endowments to support graduate stipends, research grant funding must be utilized. In larger laboratories, grant funding models pit funding Post-Doctorates against funding graduate students, the later being more demanding on time and supervision by the primary investigator. There are no easy answers to this dilemma, but solutions must be found if the Penn State’s graduate programs are to remain viable and nationally ranked.

Finally, downsizing enrollments in some graduate programs could improve their overall quality and address issues of stipend support. The Senate Officers were told that the College of Liberal Arts made the difficult decision to reduce graduate student enrollments ten years ago. Over that time period, this action reduced the number of Liberal Arts graduate students; however, it improved graduate application credentials, and all graduate students accepted into the program could be offered competitive stipend support.

Prepared by:

James Strauss, Faculty Senate Secretary in consultation with Faculty Senate Chair Jonna Kulikowich and Chair-Elect Mohamad Ansari.
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, June 30, 2015 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Guests/Others: L. Backer, R. Becker, B. Bowen, D. Gray, D. Hagen, W. Knight, N. Schlegel, S. Weaver, M. Whitehurst,

Absent: M. Hanes, K. Jablokow, E. Knodt, G. Kuldau, E. Miller, R. Pangborn, C. Weidemann, and V. Brunsden

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ansari called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. on Tuesday, June 30, 2015, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 14, 2015

The minutes of the April 14, 2015, meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Ansari welcomed all new and continuing members and special guests. He remarked that the meeting would be the final meeting of Wanda Knight, Administrative Fellow. He announced Carey Eckhardt would continue serving as the Senate Council liaison to Graduate Council.

Executive Vice President and Provost Nick Jones reported nearly 129,000 applications have been received for the 2015-16 year. This is an increase over 2014. The numbers of applications for Law, Medicine, and the Graduate School are higher. Accepts are down at the larger commonwealth campuses and University Park; the latter by design to resolve excessive number of admits to University Park in 2014. Jones mentioned the anticipated appointment of Douglas Cavener as Dean of the Eberly College of Science and reported interviews of finalists for the Vice Provost for Educational Equity will begin soon. The search for Vice Provost for Program Assessment is proceeding. The position description for Dean of Penn State Law and the School of International Affairs is being developed; the search for the Dean of Dickinson Law will begin after the search for Dean of Penn State Law is underway. He reviewed the recent cyber security breaches that have been reported in the media and the steps being taken to monitor systems to
prevent future breaches. He also stressed the importance of removing Personally Identifiable Information from computers. The draft Strategic Plan continues to be revised and it will be interfaced with Development plans. Questions posed by Councilors included issues related to the protection of data, and availability of assistance from government agencies for protecting computer systems.

Vice Provost Blannie Bowen summarized a letter from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education that had just been received. The Commission renewed the University’s accreditation, but a mentoring report will be due on April 1, 2017 to address progress on five areas.

Acting Vice Provost Marcus Whitehurst reported diversity issues are being incorporated into the university strategic plan and a revised statement on diversity is being drafted.

The Senate officers, Executive Director, and Councilors had not comments.

Chair Ansari requested and was granted approval to revise the agenda to address the discussion item on health care by David Gray, Senior Vice President for Business. Vice President Gray gave a Powerpoint presentation that summarized the progress to date and future plans of the Health Care Advisory Committee. The Committee was formed in response to the report of the Health Care Task Force.

**ACTION ITEMS**

Revisions to the submission deadlines for Senate Council reports and curriculum proposals on the 2015-2016 Senate Calendar were approved.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Chair Ansari introduced David Gray, Senior Vice President for Business, who gave a slide presentation on the activities of the Health Care Advisory Committee. The Committee was formed in response to the report of the Health Care Task Force. Gray pointed out the desire to develop transparency tools regarding health care. Penn State Hershey Medical Center and Mt. Nittany Medical Center in State College are discussing the formation of a joint network that could improve health care services for Penn State employees. Development of a ‘data warehouse’ for health plans is also being considered. He provided demographic information on the Blue and Savings plans; the Blue plan is more popular with lower-salaried employees; the Savings plan is more popular with younger employees. About 40% of employees chose the Savings plan for the current year. Health care expenditures are being tracked for the two plans. Whereas the Blue plan has experienced an 8.3% increase, expenditures have decreased 19.2% for the Savings plan. Seventy-seven percent of those eligible are contributing to their Health care Savings Accounts. Gray emphasized no major changes in the health care plans are planned for 2016. Salary indexing of contributions to the plans will continue, but the slope of the index is being studied. Gray provided clarification on issue raised by Councilors and agreed to forward to the Committee the suggestions offered by Councilors.

Chair Ansari introduced Regis Becker, Director of University Ethics and Compliance, who gave an update on a Pennsylvania Senate bill that would modify the requirements and define certain terms in the 2014 legislation that requires background checks for those working with minors. Becker introduced Sandy Weaver, the Youth Programs Compliance Specialist. The bill was
passed by the PA Senate on June 30; PA House action will follow. If the bill passes the House, it will go to the Governor for signature. The bill would exempt current employees who are working with matriculated and enrolled full-time students from background checks and make background clearances portable between employers and extend the clearances from the current 3 years to 5 years. The three-part background checks would continue to be required for all new hires and faculty who work with dual-enrollment minors would be required to have the three background checks. [Post-meeting note: The bill was signed by Governor Wolf on July 1, 2015 as Act 15 of the Legislature.]

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Minutes from the April 15, 2105 and May 6, 2015, Graduate Council meetings are posted on the Graduate School website at http://www.gradschool.psu.edu/gradcouncil/2014-15-graduate-council-meetings/. Councilor Eckhart reported that discussions continue on the subject of graduate faculty membership tiers. A chart describing the tiers can be found on the pages for the April and May Senate Council meetings on the Graduate School web site.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

Forensic Business

Legislative Reports
Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid — Revisions to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal). This report was placed on the Agenda on an Eckhardt/Koch motion.

Advisory/Consultative Reports

Faculty Affairs — Revision of HR25 Emeritus Status. Two revisions were approved via separate motions to amend. The revised report was placed on the Agenda on a Taylor/Wilson motion.

Informational Reports

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari mentioned that the Agenda for the September 15 meeting would approved at the August 25 Senate Council meeting, when additional reports would be considered by Council. Chair Ansari thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

Daniel R. Hagen
Executive Director
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, August 25, 2015 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Absent: E. Miller

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ansari called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 25, 2015, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JUNE 30, 2015

The minutes of the June 30, 2015, meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Ansari welcomed new members who were not introduced at the June 30, 2015 meeting: Gretchen Kuldau (Ag Sciences) and Douglas Wolfe (Engineering) He also welcomed special guests, Ryan McCombie, a member of the Board of Trustees, and David Han, Academic Trustee. He announced a conference, Transformative Teaching and Learning, sponsored by the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence and the Schreyer Honors College on October 20 at the Penn Stater. Details are available on the Schreyer Institute’s website.

Executive Vice President and Provost reported the search for a Dean of Penn State Law has begun; the search for Dean of Dickinson Law will begin shortly. He introduced Marcus Whitehurst, who was recently named the Vice Provost for Educational Equity. The new Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment will be announced soon. He mentioned the costs of the
security breaches in the College of Engineering and the College of the Liberal Arts. The Provost also reported that WorkLION, a new system that will combine the human resources and payroll functions, is moving ahead; its development will emulate the process used for LionPATH. He recently held a Town Hall with staff in the Office of Physical Plant. Work on the strategic plan continues; the next generation draft will be released soon. The plan will mirror the university's development plan.

Blannie Bowen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, reported the new faculty orientation was held recently and remarked on the age range of the new faculty.

Madlyn Hanes, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, reported new chancellors have been hired for Worthington-Scranton and Lehigh Valley searches will begin soon for chancellors of Greater Allegheny, Beaver, Abington, and Behrend.

Rob Pangborn, Vice President for Undergraduate Education, reported strong enrollments for the 2015-16 year. Commonwealth Campus enrollment is expected to be 8,262; anticipated enrollment at University Park is 7,947. The staged LionPATH implementation will begin on September 1 with the application process, move to classroom scheduling, followed student aid, registration, class rosters, and finally grading.

Craig Weidemann, Vice President for Outreach, reported on the new facility at San Diego, CA to support military members who are enrolled in World Campus courses.

Marcus Whitehurst, Vice Provost for Educational Equity, mentioned a small increase in the number of veterans enrolled at Penn State and announced the Promotion and Tenure workshop scheduled for October 16.

There were no comments by the other Senate officers or the Executive Director.

Councilors had no questions or comments

ACTION ITEMS

On a Taylor/Koch motion, Council recommended approval of the proposal from the College of Medicine to change the name of the Department of Anesthesiology to the Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine. The Provost will be informed of the action.

Revision to the Penn State Altoona constitution. The revision, forwarded by the Unit Constitution Committee was approved. The chair of the unit faculty organization and the Abington chancellor will be notified.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chair Ansari reminded Councilors that the Senate Council is responsible for considering the degree of readiness of each report, not for judging the merits of each report.
C. Eckhardt, liaison to Graduate Council, reported that Graduate Council has not met since the June 30 meeting of Senate Council. The next Graduate Council meeting is scheduled for September 16, 2015.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

Forensic Business

Joint Diversity Awareness. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Koch motion. Twenty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Update on Implementation of LionPATH. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Taylor/Brunsden motion. Twenty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Update on Background Checks. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Szczygiel motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Penn State Values. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Eckhardt/Wilson motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Legislative Reports

The report from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid "Revisions to Senate Policy 54-90 (Academic Renewal)," was approved by the Senate Council on June 30, 2015

Special Senate Committee on The Implementation of LionPath — Change to Senate Policy 34-60 (Prerequisites and Concurrent Courses). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Taylor/Koch motion. A question was raised about implementation of the policy.

Advisory/Consultative Reports

The report from Faculty Affairs "Revision of HR25 Emeritus Status," was approved by the Senate Council on June 30, 2015.

Informational Reports

Faculty Affairs — Report on Protection of Faculty during Budgetary Contractions. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Eckhardt motion. Fifteen minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Faculty Rights and Responsibilities — Annual Report for 2014-2015. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Brunsden/Taylor motion. This report will be posted online only without presentation and discussion at the Senate meeting. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

Intercollegiate Athletics — Annual Report of Academic Eligibility and Athletic Scholarships for 2014-2015. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Myers/Nousek motion. This report will be
posted online only without presentation and discussion at the Senate meeting. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

Senate Council — Report on Spring 2015 Campus Visits. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Rowland/Koch motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR September 15, 2015

The Agenda was approved on a Wilson/ Szczygiel motion.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

Daniel R. Hagen
Executive Director
Date: September 4, 2015

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings for September 14 and 15. Please notify the Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2015

4:00 p.m. New Faculty Senators Workshop 102 Kern Graduate Building

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

8:15 p.m. Commonwealth Caucus Meeting 102 Kern Graduate Building

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

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

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

   Committees and Rules 201 Kern Graduate Building

   Curricular Affairs 102 Kern Graduate Building

   Educational Equity and Campus Environment 315 Grange Building

   Joint meeting of Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations 118 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building

   Faculty Benefits 519 Elliott Building

   Research 217 Grange Building

   Undergraduate Education 110C Chandlee Lab

   University Planning 324 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building

9:00 a.m. Global Programs 412 Boucke Building

   Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology 510A Paterno Library

An Equal Opportunity University
9:00 a.m. cont.

Outreach 214 Business Building
Student Life 409H Keller Building

11:00 a.m. Student Senators Caucus 114 Kern Graduate Building
and Orientation

11:15 a.m. Commonwealth Caucus Meeting Alumni Lounge, Nittany Lion Inn

1:30 p.m. University Faculty Senate 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: September 4, 2015

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

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

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2015 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING

Update on Online Intrusions at Penn State
Kevin Morooney, Vice Provost for IT, and John Harwood, associate vice provost for IT

To join the evening caucus meeting by phone or video, please dial 440352 for video or 814-867-5845 and enter the ID# 440352 for phone.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015 – 11:15 AM
ALUMNI LOUNGE, NITTANY LION INN

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

Agenda

I. Call to Order

II. Announcements

III. Committee Reports

IV. Other Items of Concern/New Business

Discussion of speakers for Monday evening Caucus meetings

V. Adjournment and Lunch

An Equal Opportunity University