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Introduction

In its meeting on April 28, 2015, the University Faculty Senate approved a legislative report (http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/april-28-2015-agenda/appendix-b/) that included, as its Recommendation 6, a new General Education requirement for Integrative Studies:

(a) Require 6 credits of Integrative Studies as part of the General Education Baccalaureate requirements; (b) create inter-domain courses as a way for students to accomplish the Integrative Studies requirement; (c) create linked courses as a way to offer the Integrative component; (d) replace the “9-6-3” substitution with the more flexible “Move 3” substitution; and (e) allow an Integrative Studies course to satisfy the flexible 3 credits of exploration within the Associate Degree General Education curriculum.

That section of the April 2015 legislative report specified the number of Integrative Studies credits required for Baccalaureate degrees (6 credits) and allowed for Associate degrees (3 credits), and stated that inter-domain courses and linked courses should form two ways to meet that requirement.

In June 2015, Senate Chair Mohamad Ansari appointed a Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform. The full charge to this committee is included as Attachment 1. Key aspects of the charge include:

The Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform is being appointed and is charged with the design of a clear and unambiguous process by which Recommendation 6 [of the April 2015 Senate legislative report on General Education] is to be implemented. More specifically, the Special Committee is charged to:

- Develop an implementation plan for inter-domain courses, and propose a process of consultation, including approval criteria that ensure academic rigor and distribution across domains in the design and staffing of these courses;
- Develop an implementation plan for linked courses, and propose a process of consultation, including approval criteria that ensure academic rigor and distribution across domains in the design and staffing of these courses;
- Consider, if the Special Senate Committee chooses to, the Topics for Further Consideration as stated in Part III of the April 28, 2015 Legislative Report from the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force. If such topics are considered, then the Special Committee will bring related Legislative Reports to the University Faculty Senate for its consideration and approval;
- Consult and maintain liaison with the University Faculty Senate Standing Committees on Curricular Affairs and Undergraduate Education; and
- Forward reports, prior to submission to the Senate Council, to the University Faculty Senate Standing Committees on Curricular Affairs and Undergraduate Education for consultation.
The Senate Special Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform will be expected to present its work as follows:

- Prepare Legislative Report(s) for the University Faculty Senate Plenary meeting of December 8, 2015, January 26, 2016, or March 15, 2016

In accordance with Chair Ansari’s charge, the Implementation Committee has met regularly since June 2015. Our process has included a Forensic Report to the Senate on January 26, 2016 (http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/january-26-2016-agenda/appendix-b/) and consultations with constituencies within and beyond the Senate. For a list of consultation meetings held by the Implementation Committee’s chair, see Attachment 2.

Part I. Proposal to Update the Descriptions of the Foundations (formerly Skills) and Knowledge Domains of General Education: Recommendation 1

Updating the descriptions of the Foundations (Writing and Speaking, GWS; and Quantification, GQ) and the Knowledge Domains of General Education (Arts, GA; Humanities, GH; Health and Wellness, GHW; Natural Sciences, GN; and Social and Behavioral Sciences, GS) is an important step towards establishing criteria for the new Integrative Studies category that will reach across the individual Knowledge Domains. Our process included a survey, sent in October 2015 to all Senators, full-time faculty members (tenure-track and non-tenure-track) at all locations who have taught General Education during the past three years, and key administrative leaders (such as department heads) to invite broad input on proposed revisions to the descriptions of the Foundations and Knowledge Domains. The survey and a summary of the responses are available on the Senate website (http://senate.psu.edu/gened-survey-results/).

As is shown in Attachment 3, survey responses showed an overwhelming approval of the draft updates. Summing the data across all questions, 96% of the replies approved of the proposed Foundation and Knowledge Domain revisions, either as-is or with suggested changes in wording. For GWS, for example, 165 out of 218 respondents to one question indicated “keep as worded,” while another 49 indicated “keep, with rewording.” Further numerical data is provided on the Senate website (URL listed above) showing the data in response to each of the criteria as then written. In addition, the survey showed strong support for requiring courses to target three of the Student Learning Criteria in any category (rather than just one criterion, on the one hand, or all the criteria, on the other). The Special Committee also gave serious consideration to the written comments received in response to the survey. Both survey input and other input have been reflected in the proposed wording shown below.

The proposed updated version appears below; a side-by-side layout of the current (existing) and proposed descriptions is provided in Attachment 4.

Recommendation 1. The Senate endorses the updated descriptions and criteria for the Foundations and the Knowledge Domains of General Education that are shown below. To receive approval for a General Education Foundations category or a Knowledge Domain, courses will address at least three of the Student Learning Criteria identified in the appropriate section below.

Foundations

Writing/ Speaking (GWS)
In Writing and Speaking (GWS) courses, students do more than improve their abilities to communicate information clearly. They learn to set forth arguments persuasively and well, both orally and in writing. Students should emerge from their GWS courses as more accomplished writers and speakers, competent in a wide variety of settings.

To help students achieve GWS goals, the university provides GWS courses and an appropriate learning environment that will:

- Provide opportunities for students to become increasingly effective communicators as they enter new contexts and address new audiences
- Provide opportunities for students to become increasingly accomplished in written, oral, digital, and visual communication.

GWS Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Writing and Speaking requirements, students will have increased their abilities to:

- Demonstrate rhetorical and analytical skills as they explore, compose, interpret, and present a variety of texts
- Communicate effectively and persuasively to a range of audiences
- Demonstrate capacities for critical thinking, listening, and generating ideas
- Demonstrate proficiency in composing processes
- Employ the conventions of both spoken and written communication with sensitivity to context and venue.

Quantification (GQ)

In Quantification (GQ) fields, students practice and master basic mathematical and statistical skills of lifelong value in solving real world problems. Students should learn to apply mathematical skills appropriate to solve such problems.

To help students achieve GQ goals and master foundational quantification skills, the university provides GQ coursework and an appropriate learning environment that will:

- Provide experience in assessing and interpreting quantitative data and information
- Guide students to recognize patterns, establish relations, exercise conceptual thinking, develop problem-solving skills, and think logically and critically
- Provide students with opportunities to determine probabilities
- Support students in their efforts to draw accurate and useful conclusions; make informed decisions based on quantitative analysis; and use basic mathematical and statistical skills to solve conceptual problems.

GQ Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Quantification (GQ) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

- Use mathematical, statistical, or computational models, principles, and processes to integrate, synthesize, generalize, or make judgments about real world problems
- Recognize patterns, establish mathematical relations, apply problem-solving skills, and think logically and critically
- Develop, explore, analyze, and reason about multi-variable relationships using quantitative tools
- Use probability to reason and make judgments based on data that exhibit variability
- Communicate and explain mathematical and statistical ideas.
Knowledge Domains

Arts (GA)

In Arts fields (GA), students focus on exploring or creating works of art. Students should become familiar with the importance of significant creative works, the traditions and history associated with those works, and the important role that the arts play as expressions of the cultural values of society and the human condition.

To help students achieve GA goals, the University provides GA courses and an appropriate learning environment with purposeful engagement with the arts and creative works for students to:

- Encouter and become conversant with the terminologies, techniques, practices, knowledge, and skills employed by the arts
- Gain a comprehension of the role that the arts play as expressions of the cultural values of society and the human condition
- Expand their knowledge of the variety of expressions and experiences that are provided through the arts
- Develop competencies in interpreting and critically evaluating diverse expressions in the arts.

GA Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Arts (GA) requirement, students should be able to:

- Explain the methods of inquiry in arts fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
- Demonstrate an expanded knowledge and comprehension of the role that the arts play in various aspects of human endeavor
- Demonstrate competence in the creation of works of art and design
- Demonstrate competence in analysis, critical thinking and interpretive reasoning through the exploration of creative works
- Identify and explain the aesthetic, historic, social, and cultural significance of important works of art and critically assess creative works, their own or others’, through evaluative processes of analysis and interpretation.

Humanities (GH)

In Humanities (GH) fields, students focus on exploring important works of literature, history, religion, philosophy, and other closely related forms of cultural expression, thereby broadening their understanding of diverse ways of seeing, thinking about, and experiencing the self and society. Students will enlarge their intellectual horizons and knowledge of the world through encountering humanistic representations of both lived experiences and imaginative or speculative constructions, past or present. Students thus become increasingly prepared to live as thoughtfully engaged members of multiple communities, whether local, regional, or global.

To help students achieve GH goals, the University provides GH courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:

- Engage in the qualitative study of the humanities
- Expand their knowledge of the variety of human experiences
- Gain access to various intellectual traditions and their changes through time
• Probe the foundations of communication and thought and become aware of the scope and limitations of human communication
• Encounter concepts and traditions that attempt to bring sense to human existence
• Develop their competency in interpreting and critically evaluating diverse ways of life, traditions, and shared or individual values, including their own.

GH Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Humanities (GH) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

• Explain the methods of inquiry in humanities fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
• Demonstrate competence in critical thinking about topics and texts in the humanities through clear and well-reasoned responses
• Critically evaluate texts in the humanities—whether verbal, visual, or digital—and identify and explain moral or ethical dimensions within the disciplines of the humanities
• Demonstrate knowledge of major cultural currents, issues, and developments through time, including evidence of exposure to unfamiliar material that challenges their curiosity and stretches their intellectual range
• Become familiar with groups, individuals, ideas, or events that have influenced the experiences and values of different communities.

Health and Wellness (GHW)

In Health and Wellness (GHW) fields, students focus on the physical and psychosocial well-being of individuals and communities. They expand their theoretical and practical knowledge about health and wellness—concepts that are multidimensional and culturally defined. The University provides opportunities for students to study such diverse topics as nutrition, physical activity, stress, sleep, healthy leisure, alcohol, tobacco, and other substance use, sexual health, and safety—all useful in maintaining lifelong health and wellness and in creating healthy work and community environments.

To help students achieve GHW goals, the University provides GHW courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:

• Identify and practice skills, attitudes, and behaviors that should enable them to better maintain health and wellness across their lifespans
• Identify wellness as a positive state of well-being, not merely the absence of disease or illness
• Recognize the importance of social, emotional, and physical health and wellness for communities as well as for individuals.

GHW Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Health and Wellness (GHW) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

• Explain the methods of inquiry in Health and Wellness fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
• Describe multiple perceptions and dimensions of health and wellness (emotional, spiritual, environmental, physical, social, intellectual, and occupational)
• Identify and explain ways individuals and/or communities can achieve and maintain health and wellness
• Describe health-related risk factors and explain changes in knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, activities or skills that have the potential of improving health and wellness
• Disseminate knowledge about health and wellness and demonstrate behavioral practices needed to engage in healthy living across the life span.

Natural Sciences (GN)

In Natural Science (GN) fields, students develop the skills necessary to make informed judgments about scientific information and arguments. Along with building knowledge of foundational scientific principles, students expand their understanding of how and why science works, why it is an effective tool for knowledge generation, and how it can address contemporary questions and challenges.

To help students achieve GN goals and develop this scientific literacy, the University provides GN courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:
• Encounter the order, diversity, and beauty of nature
• Sample some of the ways in which science offers an additional lens through which to view the human condition
• Engage with scientific material through discussion, exploration, data analysis, and experimentation
• Gain practice in recognizing the nature of scientific process and discovery, in identifying what science can and cannot achieve, and in analyzing why scientific arguments may lead to different conclusions than other forms of intellectual discourse.

GN Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education (GN) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:
• Explain the methods of inquiry in the natural science fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
• Construct evidence-based explanations of natural phenomena
• Demonstrate informed understandings of scientific claims and their applications
• Evaluate the quality of the data, methods, and inferences used to generate scientific knowledge
• Identify societal or philosophical implications of discoveries in the natural sciences, as well as their potential to address contemporary problems.

Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS)

In Social and Behavioral Science (GS) fields, students focus on analyzing the forces that influence behaviors, values, habits, attitudes, and institutions. GS courses allow students to explore the multiple perspectives and methodologies useful in analyzing and addressing complex social issues.

To help students achieve GS goals, the university provides GS courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:
• Explore the interrelationships of the many factors that shape behavior
• Be introduced to methodological analyses of the forms, practices, and theories of politics, economics, and social institutions
• Develop comprehensive, integrated, reasoned, and theoretical views of their contemporary and emerging social worlds
• Expand their understanding of how social, political, and economic influences and trends affect individual, group, organizational, local, national, and global contexts.

GS Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:
• Explain the various methods of inquiry used in the social and behavioral sciences and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
• Identify and explain major foundational theories and bodies of work in a particular area of social and behavioral sciences
• Describe the ways in which many different factors may interact to influence behaviors and/or institutions in historical or contemporary settings
• Explain how social and behavioral science researchers use concepts, theoretical models and data to better understand and address world problems
• Recognize social, cultural, political and/or ethical implications of work in the social and behavioral sciences.

Part II. Principles for Integrative Studies: Recommendations 2, 3, and 4

As noted above, the 6-credit Integrative Studies requirement for baccalaureate students is new.1 Two Pathways, Inter-Domain Courses and Linked Courses, were specified in the April 2015 legislation. Both involve relating different Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GHW, GN, GS) to each other. Both Pathways require students to study related subject matter from the perspective of two Knowledge Domains. Each Linked Course provides sustained focus on a single Knowledge Domain, with connections to another course in a different Knowledge Domain, while each Inter-Domain course provides the immediacy of incorporating two Knowledge Domains in the same course. Such Integrative Studies coursework promotes an awareness of how different disciplines and methods of inquiry can speak to shared concerns. The goal of Integrative Studies is both curricular coherence and the exploration that occurs when students move beyond a single intellectual framework. Integrative Studies coursework yields a multi-faceted understanding and an awareness that different disciplines and forms of knowledge make particular and special contributions to our overall understanding. Both existing and new courses are eligible to be designated as Integrative Studies.

Several recommendations to clarify the Integrative Studies requirement appear below.

Pathways and Student Choices. The Faculty Senate’s April 2015 legislation provides students with two Pathways (Inter-Domain and Linked) to complete the Integrative Studies requirement, with the possibility that further Pathways might be developed. The Implementation Committee recommends that students satisfy their Integrative Studies requirement within a single Pathway in order to keep degree progress as clear as possible. (The Senate may use assessment data to inform development of future Pathways or perhaps combinations.) At least two Knowledge Domains must be included, though student choices may involve more. To promote flexibility and encourage students to practice integration throughout their undergraduate years, the Integrative Studies courses may be taken at any time. They do not have to be

1 Except where otherwise indicated, this report refers to baccalaureate degree programs and the students enrolled in them.
taken in the same or in adjacent semesters, though that will often be advantageous\(^2\); the goals of curricular coherence and exploration of multiple frameworks can be achieved with a variety of timetables.

In order to establish clarity and provide flexibility, the Implementation Committee makes the following recommendation:

**Recommendation 2.** Students will complete the Integrative Studies requirement within one of the approved Pathways—the Inter-domain Pathway, the Linked Courses Pathway, or a further Pathway if legislatively approved. Courses in the student’s selected Integrative Studies Pathway may be taken at any time in the student’s course of study. The student’s Integrative Studies choices must include courses approved for at least two Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GHW, GN, GS).

**Flexibility.** The plan for implementing the new Integrative Studies component must be sufficiently nimble to allow faculty members and administrators in all units and at all locations, whether they are at University Park, the stand-alone colleges, or University College campuses, to optimize their resources and engage their constituencies in innovative ways. That agility has to be enabled by flexibility within student information systems and other software. Although support systems are not within the scope of our committee, we reiterate that pedagogical integrity is the driver of our curriculum.

**Recommendation 3.** Flexibility is essential if Linked Courses and Inter-Domain Courses are to be feasible and attractive Pathways for students in all units and at all locations. Exceptions and substitutions can be made by the Associate Deans, the Directors of Academic Affairs (DAAs), or through the normal petition process or other approval process of the student’s college of graduation. Special situations relating to flexibility may include: (a) the need to honor articulation agreements; (b) the distinctive needs of change-of-location students and transfer or advanced standing students, which will receive careful consideration, though it is anticipated that most students will complete the Integrative Studies requirement through Penn State courses; (c) Education Abroad, which may be approved for the Integrative Studies requirement where appropriate.

**Single Domain Courses.** Integrative Studies courses, and other curricular opportunities that bridge domains or otherwise provide flexibility in a student’s program, are not intended to completely replace coursework that stays wholly within one Knowledge Domain (Single Domain courses). It is essential for students to experience the focus that characterizes Single Domain coursework, as well as to explore integration between domains. For example, a student might use Inter-Domain courses for 6 of the 9 credits required in Natural Sciences, but would need to take at least 3 credits of coursework in Natural Sciences alone. Therefore, the Implementation Committee proposes the following recommendation:

**Recommendation 4.** Because students need to experience the Knowledge Domains as such, students must take at least 3 credits of Single Domain coursework in each of the Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GHW, GN, GS). A student’s use of Inter-Domain courses, substitutions, or other flexibility options cannot replace this requirement.

---

\(^2\) The April 28, 2015 report stated the viewpoint in its narrative (p. 18) that "At least one of the linked courses should carry the other course(s) as a prerequisite or concurrent course requirement” (http://senate.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/13525/2015/04/AppB.pdf).
Part III. Implementing the Integrative Studies Pathways: Recommendations 5 and 6

As noted above, two Pathways for Integrative Studies, Linked Courses and Inter-Domain Courses, were approved in April, 2015. Integrative Studies courses will have a distinctive intellectual dimension. Because they ask the student to consider a topic from the perspective of two different General Education Knowledge Domains, they aim to advance the student’s ability to comprehend things from multiple perspectives, to see connections, and to grasp the concept that one must employ different modes of thinking, different epistemologies to understand more adequately the nature of things; one domain is not fully equal to the task of understanding the world around us. Each Linked Course provides sustained focus on a single Knowledge Domain, with connections to another course in a different Knowledge Domain; while each Inter-Domain course provides the immediacy of incorporating two Knowledge Domains in the same course.

General Education, including the new Integrative Studies requirement, is a faculty-driven endeavor. In January, 2015, the Faculty Senate approved an Advisory/Consultative Report to establish a General Education support unit with funding and other resources to assist faculty members and other instructors who are engaged with Penn State’s General Education curriculum. Given that the Integrative Studies component invites and requires faculty members from different Knowledge Domains to work together, specific support must be provided at all levels—within academic units as well as by the General Education support unit—in order to reach and include a wide range of interested faculty members in ways that ensure openness, inclusiveness, and rigor, while also rewarding broad participation.

The Linked Courses Pathway. As a Pathway approved to meet the Integrative Studies requirement, Linked Courses, each approved for a single Knowledge Domain, demonstrate how the various disciplines within the General Education Knowledge Domains speak to one another and how knowledge in one Domain relates to knowledge in another. Courses are usually linked purposefully by subject matter, but they may be linked by some other common interest, such as an engaged scholarship project, shared assignments, shared readings, etc. The charge to the Special Committee includes proposing a process of consultation for Linked Courses, including approval criteria that ensure academic rigor and distribution across domains in the design and staffing of these courses. The following recommendation (Rec. 5) provides general principles and criteria to assist faculty members in planning and proposing courses for the Linked Courses Pathway for the Integrative Studies requirement, and to guide the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs and other participants in the approval process.

Linkages must include courses from different General Education Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GHW, GN, GS). Many courses that might potentially be linked exist now. For example, a course dealing with sustainability from a biological perspective (GN) might partner with another dealing with sustainability in a social and behavioral sciences field (GS). Flexibility will be available because courses can be proposed for either permanent or single-offering linked status. Students will need to take 6 credits from the same Linkage (which may include more than two courses), in different Knowledge Domains, to fulfill the requirement. Brief examples of possible linked courses are provided in Attachment 5.

Recommendation 5. The Senate endorses the following General Principles for the Linked Courses Pathway.

a. Linked Courses are interrelated General Education Knowledge Domain courses, each meeting the criteria of its own Knowledge Domain (GA, GH, GHW, GN, or GS), that approach similar subject matter from different intellectual perspectives or are connected in some other purposeful way to provide opportunities for students to experience and practice integrative thinking across Knowledge Domains. Each Linked Course is approved for only one Knowledge Domain and is also part of a
Linkage that includes courses from different Knowledge Domains.

b. The student must complete courses that are linked with each other, each in a different General Education Knowledge Domain (thus including at least two Knowledge Domains), for the linked set to fulfill the Integrative Studies requirement. A single course alone does not count for the Linked Courses Pathway in the Integrative Studies requirement even if that course has been approved to be part of a Linkage. However, because each Linked Course satisfies a Knowledge Domain requirement, the student can use it within that Domain (or perhaps elsewhere in the student’s program) whether or not the Linkage is completed. Although students will usually fulfill the 6-credit Linked Courses Pathway by taking two 3-credit courses, in this Pathway students may also use courses carrying anywhere from 1 to 5 credits towards the total of 6 Linked Courses credits.

c. More than two courses may participate in a Linkage; having more than two courses available in a Linkage will provide flexibility and may facilitate students’ abilities to complete the package. Each such course is taught by an instructor, or team of instructors, with appropriate expertise in the course’s Knowledge Domain.

d. Linkages are proposed by faculty members (or teams of faculty members) with expertise in the relevant disciplines of each Knowledge Domain; proposals will follow the established curricular processes for course approvals.

e. Either single-offering or permanent approval for the Linked Courses designation may be requested. A course may be offered using single-offering approval a maximum of 3 times at a given location.

f. Proposals for Linked Courses will:
   i. Request (or have received) approval as a General Education course in a particular Knowledge Domain, following the standard curricular processes.
   ii. Explain how the intellectual frameworks and methodologies of each course’s Knowledge Domain will be explicitly addressed in the course and practiced by the students.
   iii. Explain how the courses in the Linkage will be linked with each other. It is anticipated that courses will usually be linked by subject matter, but they should additionally be linked by some purposeful component that provides opportunities for students to experience and practice integrative thinking across Knowledge Domains. The Linkage component between courses needs to be intentional and explicit to students. However, each course in a Linkage must be self-contained such that students can successfully complete just one course in the Linkage if they so choose.
   iv. Include evidence of unit-level (department, program) and College-level administrative approval of the courses and Linkages, and evidence of substantive consultation among faculty members with expertise in the appropriate Knowledge Domain(s) and discipline(s).
   v. Briefly explain the staffing plan. Given that each Linked Course is approved for a single Knowledge Domain, it will be taught by an instructor (or instructional team) with appropriate expertise in that domain, who will also be expected to implement the Linkage’s shared component as defined in the proposal.
   vi. Describe the assessments that will be used to determine students’ ability to apply integrative thinking.
The Inter-Domain Pathway. As a Pathway approved to meet the Integrative Studies requirement, Inter-Domain courses each demonstrate how two Knowledge Domains speak to one another and how knowledge in one Domain relates to knowledge in another. Inter-Domain courses are each approved for two Knowledge Domains and demonstrate consistently how knowledge is integrated across these two Domains.

The charge to the Special Committee includes proposing a process of consultation for Inter-Domain Courses, including approval criteria that ensure academic rigor and distribution across domains in the design and staffing of these courses. The following recommendation (Rec. 6) provides general principles and criteria to assist faculty members in planning and proposing courses for the Inter-Domain Pathway for the Integrative Studies requirement, and to guide the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs and other participants in the approval process.

Each Inter-Domain course integrates and meets the criteria of two Knowledge Domains (GA, GH, GHW, GN, GS), as explained below. Courses that might potentially be designated as Inter-Domain exist now. An example is Chemistry and Literature, which is listed in the Undergraduate Bulletin as CHEM 233 and ENGL 233; this course is now designated GN and GH. Other examples of possible Inter-Domain courses are provided in Attachment 5. Flexibility will be available because courses can be proposed for either permanent or single-offering Inter-domain status. In this Pathway, baccalaureate degree students must take 6 credits of Inter-Domain courses in order to fulfill the Integrative Studies requirement.

Recommendation 6. The Senate endorses the following General Principles for the Inter-Domain Pathway.

a. An Inter-Domain course integrates, within one course, selected perspectives, concepts, information, and knowledge from two of the following Knowledge Domains: GA, GH, GHW, GN, GS.

b. An Inter-domain course counts towards the General Education requirement in both of its two Knowledge Domains and it provides opportunities for students to experience and to practice integrative thinking across those two Domains.

c. Students must complete 6 credits of Inter-Domain coursework in order to use this Pathway to fulfill the Integrative Studies requirement. Because these courses integrate two Knowledge Domains, and need time to do so, they will each carry at least 3 credits. Although students will usually take two 3-credit courses to fulfill this Pathway, students can also use Inter-Domain courses carrying more than 3 credits, if available.

d. Each of the two Knowledge Domains in an Inter-Domain course will receive approximately equal attention (in course topics, assignments, or other course components). Each such course is taught by an instructor, or team of instructors, with appropriate expertise in the two Knowledge Domains for which the course is approved. Inter-Domain courses may be cross-listed or concurrent-listed but this is not required.

e. Although each Inter-Domain course will satisfy a Domain requirement in both of the Knowledge Domains for which it is approved, the number of credits it contributes towards the total of 30 credits required in the Knowledge Domains is not doubled. (For example, a 3-credit course approved as both Natural Science and Social Science will
satisfy a Domain requirement in both of those categories; however, this course will contribute 3 credits, not 6, to the total of 30 needed).

f. Inter-Domain courses are proposed by faculty members (or teams of faculty members) with expertise in the relevant disciplines of each Knowledge Domain represented; proposals will follow the established curricular processes for course approvals. Consultation and support from faculty members in relevant fields within both Knowledge Domains where the course will count is required.

g. Single-offering or permanent approval for the Inter-Domain Courses designation may be requested. A course may be offered using single-offering approval a maximum of 3 times at a given location.

h. Proposals for Inter-Domain courses will:
   i. Request (or have received) approval as a General Education course and satisfy the criteria for two Knowledge Domains, following the standard curricular processes. Course proposals will not be approved for more than two Knowledge Domains.
   ii. Explain how the intellectual frameworks and methodologies of the two Knowledge Domains will be explicitly addressed in the course and practiced by the students.
   iii. Demonstrate that each of the two domains will receive approximately equal attention, providing evidence from course topics, assignments, or other course components, and that students will integrate material from both domains.
   iv. Include evidence of unit-level (department, program) and College-level administrative approval of the courses, and evidence of substantive consultation among faculty members with expertise in the appropriate Knowledge Domains and discipline(s).
   v. Where Inter-Domain courses are cross-listed, consultation with both of those academic units and their Colleges is required. For other Inter-Domain courses, given that all the Knowledge Domains are offered by more than one unit and College, this dual-Domain consultation and support should occur with the most closely related units and Colleges (more than one such unit and College may be relevant).
   vi. Briefly explain the staffing plan. Given that each Inter-Domain course is approved for two Knowledge Domains, it will be taught by an instructor (or instructional team) with appropriate expertise in both domains.
   vii. Describe the assessments that will be used to determine students’ ability to apply integrative thinking.

### Process for Courses to Receive an Integrative Studies Designation

The following section outlines key processes for Integrative Studies proposals.

1. **Department/program level first steps.** All course proposals come from faculty members, with approval by administrators in the academic departments, programs, or divisions at campus locations (as proposals do now). A faculty member’s first step will be to consult with his/her colleagues and the appropriate administrator. The unit administrator’s buy-in will be crucial to ensure that the course, if approved, will be seen as a valuable addition to the teaching roster and will indeed be scheduled, staffed, and taught.

2. **Curricular consultation.** Integrative Studies course proposals will require consultation and support among faculty members with expertise in appropriate Knowledge Domains and disciplines. Evidence of consultation and support must be included when the proposal is formally submitted to the College/Campus and Senate approval processes.
3. **Curricular Affairs proposals.** The Curricular Affairs proposal format will include a section for requesting the information detailed in Recommendations 5(f) and 6(h) above.

4. **Single-offering approvals.** On a year-round, rolling basis, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs will review proposals that request an Integrative Studies designation for a single offering (see Recommendation 7); this procedure for single-offering Integrative Studies approvals applies to all courses, including those numbered x97.

---

**Part IV. Facilitating the Integrative Studies Approval Process: Recommendation 7**

To best accommodate the highly dynamic nature of our university and faculty members’ academic pursuits, the Integrative Studies course review process will need to be nimble. In order to help ensure timely action on proposals, a new Senate Curricular Affairs subcommittee to meet year-round should be established. Additionally, Integrative Studies courses depend on factors such as faculty collaboration and administrative support. Therefore, to monitor currency and rigor, these courses will be reviewed periodically.

**Recommendation 7.** Create a new subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs. This subcommittee will provide guidelines, consistent with this legislative report, for course proposals intended to fulfill the Integrative Studies requirement. The subcommittee will review Integrative Studies proposals on a rolling, year-round basis. Further, this subcommittee will review Integrative Studies courses, after their approval, on a five-year basis.

---

**Part V. Resources and Support for Integrative Studies**

On January 27, 2015, the University Faculty Senate adopted an Advisory/Consultative report titled *Institutional Support and Resources for General Education.* The narrative of that report argued that “Given the scope and impact of General Education coursework across the University, supporting excellence, innovation, and scholarship in General Education should be a central priority for the University.” The report therefore called for a General Education support structure to serve as “an engine for collaboration, innovation, assessment, and research in General Education. Such a structure is necessary for improving our current General Education program, as well as for any future revisions to that program.” In response, President Eric Barron indicated his support of the Senate’s efforts to revise the General Education curriculum and his anticipation of receiving more detail from the Senate on its initiative.

The Implementation Committee has been mindful of the need for more detail on Integrative Studies and on the kinds of university support necessary for successful implementation. To inform considerations about support, the committee conducted a Forensic Session at the January 26, 2016 University Faculty Senate meeting to explore what incentives Senators might suggest to facilitate the intended curricular change. Discussion at the Forensic Session focused in part on obstacles Senators saw to implementation, as well as on support and incentives they suggested would be useful. Four needs were identified: support for collaboration among faculty members, a strong communication network, released time, and administrative encouragement. Two obstacles were also identified: policies or practices that discourage team-teaching, and inadequate General Education funding throughout the University. Based on the January 2015 Advisory/Consultative report and the January 2016 Forensic Discussion, we offer the

---


5 [http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/january-26-2016-agenda/appendix-b/](http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/january-26-2016-agenda/appendix-b/)
following suggestions for responding to these considerations and for adequately resourcing this revision of General Education.

The committee suggests that:

1. **The University should enact the recommendations of the January 27, 2015 report calling for the creation of “a signature intra-University faculty-led structure for General Education collaboration, support, assessment and research, which will be available to serve all Penn State locations and instructors who teach General Education courses,” working with appropriate Faculty Senate committees and providing a standing budget to support General Education.**

   The concerns detailed in the January 2015 report were echoed by many faculty members in the January 2016 Forensic Session. Planning and teaching integrated coursework will require collaboration among colleagues in many different disciplines, in many different units, and at many different locations. A strong communication network will be essential to help potential colleagues find partnerships to develop Linked and Inter-Domain courses, and to provide timely information on plans underway in various disciplines at locations across the university. Rather than just providing a space for spontaneous postings, this communication network will need proactive, ongoing leadership and support. It should foster critical exploratory assessment initiatives, as well as the type of curricular research which has long been a hallmark of Penn State teaching and learning.

2. **Ongoing University funding commitments for General Education should be developed with consideration for the many needs this curricular reform creates.** For example, these needs would include, but are not limited to, resources adequate to fund: team teaching as part of regular on-load assignments; released time for faculty members engaged in developing innovative curricula; opportunities for out-of-class activities in support of Integrative Studies courses; and sufficient instructional design services.

   Several comments made during the Forensic Session noted that developing the kinds of integrated coursework the legislation calls for will require faculty members to invest substantive time and effort. Faculty members fear that without released time, they simply won't have the time it takes to produce innovative, high quality curricula. In addition, faculty interested in team teaching in the past have frequently been assigned only half-credit for teaching such courses, so that the only way to enable a team-taught course has frequently been faculty members’ willingness to accept a course overload. Also, insufficient funding for General Education too often discourages meaningful out-of-class experiences for students.

   The April 28, 2015 Senate legislative report on General Education included a detailed cost estimate, with high and low ranges, for such components as start-up costs, annual ongoing costs, direct expenses of instruction, funding for the support structure, some provision for team-teaching and smaller section sizes, support for course revision, and assessment. This April 2015 cost estimate is included as Attachment 6. While precise costs cannot be determined until implementation is underway, and will then vary through time, this cost estimate is a useful starting point for considerations of funding.

3. **Administrators at all levels and in all appropriate units should support faculty involvement in Integrative Studies.** Comments in the Forensic Session foreshadowed some ways in which General Education reform might be impeded if there is inadequate administrative support. For
example, faculty members are concerned that responsibility for designing and teaching 
Integrative Studies coursework will fall primarily on the least senior and/or the most vulnerable 
faculty members or other instructors, and this should not be the case.

Faculty members and other instructors (such as graduate students, at some locations) are also 
concerned that if they teach innovative Integrative Studies courses and do not receive high 
SRTEs, they will face negative consequences. On this latter point, administrators should be 
reminded—and should remind the faculty they work with—that University policy already 
provides that faculty members engaged in experimental coursework need not have SRTEs 
completed in experimental situations, or if they choose to have them administered, such SRTEs 
can be excluded from consideration during performance reviews.6 No faculty member should be 
penalized for experimenting with a new course design, which often is improved when it is 
informed by experience.

Part VI. Looking Forward

If the recommendations above are approved by the University Faculty Senate during Spring 2016, we 
anticipate that adequate support for curriculum development will be made available, as Provost Jones has 
previously indicated (Implementation Committee Forensic Report, January 2016). The Implementation 
Committee anticipates the following timetable:

**Summer 2016-Spring 2017.** The Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs develops updated 
procedures and worksheets; support is provided for faculty consultation, collaboration, and the 
preparation of course proposals for the Linked or Inter-Domain designation; submission and 
approval of Integrative Studies courses begins; Senate committees or other bodies begin to work 
with University colleagues in advising, student life, scheduling, student information systems, 
assessment, publicity, etc., to prepare for implementation of this Senate legislation.

As is already the case with the current General Education requirements, departments, programs, 
advising units, etc., update the worksheets they use for academic planning for their students. 
Sample worksheets to suggest how students might incorporate Linked Courses and Inter-
Domain Courses into their General Education Breadth of Knowledge Domains are provided in 
Attachment 7; other formats, including interactive online worksheets, may be explored.

**Fall 2017.** Academic units submit their upcoming year’s course schedules as usual, now including 
approved Linked Courses and Inter-Domain Courses.

2017-18 and thereafter. Consultations, proposal submissions and approvals, and support for 
course collaborations, development, and implementation will continue.

**Fall 2018.** Linked and Inter-Domain Courses are available to students. The Integrative Studies 
requirement will apply to students in the 2018-2019 Program Year. Assessment and other

---

6 Multiple University documents make this point. See, for example, http://www.srte.psu.edu/Faculty_admin_forms/ and 
http://www.psu.edu/dept/vprov/pdfs/srte_statement.pdf (Policy HR-23), which states in part “in advance of a course being taught 
for the first time in an experimental way, an administrator and a faculty member might agree not to administer the SRTE. Such 
agreements should be in writing.” Similar policy statements might be developed for graduate students engaged in teaching 
experimental courses.
research on aspects of the rollout, such as student choices, breadth of faculty participation across fields, start-up and continuing costs, etc., will also begin.

As this timetable suggests, the implementation of Integrative Studies within General Education is envisaged as an ongoing process. As mentioned in the April 2015 legislation, the Senate may develop additional Integrative Studies Pathways. In addition, ongoing assessment, data analysis, and pedagogical research will inform future proposals to adjust the implementation of Integrative Studies. The Implementation Committee thanks the many students and colleagues, University-wide, who have contributed to this report. We look forward to the next steps in providing students with this strengthened opportunity to see connections among the different parts of their Penn State General Education.
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ATTACHMENT 1: CHARGE STATEMENT FROM CHAIR ANSARI

Date: May 21, 2015

To:
Andrew Ahr aja5335@psu.edu
Martha Aynardi mwa1@psu.edu
Robin Bower rmb29@psu.edu
Michael Bérubé mfb12@psu.edu
Caroline D. Eckhardt e82@psu.edu
Jacqueline Edmondson jxe117@psu.edu
Dan Hagen drh@psu.edu, Resource
Patricia Hinchey pxh12@psu.edu
John W. Moore jwm2@psu.edu
Emily Miller err5263@psu.edu
Robert Ricketts rdr3@psu.edu
Richard Robinett rq9@psu.edu
Elizabeth M. Seymour ems22@psu.edu
Keith Shapiro kds3@psu.edu
Margaret Slattery mjs436@psu.edu
David R. Smith drs46@psu.edu
Ann H. Taylor ath3@psu.edu
Matthew Wilson mtw1@psu.edu
Kaitlyn O’Neill kao5256@psu.edu
Cynthia Zook cjz2@psu.edu, Support Staff

From: Mohamad A. Ansari
Chair - University Faculty Senate

Re: The Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform

At the April 28, 2015, plenary meeting, the University Faculty Senate ratified a legislative report entitled “Revision to General Education Curriculum,” which was brought forward by the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force. The Faculty Senate approved six recommendations pertaining to the General Education Curriculum (Appendix B http://senate.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/13525/2015/04/AppB.pdf).

- Recommendation 1: Revise the current statement on General Education goals to include updated Learning Objectives. Implementation by inclusion in the Undergraduate
Bulletin and other documents, advising and new student orientation, and course revisions by the Curricular Affairs Committee;

- **Recommendation 2:** A regular and ongoing assessment plan for General Education Should be developed by the Faculty Senate and University bodies assigned to program assessment, following the principles described in this report. The plan should be approved by Faculty Senate, and findings should be used by the appropriate Senate committees to address areas for refinement and improvement. This recommendation pertains to the assessment plan to be designed in conjunction with the Office of Planning and Assessment and brought forward to the University Faculty Senate for its consideration and approval;

- **Recommendation 3:** Rename Health and Physical Activity (GHA) to Health and Wellness. Implementation by inclusion in the Undergraduate Bulletin and other documents, and advising and new student orientation;

- **Recommendation 4:** (a) Rename the “Skills” component of General Education to Foundations and (b) rename the “Knowledge Domains component of General Education to “Breadth Across Knowledge Domains.” Implementation by inclusion in the Undergraduate Bulletin and other documents, and advising and new student orientation;

- **Recommendation 5:** (a) Require a C or better in GWS (Writing and Speaking) courses for the Baccalaureate and Associate General Education programs, and (b) require a C or better in GQ (Quantification) courses for the Baccalaureate and Associate Degree General Education programs. Implementation by inclusion in the Undergraduate Bulletin and other documents, and advising and new student orientation; and

- **Recommendation 6:** (a) Require 6 credits of Integrative Studies as part of the General Education Baccalaureate requirements; (b) create inter-domain courses as a way for students to accomplish the Integrative Studies requirement; (c) create linked courses as a way to offer the Integrative Studies component; (d) replace the “9-6-3” substitution with the more flexible “Move 3” substitution; and (e) allow an Integrative Studies course to satisfy the flexible 3 credits of exploration within the Associate Degree General Education Curriculum. Implementation by the Special Senate Committee on General Education Reform.

The Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform is being appointed and is charged with the design of a clear and unambiguous process by which Recommendation 6 is to be implemented. More specifically, the Special Committee is charged to:

- Develop an implementation plan for inter-domain courses, and propose a process of consultation, including approval criteria that ensure academic rigor and distribution across domains in the design and staffing of these courses;

- Develop an implementation plan for linked courses, and propose a process of consultation, including approval criteria that ensure academic rigor and distribution across domains in the design and staffing of these courses;

- Consider, if the Special Senate Committee chooses to, the Topics for Further Consideration as stated in Part III of the April 28, 2015 Legislative Report from the General Education Planning
and Oversight Task Force. If such topics are considered, then the Special Committee will bring related Legislative Reports to the University Faculty Senate for its consideration and approval;

- Consult and maintain liaison with the University Faculty Senate Standing Committees on Curricular Affairs and Undergraduate Education; and

- Forward reports, prior to submission to the Senate Council, to the University Faculty Senate Standing Committees on Curricular Affairs and Undergraduate Education for consultation.

The Special Senate Committee on Implementation of the General Education Reform will be expected to present its work as follows:

- Prepare Legislative Report(s) for the University Faculty Senate Plenary meeting of December 8, 2015, January 26, 2016, or March 15, 2016

Please indicate your willingness to serve on this Special Senate Committee to Nichole Schlegel (nxl12@psu.edu) by May 26, 2015. The University Faculty Senate will be in touch with you in the near future to schedule the charge meeting for the group.

On behalf of the University Faculty Senate, I would like to thank you for your kind consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Mohamad A. Ansari, Chair
University Faculty Senate

CC: Nicholas P. Jones
    Robert N. Pangborn
    James A. Strauss
ATTACHMENT 2: CONSULTATIONS BY THE CHAIR OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

The chair of the Implementation Committee, John Moore, has met with various groups and individuals, beginning in August, 2015, as shown below. Other members of the Implementation Committee have also conferred with colleague.

1. 8/3 Leslie Pillen, Center for Food Systems Studies
2. 8/10 Animal Science Faculty, College of Agricultural Sciences
3. 8/13 Tracy Hoover, Associate Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
4. 9/1 Mary Beth Williams Associate Dean, Eberly College of Science
5. 9/1 Madlyn Hanes, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, and David Christiansen, Associate Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses
6. 9/4 Katelyn Perry, College of the Liberal Arts, Advising
7. 9/9 Scott Wing, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Architecture, and Keith Shapiro, Arts & Architecture
8. 9/22 Paul Taylor, Associate Dean, College of the Liberal Arts
9. 9/30 Conference of the Commonwealth Campuses Directors of Academic Affairs (DAAs) and Course Coordinators
10. 10/12 Susannah Barsom, Director of Academic Programs, Sustainability Institute
11. 10/13 Scott Smith, Director, Undergraduate Studies, Department of English
12. 10/15 Hampton Shirer, Associate Dean, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
13. 10/16 William Kelly, Theater, and Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture
14. 10/26 Robert Kubat, University Registrar, and Paula Hamaty, Associate Registrar, Academic Records
15. 10/27 Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations, Chair, Roger Egolf
16. 10/30 Peter Butler, Associate Dean, College of Engineering
17. 10/19-11/8 Email discussions with Brent Yarnal, Donna Peuquet, and Jodi Vender, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences, Department of Geography
18. 11/9 Raymonde Brown, Associate Dean, College of Nursing
19. 11/10 Stephanie Knight, Associate Dean, College of Education
20. 11/17 Jeff Sharp, Associate Dean, Debbie Lissenden, Records, and Michael Gilpatrick, Director Planning and Assessment, Smeal College of Business
21. 11/17 Dennis Shea, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Development
22. 11/18 Mary Beth Rosson, Interim Dean, College of Information Science & Technology
23. 11/30 Joseph Salem, Associate Dean, and Rebecca Miller, Head, Library Learning Services, The University Libraries
24. 12/3 Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education (ACUE)
25. 12/7 Commonwealth Caucus Evening Meeting, Co-Chair, Matthew Woessner
26. 12/8 Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education, Chair, Keefe Manning
ATTACHMENT 3: SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS, OCTOBER 2015

In October 2015, the Implementation Committee prepared and sent out a survey asking recipients to compare the existing descriptions and criteria of the seven General Education components with proposed revisions of the descriptions and criteria. The survey was sent to all members of the Senate, to faculty who had recently taught General Education courses, and to administrators in key roles related to General Education, inviting their input in order to arrive at proposed updates that would have widespread and current support. A summary of the results is provided here; for further data and details, see the Survey's webpages on the University Faculty Senate's website (http://senate.psu.edu/gened-survey-results).

The survey was sent to 2638 individuals, of whom 803 replied, a response rate of roughly 31%. The survey invited recipients to comment on each of the proposed new Student Learning Criteria for each of the seven categories of General Education requirements noted above: Quantification, Writing and Speaking, Arts, Humanities, Health and Wellness, Natural Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. The overall response was very strongly positive. For each of the proposed new criteria, the survey offered three choices. Choice (1) was "Keep as worded"; summing the data across responses to all criteria, 82% replied yes. Choice (2) was "Keep and reword"; summing the data across all questions, it received a response of roughly 14%. Choice (3) was "Delete and Remove"; it received a response of roughly 4%. Thus, 96% of the replies approved of the proposed domain revisions, either as-is or with suggested changes in wording.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Keep as worded</th>
<th>Modify</th>
<th>Delete</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWS</td>
<td>658 (76%)</td>
<td>185 (21%)</td>
<td>26 (3%)</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ</td>
<td>723 (82%)</td>
<td>110 (13%)</td>
<td>46 (5%)</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Domains</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>652 (84%)</td>
<td>97 (12%)</td>
<td>31 (4%)</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>1034 (77%)</td>
<td>237 (18%)</td>
<td>67 (5%)</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHW</td>
<td>650 (83%)</td>
<td>95 (12%)</td>
<td>35 (5%)</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>752 (85%)</td>
<td>112 (13%)</td>
<td>21 (2%)</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>581 (73%)</td>
<td>166 (21%)</td>
<td>45 (6%)</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the question "How Many Criteria Should Be Required" within each category, the responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: At the time of the Survey, there were different numbers of Criteria within the different categories. This has now been standardized at 5 within each category. Recommendation #1 in this report proposes that 3 out of 5 be required.
ATTACHMENT 4: CURRENT AND PROPOSED FOUNDATIONS AND KNOWLEDGE DOMAINS CRITERIA

# FOUNDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Criteria</th>
<th>Proposed New Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing/Speaking (GWS)</td>
<td>Writing/Speaking (GWS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objective is for students to communicate information clearly and set forth their beliefs persuasively both orally and in writing. In particular, they must be sufficiently proficient in writing, such that their expository prose meets the expectations of educated readers in both form and style. Gaining communication skills in a natural language or languages other than English may be incorporated as part of the objectives of communications. (Senate Agenda, 4-30-85.)

In the review of the course proposal the General Education subcommittee will examine whether the proposal meets the General Education course criteria stated above and in addition shows how the course will:

1. teach students to organize materials in a logical and clear manner.
2. teach students to write clearly.
3. teach students to write proficiently with respect to form and style.
4. teach students to express ideas orally in a logical and clear manner.
5. provide constructive criticism of the efforts of students to meet the General Education objectives of the Writing/Speaking Area.
6. assess the degree to which its stated Writing/Speaking General Education objectives are met.

In Writing and Speaking (GWS) courses, students do more than improve their abilities to communicate information clearly. They learn to set forth arguments persuasively and well, both orally and in writing. Students should emerge from their GWS courses as more accomplished writers and speakers, competent in a wide variety of settings.

To help students achieve GWS goals, the university provides GWS courses and an appropriate learning environment that will:

- Provide opportunities for students to become increasingly effective communicators as they enter new contexts and address new audiences
- Provide opportunities for students to become increasingly accomplished in written, oral, digital, and visual communication.

GWS Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Writing and Speaking requirements, students will have increased their abilities to:

- Demonstrate rhetorical and analytical skills as they explore, compose, interpret, and present a variety of texts
- Communicate effectively and persuasively to a range of audiences
- Demonstrate capacities for critical thinking, listening, and generating ideas
- Demonstrate proficiency in composing processes
- Employ the conventions of both spoken and written communication with sensitivity to context and venue.
### Current Criteria

**Quantification (GQ)**

The objective is for the students to work with numbers so as to measure space, time, mass, forces and probabilities; to reason quantitatively; and to apply basic mathematical processes to daily work and everyday living. (Senate Agenda, 4-30-85)

In the review of the course proposal the General Education committee will examine whether the proposal meets the General Education course criteria stated above and in addition shows how the course will:

1. teach students to reason quantitatively.
2. teach students to measure probabilities.
3. apply basic mathematical principles and processes to practical problems of day-to-day living.
4. provide opportunities for students to formulate informed judgments based on quantitative reasoning.
5. assess the degree to which its stated Quantification General Education objectives are met.

### Proposed New Criteria

**Quantification (GQ)**

In Quantification (GQ) fields, students practice and master basic mathematical and statistical skills of lifelong value in solving real world problems. Students should learn to apply mathematical skills appropriate to solve such problems.

To help students achieve GQ goals and master foundational quantification skills, the university provides GQ coursework and an appropriate learning environment that will:

- Provide experience in assessing and interpreting quantitative data and information
- Guide students to recognize patterns, establish relations, exercise conceptual thinking, develop problem-solving skills, and think logically and critically
- Provide students with opportunities to determine probabilities
- Support students in their efforts to draw accurate and useful conclusions; make informed decisions based on quantitative analysis; and use basic mathematical and statistical skills to solve conceptual problems.

**GQ Student Learning Criteria.** Upon successful completion of the General Education Quantification (GQ) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

- Use mathematical, statistical, or computational models, principles, and processes to integrate, synthesize, generalize, or make judgments about real world problems
- Recognize patterns, establish mathematical relations, apply problem-solving skills, and think logically and critically
- Develop, explore, analyze, and reason about multi-variable relationships using quantitative tools
- Use probability to reason and make judgments based on data that exhibit variability
- Communicate and explain mathematical and statistical ideas.
## KNOWLEDGE DOMAINS (GA, GH, GHW, GN, GS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Criteria</th>
<th>Proposed New Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts (GA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arts (GA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should understand and appreciate some of the more important creative works, traditions, literature and history of the arts and architecture. The student should recognize the comprehensive role of arts and architecture as an expression of the cultural values of a society and the need to preserve these expressions for the benefit of future generations.</td>
<td>In Arts fields (GA), students focus on exploring or creating works of art. Students should become familiar with the importance of significant creative works, the traditions and history associated with those works, and the important role that the arts play as expressions of the cultural values of society and the human condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should recognize aesthetic values as an integral part of society's essential need and gain lifelong benefits through the acquisition and appreciation of arts-related skills. Students should be conversant with the terminology, techniques, attitudes, ideas and skills which comprise the arts areas so as to understand the approaches to human existence and distinguish among the arts. (Senate Agenda, 4-30-85)</td>
<td>To help students achieve GA goals, the University provides GA courses and an appropriate learning environment with purposeful engagement with the arts and creative works for students to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the review of the course proposal the General Education committee will examine whether the proposal meets the General Education course criteria stated above and in addition shows how the course will:</td>
<td>• Encounter and become conversant with the terminologies, techniques, practices, knowledge, and skills employed by the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. develop an understanding of creative works of arts and architecture.</td>
<td>• Gain a comprehension of the role that the arts play as expressions of the cultural values of society and the human condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. develop an understanding of the historical developments in arts and architecture.</td>
<td>• Expand their knowledge of the variety of expressions and experiences that are provided through the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. provide an opportunity for students to comprehend the role of arts and architecture as an expression of the cultural values of a society.</td>
<td>• Develop competencies in interpreting and critically evaluating diverse expressions in the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. help students become conversant with the terminology, techniques, and ideas that comprise the Arts Area.</td>
<td><strong>GA Student Learning Criteria.</strong> Upon successful completion of the General Education Arts (GA) requirement, students should be able to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. lead students to a recognition of aesthetic values.</td>
<td>• Explain the methods of inquiry in arts fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. relate its field of study to other arts disciplines.</td>
<td>• Demonstrate an expanded knowledge and comprehension of the role that the arts play in various aspects of human endeavor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. assess the degree to which its stated Arts General Education objectives are met</td>
<td>• Demonstrate competence in the creation of works of art and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrate competence in analysis, critical thinking and interpretive reasoning through the exploration of creative works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify and explain the aesthetic, historic, social, and cultural significance of important works of art and critically assess creative works, their own or others', through evaluative processes of analysis and interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objective of humanistic studies is to direct students toward interpretation and evaluation for the sake of a more significant form of participation in reality, rather than in the direction of methodologies for the technical manipulation of natural and cultural phenomena. Humanistic studies are divided into four categories: (1) literature, (2) history and culture, (3) advanced language, and (4) philosophy.

The study of the Humanities should develop competency in interpretive understanding of the human condition and of the values inherent in it. This interpretive understanding should evolve into the development of insights and a critical evaluation of the meaning of life, in its everyday details as well as in its historical and universal dimensions. Through this development, students should acquire knowledge of and concern for the humanistic values which motivate and inform all humanistic studies.

In literature, students should achieve these objectives through the study of works in which the human condition is presented and evaluated through aesthetic means. In the study of Western and non-Western culture and history, the student should gain access to various human traditions and their changes through the course of time. In studies of the development, structure, and use of language, students will probe the foundations of communication and thought and become aware of the scope and limitations of human communication. In philosophical studies, students will encounter philosophical and religious concepts and traditions which attempt to bring ultimate sense to human existence. (Senate Agenda, 4-30-85)

In the review of the course proposal the General Education subcommittee will examine whether the proposal meets the General Education course criteria stated above and in addition shows how the course will:

1. develop broad, coherent overviews of major cultural or ideological currents throughout history.
2. develop emphases on important figures, ideas and events which influence the values of different societies.
3. develop competence in interpretive understanding of the human condition and of the values inherent in it.
4. lead the student to an appreciation of aesthetic values.
5. teach the student techniques for the objective evaluation of readings and the formulation of clear and valid responses.
6. assess the degree to which its stated Humanities General Education objectives are met.

In Humanities (GH) fields, students focus on exploring important works of literature, history, religion, philosophy, and other closely related forms of cultural expression, thereby broadening their understanding of diverse ways of seeing, thinking about, and experiencing the self and society. Students will enlarge their intellectual horizons and knowledge of the world through encountering humanistic representations of both lived experiences and imaginative or speculative constructions, past or present. Students thus become increasingly prepared to live as thoughtfully engaged members of multiple communities, whether local, regional, or global.

To help students achieve GH goals, the University provides GH courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:

- Engage in the qualitative study of the humanities
- Expand their knowledge of the variety of human experiences
- Gain access to various intellectual traditions and their changes through time
- Probe the foundations of communication and thought and become aware of the scope and limitations of human communication
- Encounter concepts and traditions that attempt to bring sense to human existence
- Develop their competency in interpreting and critically evaluating diverse ways of life, traditions, and shared or individual values, including their own.

GH Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Humanities (GH) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

- Explain the methods of inquiry in humanities fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
- Demonstrate competence in critical thinking about topics and texts in the humanities through clear and well-reasoned responses
- Critically evaluate texts in the humanities—whether verbal, visual, or digital—identify and explain moral or ethical dimensions within the disciplines of the humanities
- Demonstrate knowledge of major cultural currents, issues, and developments through time, including evidence of exposure to unfamiliar material that challenges their curiosity and stretches their intellectual range
- Become familiar with groups, individuals, ideas, or events that have influenced the experiences and values of different communities.
Current Criteria

Health and Physical Activity (GHA)

Courses will focus on the theory and practice of life span wellness and fitness activities, and on the knowledge, attitudes, habits, and skills needed to live well. Courses are expected to promote an active and healthful lifestyle and are understood to include such diverse topics as diet, exercise, stress management, the wise use of leisure time, alcohol consumption and drug use, sexual health awareness, and safety education. Courses may be knowledge-focused or practice-focused or integrated in any manner. Theory-focused courses are understood to emphasize the transmission of knowledge about some aspect of healthful living. Practice-focused courses are understood to emphasize attitudes, habits, and skills needed to engage in healthful living. Traditional dance, exercise, and sport activity classes are understood to meet the practice-focused criterion if they will promote healthful living across the life span.

In the review of the course proposal the General Education committee will examine whether the proposal meets the General Education course criteria stated above and in addition shows how the course will:

1. teach students to achieve and maintain good health.
2. promote an active and healthful lifestyle.
3. transmit knowledge about some aspect of healthful living, when emphasizing theory.
4. develop attitudes, habits, and skills needed to engage in healthful living and promote healthful living across the life span, when emphasis on practice (dance, exercise, and sport activity).

Proposed New Criteria

Health and Physical Activity (GHW)

In Health and Wellness (GHW) fields, students focus on the physical and psychosocial well-being of individuals and communities. They expand their theoretical and practical knowledge about health and wellness-concepts that are multidimensional and culturally defined. The University provides opportunities for students to study such diverse topics as nutrition, physical activity, stress, sleep, healthy leisure, alcohol, tobacco, and other substance use, sexual health, and safety—all useful in maintaining lifelong health and wellness and in creating healthy work and community environments.

To help students achieve GHW goals, the University provides GHW courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:

- Identify and practice skills, attitudes, and behaviors that should enable them to better maintain health and wellness across their lifespans
- Identify wellness as a positive state of well-being, not merely the absence of disease or illness
- Recognize the importance of social, emotional, and physical health and wellness for communities as well as for individuals.

GHW Student Learning Criteria. Upon successful completion of the General Education Health and Wellness (GHW) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

- Explain the methods of inquiry in Health and Wellness fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
- Describe multiple perceptions and dimensions of health and wellness (emotional, spiritual, environmental, physical, social, intellectual, and occupational)
- Identify and explain ways individuals and/or communities can achieve and maintain health and wellness
- Describe health-related risk factors and explain changes in knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, activities or skills that have the potential of improving health and wellness
- Disseminate knowledge about health and wellness and demonstrate behavioral practices needed to engage in healthy living across the life span.
**Current Criteria**
Natural Sciences (GN)

The goal of the Natural Sciences is to reveal the order, diversity, and beauty of nature and in so doing enable students to develop a greater appreciation of the world around them. The objective of the Natural Sciences is to understand the nature of science through exposure to the broad divisions of science–physical science, biological science, earth science, and applied natural science. The students should know how to acquire scientific factual information, to use scientific methodology and to develop an appreciation of the natural world.

All divisions of Natural Science employ inductive reasoning and establish theories and laws of nature based on observation, and deductive reasoning to draw conclusions based on these theories and laws. Such reasoning is applied to the study of both non-living and living matter. Students should gain an understanding of how scientists reason and how they draw conclusions. (Senate Agenda 4-30-85)

In the review of the course proposal the General Education committee will examine whether the proposal meets the general General Education course criteria stated above and in addition shows how the course will:

1. broadly survey the existing knowledge in the discipline.
2. develop an understanding of the inductive reasoning process and develop a student’s ability to reason inductively.
3. develop an understanding of the deductive reasoning process and develop a student’s ability to reason deductively.
4. include, if appropriate, laboratory work.
5. relate its field of study to other fields of the natural sciences.
6. assess the degree to which its stated Natural Sciences General Education objectives are met.

**Proposed New Criteria**
Natural Sciences (GN)

In Natural Science (GN) fields, students develop the skills necessary to make informed judgments about scientific information and arguments. Along with building knowledge of foundational scientific principles, students expand their understanding of how and why science works, why it is an effective tool for knowledge generation, and how it can address contemporary questions and challenges.

To help students achieve GN goals and develop this scientific literacy, the University provides GN courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:

- Encounter the order, diversity, and beauty of nature
- Sample some of the ways in which science offers an additional lens through which to view the human condition
- Engage with scientific material through discussion, exploration, data analysis, and experimenttion
- Gain practice in recognizing the nature of scientific process and discovery, in identifying what science can and cannot achieve, and in analyzing why scientific arguments may lead to different conclusions than other forms of intellectual discourse.

**GN Student Learning Criteria.** Upon successful completion of the General Education (GN) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

- Explain the methods of inquiry in the natural science fields and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
- Construct evidence-based explanations of natural phenomena
- Demonstrate informed understandings of scientific claims and their applications
- Evaluate the quality of the data, methods, and inferences used to generate scientific knowledge
- Identify societal or philosophical implications of discoveries in the natural sciences, as well as their potential to address contemporary problems.
### Current Criteria

**Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS)**

The objective of the Social and Behavioral Sciences is an understanding of the diverse personal, interpersonal, and societal forces which shape people's lives and to approach these subjects through the concepts, principles and methods of scientific inquiry. The general goal is a theoretical understanding of the interrelationships of the determinants of the organization of human behavior.

Students should be introduced to the scientific analysis of:
1. the forms, practices, and theories of politics;
2. the nature and operation of economic analysis;
3. the interrelationships of social institutions;
4. the dynamics of individual and group behavior and change; and
5. the processes and functions of human communication.

Through the application of the methodologies of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, students should develop an understanding of the multiple nature of causality in social settings. The Social and Behavioral Sciences require a comprehensive, integrative, empirical and theoretical view of the social world. (Senate Agenda, 4-30-85)

In the review of the course proposals the General Education subcommittee will examine whether the proposal meets the General Education course criteria stated above and in addition shows how the course will:

1. broadly survey the existing knowledge in the discipline.
2. develop the student's understanding of the scientific methodologies of social and behavioral sciences.
3. develop an understanding of the multiple nature of causality in social settings.
4. relate its specific field of study, where appropriate, to other areas in the social and behavioral sciences.

### Proposed New Criteria

**Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS)**

In Social and Behavioral Science (GS) fields, students focus on analyzing the forces that influence behaviors, values, habits, attitudes, and institutions. GS courses allow students to explore the multiple perspectives and methodologies useful in analyzing and addressing complex social issues.

To help students achieve GS goals, the university provides GS courses and an appropriate learning environment for students to:

- Explore the interrelationships of the many factors that shape behavior
- Be introduced to methodological analyses of the forms, practices, and theories of politics, economics, and social institutions
- Develop comprehensive, integrated, reasoned, and theoretical views of their contemporary and emerging social world
- Expand their understanding of how social, political, and economic influences and trends affect individual, group, organizational, local, national, and global contexts.

**GS Student Learning Criteria.** Upon successful completion of the General Education Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS) requirement, students should have increased their abilities to:

- Explain the various methods of inquiry used in the social and behavioral sciences and describe how the contributions of these fields complement inquiry in other areas
- Identify and explain major foundational theories and bodies of work in a particular area of social and behavioral sciences
- Describe the ways in which many different factors may interact to influence behaviors and/or institutions in historical or contemporary settings
- Explain how social and behavioral science researchers use concepts, theoretical models and data to better understand and address world problems
- Recognize social, cultural, political and/or ethical implications of work in the social and behavioral sciences.
ATTACHMENT 5: EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE LINKED COURSES AND INTER-DOMAIN COURSES

An essential aspect of the Integrative Studies concept is that course proposals should be faculty-driven, allowing for innovation, experimentation, and responsiveness to student interests and local circumstances. We recognize that it is risky to give examples, lest they be understood as “the” patterns to follow and therefore tend to limit or foreclose the impetus to develop other possibilities. Nevertheless, having models can be useful to faculty in planning Integrative Studies offerings in both of the approved Pathways (Linked Courses and Inter-Domain Courses). The examples that follow are offered in that spirit. These examples do not completely describe the courses, but only highlight their distinctive characteristics as relating to Integrative Studies. Please note that the inclusion of particular courses in this attachment is based on brief information available to the Implementation Committee, often from the descriptions in the Undergraduate Degree Programs Bulletin descriptions, and mention of these courses here does not constitute advance Integrative Studies approval for them. If their academic units choose to propose them for the Linked or Inter-Domain designation, approval for these courses would follow the same process as for other courses.

**Linked Courses: In what way(s) might courses be linked?**

In the examples below, courses would likely meet the intentions of the Integrative Studies requirement because they would purposefully integrate perspectives from two knowledge domains, and students would practice integrative thinking in a course component informed by both domains.

1. A thriving example of how courses might be innovatively linked across domains already exists in the English Department’s series of *Adventure Literature* courses, which “combine the study of literature with outdoor adventures . . . [S]tudents not only read Thoreau, but like him they travel to the mountains, the river, or the seashore, and they climb, hike, and kayak, and write about their experiences.” Some offerings in this series pair themed literature (GH) and relevant Kinesiology (GHW) instruction. For example, in one pairing (“The Beach: Exploring the Literature of the Atlantic Shore”) students read the work of such writers as Henry Beston and Rachel Carson and travel to coastal South Carolina, where they visit historical sites and meet with local writers. The kinesiology portion of the coursework provides instruction in kayaking, including: its history; paddling; safety concerns; and “Leave-No-Trace” outdoor ethics. This instruction prepares students to use kayaking to explore the area’s cypress swamps, tidal marshes and barrier islands. Students earn 3 credits of English and 1.5 of Kinesiology. While these Linkages have been forged by faculty with specific interests, the concept of linking texts with outdoor experiences might be developed in a wide variety of locations.

The themed approach also opens the door to Linkages beyond humanities and kinesiology. For example, one theme in the series is food. In addition to allowing for connections between literature (GH) and wellness (perhaps using such GHW courses as Nutrition 100 or Food Science 105), a Linkage might also be developed with a course like Kitchen Chemistry (Chemistry 005, GN).

The *Adventure Literature* program may provide faculty with a starting point to imagine multiple ways existing courses can be linked. The English Department’s website (http://english.la.psu.edu/undergraduate/adventure-literature) and the program’s Facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/PennStateAdventureLit/) offer full details on the existing program for faculty who want to know more.

2. Two courses, Political Science 130, American Political Campaigns and Elections (GS), and Philosophy 119, Ethical Leadership (GH), would together allow students to apply their knowledge of
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ethical theory to the complex undulation of American political elections. The course on Ethical Leadership emphasizes that such leadership requires a strong moral sense, honesty and integrity, commitment to self-reflection, and a willingness to put theory into practice by acting ethically. The course on American Political Campaigns and Elections explores politicians’ integration of polls, political consultants, parties, and the media in the course of campaigning. If these courses shared, for example, a substantial combined work-product or assignments that integrate perspectives from both the humanities and social sciences, they would likely meet the intentions of the Integrative Studies requirement. Additional courses might also participate in this Linkage.

3. Several courses address drama from the perspectives of the performing arts (GA) and literature (GH). Existing courses might include Comparative Literature 153, International Cultures: Literature and Film (GH); Theatre 105, Introduction to Theatre (GA); Theatre 112, Introduction to Musical Theatre (GA); Communications 250, Film History and Theory (GA); French 142, French Fiction, Drama, and Film (GH); and English 129, Shakespeare (GH). In their literature courses, students would study the thematic content and literary techniques of the plays; in theatre and film courses, they would study the performative aspects and the types of choices that directors and performers make in moving from text to stage. As a culminating project, some students, in small groups, might present a scene from a play and prepare a paper explaining and justifying their choices as directors and performers, using both textual and performative perspectives. Other students, for example those in World Campus, might make an animated version of a scene, record themselves presenting a speech from a play, or in other creative ways incorporate and explain both the performative and textual perspectives in their choices.

4. Students from courses in Global Studies (GH), Linguistics (GS), International Arts (GA), and Latin American civilization (GH) participate in an ongoing English literacy partnership with a school in Latin America, using Skype to provide the school’s students with opportunities to practice their English and to mutually learn about each other’s cultural practices. Some students participate in a faculty-led short-term embedded study-abroad experience to visit this school and provide service there over Spring Break, but for other students the Linkage is wholly on World Campus. The Latin American school chosen is in an international location where Penn State has a GEN [Global Engagement Network] affiliation and/or a study abroad program, and this school-partnership project has the commitment of at least two of the participating academic departments, in different Knowledge Domains, to enable it to extend through multiple semesters.

This example is provided to suggest that both campus-specific and University-wide embedded study abroad opportunities can serve to create innovative and substantive Linkages among Knowledge Domains.

Inter-Domain Courses. In what ways might an individual course combine two Knowledge Domains?

In the examples below, each course would likely meet the intentions of the Integrative Studies requirement because it would purposefully integrate perspectives from two knowledge domains, and students would practice integrative thinking in course components informed by both domains, with approximately equal attention to each. (Note: descriptions of the courses are drawn from the Bulletin statements rather than the Committee.)

1. Gender Dynamics in Africa (African Studies 202 / Women’s Studies 202) is now listed as GS and potentially might also be GH. The Bulletin description is “Critical analysis of multidisciplinary research on relations between men and women in Africa and critique of Western feminist theories.” Feminism is one of the latest Western theoretical fashions to be applied to African societies. Although in terms of gender studies, Western academics have dominated the field, this course will offer a more
African-centered analysis of gender relations in Africa. Important African women writers will be read and their works analyzed. The role of African gender dynamics in the African diaspora will also be studied. This course would likely meet the intentions of the Integrative Studies requirement because it analyzes gender dynamics in historical and literary frameworks (GH) while using social science approaches to apply these concepts to African societies (GS).

2. Behavior, Health, and Disease (Biobehavioral Health 119) is now listed as GHW and potentially might also be GN. The Bulletin description is “Principles of health promotion, disease prevention, and treatment of acute and chronic illness.” This course provides a broad understanding of the major human diseases underlying morbidity and mortality in America. The course covers most major diseases using a variety of organizational schema including: (1) diseases according to organ systems, (2) diseases according to developmental and age-related processes, and (3) diseases according to causal factors including behavioral (lifestyle), environmental, and genetic factors. The course content is organized to encourage promotion of a healthy lifestyle, prevention of disease and understanding the causes and management of acute and chronic illness. This course would likely meet the intention of the Integrative Studies requirement because it ties the underlying pathobiology of disease states (GN) with direct applications to health (GHW).
ATTACHMENT 6: COST ESTIMATE (AS OF SPRING 2015) FOR THE GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM THAT THE SENATE APPROVED ON APRIL 28, 2015

The cost estimate that follows, "Estimated ranges for the additional cost of the proposed General Education revisions beyond the cost of the current General Education program," has been reproduced from the Senate Agenda of April 28, 2015, where it was included in the Legislative Report from the General Education Task Force (Appendix B of the April 28, 2015 Agenda). At that time, the estimate was prepared by Senators who were members of the General Education Task Force in collaboration with administrative representatives and others who provided budgetary data, other types of information, and much-appreciated expertise.

It is important to emphasize that this cost estimate is just that—an estimate—not an actual budget. It necessarily relied on assumptions that will need to be either confirmed or adjusted after actual implementation data become available.

Some of the cost categories shown here, such as an ongoing, annual estimate for faculty development for Integrative Studies, are specific to this component of General Education. However, other categories included in this estimate would apply to General Education as a whole, rather than specifically to Integrative Studies. For example, the estimate includes costs for a General Education support structure that would benefit not only Integrative Studies but also other aspects of General Education. Further, the cost estimate reflects an anticipated increase in 200-level courses that was not actually legislated in April, 2015 and is not part of the present proposal.

Despite its limitations, this cost estimate can provide a useful starting-point for budgetary considerations.
Attachment 6: Estimated ranges for the additional cost of the proposed General Education revisions beyond the cost of the current General Education program. This estimate was a part of Appendix B in the April 28, 2015 Senate Agenda. [http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/april-28-2015-agenda/appendix-b/](http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/april-28-2015-agenda/appendix-b/)

### Start-up Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adviser/faculty training</td>
<td>$10,000 - $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; design of material for incoming students/NSO (assistance from StratCom?)</td>
<td>$5,000 - $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff time for curriculum development and revision</td>
<td>$170,000 - $425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-recurring Start-up costs</strong></td>
<td>$185,000 - $465,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual - Ongoing Costs

#### Instruction:

- Instructional Capacity for additional sections for students who earned a "D" in a GQ or a GWS courses to retake the course
  - **Range**: $575,000 - $2,800,000
- Offering more 200-level courses and fewer 100-level courses - 110 net new sections due to smaller average section size for 200-level courses (assumes all Integrative Studies courses are 200-level)
  - **Range**: $440,000 - $2,300,000
- Ongoing faculty development for Integrative Studies
  - Instruction Sub-Total: $2,503,000 - $9,564,000

#### General Education Support Structure

- Director and Staff
  - **Range**: $236,250 - $310,500
- Gen Ed Innovation and Quality Improvement Grants
  - **Range**: $200,000 - $400,000
- Assessment
  - **Range**: $90,000 - $135,000
  - Operating funds - technology, travel between campuses, campus liaisons, conference attendance, etc.
    - **Range**: $60,000 - $80,000
  - General Education Support Structure Subtotal: $586,250 - $925,500

**Total Ongoing Costs**: $3,089,250 - $10,489,500

#### Grant Revenue Goal for Innovation and Quality Improvement to Offset Ongoing Costs

- **Range**: $100,000 - $250,000

*This cost estimate was presented to and discussed with Provost Jones on April 14, 2015.*

---

1 UP delivered 650 General Education Courses in Fall 2012-13. Assuming that campuses are delivering the same Gen Ed courses, course development/revision would be needed for the 13% of these courses that would need to be Integrative Studies (650 x 13% = 85 courses).
Faculty development for Integrative Studies is estimated at $4,000/section for 25% of Integrative course sections (low) and 75% of sections (high).

On January 27th, the Faculty Senate voted to approve a standing General Education Support Structure to function as an engine for collaboration, innovation, assessment, and research in General Education. This budget assumes a need for a faculty director and two staff members, one with significant experience in assessment in addition to a standing budget to fund grants for faculty proposals to develop innovative curriculum. Funding priorities should be given to proposals that will significantly improve general education at Penn State, scale to the university level, and be competitive for funding from external sources.

The current CAT assessment employs faculty at $300 each to score the assessment. If the same method were used annually for assessing two learning objectives, involving 30 faculty from five units, the estimated cost of appropriate compensation for faculty scorers is about $90,000.
ATTACHMENT 7: SAMPLE GENERAL EDUCATION BACCALAUREATE DEGREE WORKSHEETS

Two sample worksheets are shown here. They are intended only as possible formats for visualizing ways in which the new General Education can include 6 credits of integrative Studies.

As is already the case with the current General Education requirements, departments, programs, advising units, etc., may devise worksheets that seem most appropriate for their students. Interactive online worksheets, enabling students to try out different choices and see where each course would fit into their individual academic programs, are also being explored.
Worksheet: Sample A

Foundations: 15 Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing/Speaking Skills (GWS)</th>
<th>9 Credits</th>
<th>Quantification (GQ)</th>
<th>6 Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GWS Writing—3 cr</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>GQ Quantification—3 cr.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWS Writing—3 cr.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GQ Quantification—3 cr.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWS Speaking—3 cr.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breadth Across Knowledge Domains: 30 Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Sciences (GN)-</th>
<th>Humanities (GH)--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GN Single Domain—3 cr.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN Single Domain or Inter-Domain—3 cr.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN Single Domain or Inter-Domain—3 cr.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts (GA)-</th>
<th>Social and Behavioral Sciences (GS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA Single Domain—3 cr.</td>
<td>GS Single Domain—3 cr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Single Domain or Inter-Domain—3 cr.</td>
<td>GS Single Domain or Inter-Domain—3 cr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Wellness (GHW)-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrative Studies (included above)</th>
<th>Additional Explorations (available when the Inter-Domain Pathway is chosen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Studies Course—3 cr.</td>
<td>Knowledge Domain Course—3 cr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Studies Course—3 cr.</td>
<td>Knowledge Domain Course—3 cr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other graduation requirements (US/International, Writing Intensive, First Year Experience, etc.) and forms of flexibility (“Move 3”, World Language substitution, 400-level substitution, etc.) are not shown on this Worksheet but would be part of the student’s planning as appropriate. For details see next page.
Flexibility in General Education (these are the flexibility provisions that relate to implementing Integrative Studies or Move 3 for baccalaureate students). The statement below is modified from the present Advising Handbook. Ideally students should develop their plans to use flexibility in General Education with their academic adviser.

Substitution of Higher Level Courses
With the approval of the student's adviser and appropriate dean's representative, a student may substitute 200- to 499-level courses for courses approved for General Education if they are in the same area of General Education. For example, a student might take PHIL 432, substituting it for a lower-level General Education humanities (GH) course.

Move 3 Substitution
In consultation with an adviser and the student's appropriate dean's representative, within the 30 credits of Breadth Across Knowledge Domains, students may substitute 3 credits from one Knowledge Domain for a course in one of the other Knowledge Domains. For example, a student might take one additional course in the Arts (GA) and one less in Natural Science (GN). This option does not apply to courses in the Foundations area and no domain may be reduced below 3 credits of single-domain coursework.

World Language Substitution
With the permission of his/her adviser and the appropriate dean's representative, a baccalaureate degree candidate may make one of the following world language substitutions (for this purpose, "world language" is defined as a language other than English):

1. If the student is enrolled in a major that does not require the 12th-credit level of proficiency in a world language, he/she may substitute 3 credits in a world language at the 12th-credit level (or higher) for 3 credits in any of the categories of General Education (with the exception of GHW, Health and Wellness, where only 3 credits are required). For example, a student majoring in nursing might substitute SPAN 003 for 3 credits in the Arts (GA).

2. If the student is enrolled in a major that does require the 12th-credit level of proficiency in a world language, he/she may substitute 3 credits in a world language beyond the requirements of his/ her degree program for 3 credits in any of the categories of General Education (with the exception of GHW, Health and Wellness). For example, a student majoring in history, where 12th-credit level proficiency is already required, might substitute ARAB 110 (a 15th-credit-level course) for 3 credits in social science (GS).

If a student has demonstrated proficiency in one world language and elects to study another world language, he/she can use the 12th-credit level of the language as a world language substitution. For example, an international student from China who elects to study French might substitute FR 003 for 3 credits in Humanities (GH).

Students may not eliminate all Single Domain coursework in any General Education area by using the Move 3 Substitution, the World Language Substitution, Inter-Domain courses, or other forms of flexibility described above. A minimum of 3 Single-Domain credits each in GQ, GWS, GA, GH, GHW, GN, and GS is always required.
After a student completes a course that could take advantage of any of the flexibility provisions above, the student submits a request for the substitution in his/her department or college. When approved, the student's degree audit will show that the substitution has been made.

A student who wants to take advantage of options for flexibility in General Education should talk to his/her academic adviser or contact the appropriate Academic Advising Center.

Worksheet: Sample B

FOUNDATIONS (15 credits; C or better grades required)

6 credits Writing (GWS)  
- ENGL 015  3cr  
- ENGL 202D  3cr

3 credits Speaking (GWS)  
- CAS 100A  3cr

6 credits Quantification (GQ)  
- MATH 034  3cr  
- STAT 100  3cr

KNOWLEDGE DOMAINS (30 credits)

Get Exposure and Experience (15 credits)
Complete one course in each area. Inter-domain courses cannot be listed here. No substitutions may be used in for these courses. 3 credits of single-domain coursework are required for each domain.

- B I S C 003  3cr  Natural Science (GN)
- T H E A 100  3cr  Arts (GA)
- R L S T 001  3cr  Humanities (GH)
- E C O N 102  3cr  Social Sciences (GS)
- N U T R 251  3cr  Health and Wellness (GHW)

Build Focus and Connections (15 credits)

Integrative Studies (6 credits) Choose two 3-credit Inter-Domain Courses or two 3-credit Linked Courses

- A N T H 216  Knowledge Domains: GN/GS  
- A R T H 225  Knowledge Domains: GA/GH

Check all of the Knowledge Domains these courses fulfill in the General Education Checklist (below). The basic pattern is 9 credits of GN, 6 credits each of GA, GH, and GS; and 3 credits of GHW. You can use the Substitutions below to vary this pattern, though the total of 30 credits in the Knowledge Domains remains the same.

Additional Exposure and Experience (9 credits) Select three courses from the Knowledge Domains to complete the General Education Requirements Checklist or use the substitutions below to satisfy requirements.

- A N T H 021  3cr  
- A R T H 122  3cr  
- A R T H 305  3cr
## General Education Requirements Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science (GN)</td>
<td>ANTH 216</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (GH)</td>
<td>ART H 225</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science (GN)</td>
<td>ANTH 021</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences (GS)</td>
<td>ANTH 216</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (GA)</td>
<td>ART H 225</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substitutions** (Check the boxes above with your choice of these options. None of these may apply to the single-domain courses listed under the heading “Get Exposure and Experience”)

- **BUILD language competency** by replacing 3 credits in one Knowledge Domain with a world language**
  - World Language _______________ to 3 credits of _____ (GWS, GQ, GN, GA, GH, or GS)

- **CREATE depth** in a General Education Knowledge Domain by substituting a 200-499-level course.
  - Course ________________ Knowledge Area _____________

- **FOCUS on one Knowledge Domain** by moving a maximum of 3 credits from another Knowledge Domain.
  - Move 3 credits of _____ (GA, GH, GN, GS) to 3 credits of _____ (GA, GH, GHW, GN or GS)

**World Language Alternative**

*Majors that do not require the 12th-credit level of proficiency in a world language:* substitute 3 cr in a language at the 12th-credit level (or higher) for 3 cr in any of the General Education Knowledge Domains (with the exception of GHW). E.g., a nursing major could substitute SPAN 003 for 3 cr in the arts (GA).

*Majors that do require the 12th-credit level of proficiency in a world language:* substitute 3 cr in a language beyond the requirement of the degree program for 3 cr in any General Education Knowledge Domain (with the exception of GHW). E.g., a major in philosophy could substitute GER 201 for 3 cr in natural science (GN).

*Students who have demonstrated proficiency in one world language and elect to study another world language:* substitute 3 cr of another language at the 12th-credit level of proficiency. E.g., an international student from China who elects to study French can substitute FR 003 for 3 cr in humanities (GH).
Additional University Requirements

United States Cultures (US) ___________________ 3 credits
Double count in General Education, major, BA requirement, or elective.

International Cultures (IL) ___________________ 3 credits
Double count in General Education, major, BA requirement [except Other Cultures], or as an elective. Study abroad courses often satisfy this requirement.

Writing Intensive Courses (W, M, X, or Y suffix) ___________________ 3 credits
Typically embedded in courses required for a major.

First-Year Experience ___________________ 0-3 credits
Implementation of Updated General Education Learning Objectives

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate (and development of procedures when applicable)

Introduction

On April 28, 2015 the Penn State Faculty Senate approved the following in Recommendation 1 of the General Education Task Force report, “Revise the current statement on General Education goals to include updated Learning Objectives as presented.”

The following is the Learning Objectives and preamble as presented in the April 28, 2015 report.

The General Education curriculum will enable students to acquire skills, knowledge, and experiences for living in interconnected contexts, so they can contribute to making life better for others, themselves, and the larger world. General Education encompasses the breadth of knowledge involving the major intellectual and aesthetic skills and achievements of humanity. This must include understanding and appreciation of the pluralistic nature of knowledge epitomized by the natural sciences, quantitative skills, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, and arts. To achieve and share such an understanding and appreciation, skills in self-expression, quantitative analysis, information literacy, and collaborative interaction are necessary. General Education aids students in developing intellectual curiosity, a strengthened ability to think, and a deeper sense of aesthetic appreciation. General Education, in essence, aims to cultivate a knowledgeable, informed, literate human being.

An effective General Education curriculum shall facilitate teaching and learning through seven key objectives:

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION – the ability to exchange information and ideas in oral, written, and visual form in ways that allow for informed and persuasive discourse that builds trust and respect among those engaged in that exchange, and helps create environments where creative ideas and problem-solving flourish.

KEY LITERACIES – the ability to identify, interpret, create, communicate and compute using materials in a variety of media and contexts. Literacy acquired in multiple areas, such as textual, quantitative, information/technology, health, intercultural, historical, aesthetic, linguistic (world languages), and scientific, enables individuals to achieve their goals, to develop their knowledge and potential, to lead healthy and productive lives, and to participate fully in their community and wider society.
CRITICAL AND ANALYTICAL THINKING – the habit of mind characterized by comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating a conclusion. It is the intellectually disciplined process of conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action.

INTEGRATIVE THINKING – the ability to synthesize knowledge across multiple domains, modes of inquiry, historical periods, and perspectives, as well as the ability to identify linkages between existing knowledge and new information. Individuals who engage in integrative thinking are able to transfer knowledge within and beyond their current contexts.

CREATIVE THINKING – the capacity to synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of performing, making, thinking, or acting in an imaginative way that may be characterized by innovation, divergent thinking, and intellectual risk taking.

GLOBAL LEARNING – the intellectually disciplined abilities to analyze similarities and differences among cultures; evaluate natural, physical, social, cultural, historical, and economic legacies and hierarchies; and engage as community members and leaders who will continue to deal with the intricacies of an ever-changing world. Individuals should acquire the ability to analyze power; identify and critique interdependent global, regional, and local cultures and systems; and evaluate the implications for people’s lives.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICAL REASONING – the ability to assess one’s own values within the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, describe how different perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Individuals should acquire the self—knowledge and leadership skills needed to play a role in creating and maintaining healthy, civil, safe, and thriving communities.

This report includes three recommendations necessary to implement these learning objectives as the foundation for our General Education program and curriculum and one recommendation to keep the program current.

Discussion and Rationale

Several key things need to happen to establish the new Learning Objectives as the foundation of our General Education curriculum. First, all General Education courses need to demonstrate alignment with the new Learning Objectives; faculty and administration need to be aware of how courses will be evaluated with respect to this alignment. Second, faculty and students need to recognize when they are engaging with the General Education curriculum and students should to
be clearly informed of what Learning Objectives they can expect to practice and achieve in for each General Education course. Third, all current General Education courses need to reviewed under the new criteria. This will be a time consuming and expensive process, but it is necessary to fully implement the already adopted Learning Objectives. A cost estimate for implementing the new General Education curriculum was included in the General Education Taskforce report dated April 28, 2015. A phased review process is proposed to distribute this workload over a manageable timeframe. Finally, General Education, like the academic environment in which it is housed, needs to be dynamic and responsive to student needs and assessment feedback. Therefore, we propose that General Education courses undergo rolling periodic evaluation.

Recommendations

The following four recommendations are made to address the important points discussed above. The first recommendation specifies the materials and information that must be provided for review as a General Education course. For comparison, the current text from the Guide to Curricular Procedures under heading “2. Criteria for General Education Courses” is Attachment 1. It is worth noting that the number of items to be answered by the proposer has been reduced from ten (10) to four (4).

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs will request the following information on course proposals and use it to determine if a course meets the Learning Objectives of General Education.

All General Education Course proposals must be responsive to the following prompts:

1. Which of the seven General Education Learning Objective(s) will be addressed in the course? A minimum of two (2) Learning Objective must be clearly addressed in the course; it is recommended that each course address two to three (2-3) Learning Objectives and not more than four (4).

2. What component(s) of the course will help students achieve the General Education Learning Objectives covered in the course? Provide evidence that students in the course have adequate opportunities to achieve the identified Learning Objectives.

3. How will students be assessed to determine their attainment of the Learning Objective(s) of General Education covered in the course? This assessment must be included as a portion of the student’s overall performance in the course.

4. Please provide a copy of the current or proposed syllabus.

It is important for students to be cognizant of when they are participating in a general education course and what Learning Objectives they are working to achieve.
RECOMMENDATION 2: Course syllabi for all General Education courses must clearly identify the course as a General Education course and which of the General Education Learning Objectives the course will address.

All existing General Education courses need to be reevaluated and aligned with the new General Education Learning Objectives. Therefore, the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs proposes an evaluation process reviewing all General Education courses take place over a three (3) year process. This timeline is proposed to distribute the workload associated with this process over a manageable timeframe while significant progress in aligning our current courses with the new learning objectives. Additionally, a subsequent periodic review of courses is proposed to monitor concerns of curricular drift as well as keep the information about each course reasonably current.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The senate must review all current General Education courses for alignment with the Learning Objectives adopted by the Faculty Senate on April 28, 2015. This process should be distributed over three years and under the direction of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs. This process should be complete by the end of the 2018-2019 academic year. Any efforts that can be made to streamline the process and reduce burden to the faculty and staff in completing this process should be made. This may include to the extent possible ad-hoc committee formation to expedite proposal review as well as streamlined proposal submission and completion.

RECOMMENDATION 4: General Education courses are to be re-evaluated for alignment with the General Education Learning Objectives on a rolling five (5) year basis. This review process will occur under the direction of the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs.

Effective Date
Immediately with completion of the initial review of General Education courses by the end of Spring 2019.
The criteria given below have been derived from the objectives for General Education approved by the Senate on April 30, 1985, and on December 2, 1997.

No one course must achieve every General Education objective, but each proposal must specify clearly which objectives it proposes to meet. The Senate legislation of December 2, 1997, and February 27, 2001 (see Appendix “D” of the 2/27/01 Agenda and 2/27/01 Senate Record), requires that typically three or more core competencies, activities and strategies for enhanced learning be integrated in the courses offered in the areas of Health and Physical Activity, Natural Sciences, Arts, Humanities, and Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Core Competencies, Activities, and Strategies for Enhanced Learning:
Knowledge domain courses must require each student to engage in activities promoting learning course content through practicing, typically, three or more of the following core competencies, activities, and strategies for enhanced learning:
   a. writing, speaking and/or other forms of self-expression,
   b. information gathering, such as the use of the library, computer/electronic resources, and experimentation or observation,
   c. synthesis and analysis in problem solving and critical thinking, including, where appropriate, the application of reasoning and interpretive methods, and quantitative thinking,
   d. collaborative learning and teamwork,
   e. activities that promote and advance intercultural and/or international understanding,
   f. activities that promote the understanding of issues pertaining to social behavior, scholarly conduct, and community responsibility,
   g. a significant alternative competency for active learning designed for and appropriate to a specific course.

Rationale:
Students should be actively involved in a significant part of their own learning in all General Education courses at Penn State. Through the use of active learning in assignments, exercises, and other formal activities associated with a course, students become engaged participants in the particular course’s content and, simultaneously, build competencies, skills, and abilities that are necessary to promote learning in any situation. A successful General Education course typically will involve students in several active-learning activities, not all of the same type. However, evidence of significant involvement by students is more important than the count of activities. Activities that promote intercultural and international competence, or that help students assess social behavior and scholarly conduct in the community, are especially valuable.
Criteria for determining whether a course meets the general objectives of General Education

All General Education Course proposals must be responsive to the following questions:

1. Does the course proposal show which of the following general objectives will be addressed in the course?
2. Through General Education courses, students:
   a. should enhance their key competencies for active learning,
   b. should develop their intercultural and international competence,
   c. should be enabled to acquire knowledge through critical reading,
   d. should learn how to acquire information and data through a variety of means (including electronic),
   e. should learn how to analyze and evaluate, where appropriate in a quantitative manner, the acquired information and knowledge,
   f. should learn how to integrate knowledge from a variety of sources and fields,
   g. should learn how to make critical judgments in a logical manner,
   h. should learn how to communicate effectively.
3. Does the course proposal outline methods for achieving the General Education objectives identified as important components of the course?
4. Does the course proposal show how key competencies for active learning are integrated in the course?
5. Does the course proposal identify means through which the intercultural and international competence of the students is enhanced?
6. Does the course proposal show how the course assignments develop the ability of the students to analyze problems or questions and evaluate them critically?
7. Does the course proposal identify opportunities for students to integrate knowledge acquired from a variety of sources?
8. Does the course proposal show opportunities for students to formulate and express informed judgments?
9. Does the course proposal indicate how students will be examined to determine their attainment of the general objectives of General Education?
10. Does the course proposal show how the course is related to other fields of study or courses and how this relationship is communicated to students?
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Introduction
An important responsibility of the Faculty Senate is the ownership of the curriculum and the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs (SCCA) aspires to be a good steward of this responsibility. Penn State encompasses campuses of every size and as a university we use a wide variety of delivery modes. When SCCA reviews courses we are very intentional in reviewing courses independent of delivery mode, specific course materials, and pedagogical techniques, because over the course of time, instructors change, technology improves, and academic offerings shift. With that, we espouse the idea that within Penn State “a course is a course” and firmly believe for the benefit of students there needs to be some amount of uniformity across course offerings regardless of location, instructor, or delivery mode. We also recognize that faculty have preferred pedagogical techniques, and academic freedom to conduct their courses as they see best, but students need assurance that the courses they take will, at a minimum, satisfy the prerequisite content or skills needed for subsequent courses and the requirements of their academic majors.

Discussion and Rationale
In April 2015, the senate approved a policy governing the similarity of a course needed to be evaluated as a course equivalent (Revisions to Senate Policy 42-82; http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/april-28-2015-agenda/appendix-c/). The relevant excerpt from that policy now reads “When a candidate has satisfactorily completed, at another accredited institution, course work that is substantially equivalent (at least 80% the same) to a specific course at this University, credit is granted in the University course”. Adoption of this revision highlights that no existing policy gives guidance on uniformity between offerings of the same courses across our own university. There is a widely held belief that a single course offered in multiple sections or at multiple locations must be 80% the same, but this is not formal policy. The report referenced above includes a review of, and some basis for, this commonly held belief citing several senate reports. Therefore, we propose a new senate policy to codify what is widely known as the 80/20 rule. Wide access to the Curriculum Archive database (http://curriculumarchives.libraries.psu.edu/apex/f?p=410:2:) will facilitate access to course proposals as necessary.

Recommendation

42-10 Course Uniformity
Students complete courses that comprise a curriculum as outlined by academic units. The same courses may be offered across the university through various delivery modes and at all locations. Despite possible variation in pedagogical style, course materials, delivery mode, or location, courses offered within Penn State must include a minimum of 80% of the core content and learning objectives described in the most current course proposal as approved by Faculty Senate.

**Effective Date**
Upon approval by the Senate and revision of any relevant AAPPM policies by the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education.
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Revisions to Senate Policy 59-00 Requirements for the Minor

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate (and development of procedures when applicable)

Introduction
A joint ad hoc Certificates Committee was established by the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) and the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs (SCCA). This committee has been working since May 2014 to evaluate the current uses of certificates in the university for the purposes of recommending changes in policies and procedures. The certificates committee has now reported back to SCCA and Administrative Council for Undergraduate Education (ACUE). This proposed change in Senate Policy is a result of that committee’s work and are brought before the Faculty Senate by three standing committees of the senate.

Certificates are currently described in the Undergraduate Degree Program Bulletin (http://bulletins.psu.edu/undergrad/programs/certificates/). They are also described in the Academic Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual (AAPPM) maintained by ACUE and the OUE (http://www.psu.edu/oue/aappm/M-12-guidelines-undergraduate-certificates.html). However, there is no University Faculty Senate policy defining certificates, what they are, and what is their purpose (http://www.psu.edu/ufs/policies/). Certificates exist functionally and administratively, but have not been defined by the Senate.

Rationale
What follows is a proposed revision to Senate Policy 59-00 to include differentiation between minors and certificates and specific details of each.

The text currently listed as Senate Policy 59-00 will be renumbered as 59-10 and left otherwise unchanged. There is need to update the description for a minor, but the discussion about minors is unnecessarily delaying creation of policy for certificates. This report is submitted in an effort to align policy for certificates with current administrative practice. A future report will clarify minors and work through details associated with minors.

Requirements for the Minor are currently described in Senate Policy 59-00 as follows.

A minor is defined as an academic program of at least 18 credits that supplements a major. A minor program may consist of course work in a single area or from several disciplines, with at least six but ordinarily not more than half of the credits at the 400-course level. Total requirements are to be specified and generally limited to 18 to 21 credits. Entrance to some minors may require the completion of a number of prerequisites including courses, portfolios, auditions, or other forms of documentation that are not included in the total requirements for the minor.
Requirements for a minor may be completed at any campus location offering the specified courses for the minor. Students may not change from a campus that offers their major to a campus that does not offer their major for the purpose of completing a minor. All courses for the minor require a grade of ‘C’ or above.

Recommendations

We recommend that the following text replace current Senate Policy 59-00.

59-00 Minors and certificates

Minors and certificates are available to help Penn State students showcase their various interests, abilities, specializations, intellectual curiosity, and skills. Both minors and certificates are course-based and indicated on a transcript. Minors are more robust; like majors, a minor requires advanced 400 level course work and may only be earned by degree candidates. A certificate is typically a smaller number of credits than a minor and may be available to non-degree seeking students. Certificates should not be confused with professional certification or licensure.

59-10 Requirements for Minors (text is unchanged from current 59-00)

A minor is defined as an academic program of at least 18 credits that supplements a major. A minor program may consist of course work in a single area or from several disciplines, with at least six but ordinarily not more than half of the credits at the 400-course level. Total requirements are to be specified and generally limited to 18 to 21 credits. Entrance to some minors may require the completion of a number of prerequisites including courses, portfolios, auditions, or other forms of documentation that are not included in the total requirements for the minor. Requirements for a minor may be completed at any campus location offering the specified courses for the minor. Students may not change from a campus that offers their major to a campus that does not offer their major for the purpose of completing a minor. All courses for the minor require a grade of ‘C’ or above.”

59-20 Requirements for Certificates

Certificates can reflect emerging academic areas, necessary professional development requirements, or groups of courses that do not constitute a degree program. A certificate is intended to foster incremental or targeted development in an area of specialty or competency within a discipline or field of study. Certificates are earned either in conjunction with a major or independently of associate or baccalaureate degrees, so they may be suitable for both degree-candidates and non-degree candidates.

Certificates are designed by academic units to accommodate the parameters of the discipline or field of study as well as the specific educational needs of the intended students. A certificate consists of a group of courses, typically 9-15 credits,
developed, supervised, and evaluated by the offering academic unit(s). At least two-thirds (2/3) of the credits used to complete a certificate must be earned at Penn State. In exceptional circumstances, a certificate may have fewer than 9 credits or more than 15 credits, provided adequate justification is given to explain why. Certificates should be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs every 5 years for enrollment and currency.

**Effective Date**
Upon approval by the Senate and revision of any relevant AAPPM policies by the Administrative Council on Undergraduate Education.
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Revision to Senate Policy 42-23: Credit Requirements by Types of Instruction

(Legislative)

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

Introduction

Senate Policy 42-23, Credit Requirements by Types of Instruction, describes “common minimum requirements that must be established and these should be consistent for all credit earned by instruction regardless of delivery method.” As currently written, this policy uses the following formula:

“forty (40) hours of work planned and arranged by the University faculty is required to gain 1 credit”

However, at the Federal level, the definition of a credit hour is now defined as follows:

“
A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.”

(See 34 CFR 600.2, http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?rgn=div8&node=34:3.1.3.1.1.1.23.2)
In essence, this most recent definition of a credit hour at the Federal level sets the requirements to gain 1 credit at 45, not 40, hours. While the Department of Education provides institutions with flexibility in creating their own definition of a credit hour and in using other metrics or measures of student progress and learning outcomes for academic and other non-Federal purposes, the Federal definition of a credit hour must be used in awarding Federal student aid. However, using two different definitions within one institution—one institutional and one Federal—seems unnecessarily complicated. It would be simpler to revise Penn State’s definition so that it is in line with the Federal definition. This report recommends a few minor changes to Senate Policy 42-23 to accomplish this task.

Some context about Policy 42-23 maybe useful. It was recently updated in September 2013. This update was to modernize the types of instruction that were described and clarify the need for consistency between delivery formats. During this revision the amount of time used to define a credit was deliberately kept unchanged. Prior to this recent revision, the policy had not been updated since 1975, and therefore, the number of forty (40) hours is historical and not rooted in anything that warrants creating a complicated system with regard to federal financial aid.

Revised Policy

Please note that the following contains bold/italicized text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text.

42-23 Credit Requirements by Types of Instruction

Course credit by instruction may be achieved by a variety of educational experiences that allow the student to work toward mastery of the course objectives. There are, **To be in compliance with the Federal definition of a credit hour used for the purpose of awarding Federal student aid**, however, some common minimum requirements that must be established and these should be consistent for all credit earned by instruction regardless of delivery method. With the acknowledged goal of educational excellence, more than the minimum established here may be required for mastery of course objectives.

1. The course must be in the charge of a qualified member of the University’s instructional staff, and formal evaluation of the student’s achievement must be included in the course.
2. For the typical student, a total of forty (40) **forty-five (45)** hours of work planned and arranged by the University faculty is required to gain 1 credit.

The distribution of time between class activities and outside preparation may vary from course to course and examples of this division of time for sample types of instruction are detailed below. This is intended to include all forms of educational experiences in courses, which may include in-person, electronic, or pre-recorded content delivered through resident, on-line, or hybrid instruction.

**Lecture, Discussion, Seminar, or Recitation.** A combination of formal and informal instruction may occur and when combined with outside preparation must sum to the minimum of **forty (40) forty-five (45)**
hours of work per credit hour. The typical distribution of time is approximately one-third instruction and two-thirds outside preparation.

**Laboratory Courses.** The distribution of time may vary from twenty-five (25) to forty (40) to forty-five (45) hours of laboratory instruction per credit with sufficient additional outside preparation.

**Undergraduate theses, projects, service learning, individualized instruction, and other forms of educational experience through courses.** At least forty (40) to forty-five (45) hours of work are required per credit with varying amounts of individual instruction and may include courses delivered off-campus at locations either domestic or abroad.

**Student Teaching and Internships.** At least forty (40) to forty-five (45) hours of work are required per credit. Prior written approval of the appropriate University faculty is required for subsequent granting of credit.

---
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GRADUATING WITH DISTINCTION AND HONORS

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate (and development of procedures when applicable)

Introduction
Currently, Penn State University baccalaureate and associate degree candidates gradeate with “With Highest Distinction,” “With High Distinction,” and “With Distinction.” These levels of distinction are not well known to those outside of Penn State.

Discussion and Rationale
People outside of Penn State do not have a frame of reference for the current levels of distinction (e.g., With Highest Distinction, With High Distinction, and With Distinction) since they are not commonly used outside of Penn State. Switching to the Latin terms would bring Penn State in sync with the terminology used nationally, thereby making it easier for people to understand the level of academic distinction a student has earned. The use of the standard terminology to indicate the level of academic distinction that a student has earned would benefit students as they apply to graduate or professional school or as they look for employment.

Recommendations
The following updates would be made to policy 88-30: Summa cum Laude would replace “With Highest Distinction.” Magna cum Laude would replace “With High Distinction,” and Cum Laude would replace “With Distinction.”

Revised Policy/Policies

88-30 Graduation with Distinction

Distinction at graduation shall be awarded to those baccalaureate degree candidates of the graduating class according to the following rule. The top 12 percent of the baccalaureate degree candidates from any college shall be eligible to graduate with distinction if they have achieved at least a grade-point average of 3.50, based on at least 60 credits at the University. The 12 percent should be divided into 2 percent, Summa cum Laude, “With Highest Distinction,” 4 percent Magna cum Laude, “With High Distinction,” and 6 percent “With Distinction.” Cum Laude.

Distinction at graduation shall be awarded to those associate degree candidates of the graduating class according to the following rule. The top 12 percent of the associate degree candidates from any college shall be eligible to graduate with distinction if they have achieved at least a grade-point average of 3.50, based on at least 30 credits at the University. The 12 percent should be divided into 2 percent, Summa cum Laude, “With Highest Distinction,” 4 percent Magna cum Laude, “With High Distinction,” and 6 percent “With Distinction.” Cum Laude.
Distinction at graduation shall be awarded to those baccalaureate degree candidates of the graduating class according to the following rule. The top 12 percent of the baccalaureate degree candidates from any college shall be eligible to graduate with distinction if they have achieved at least a grade-point average of 3.50, based on at least 60 credits at the University. The 12 percent should be divided into 2 percent, Summa cum Laude, 4 percent Magna cum Laude, and 6 percent Cum Laude.

Distinction at graduation shall be awarded to those associate degree candidates of the graduating class according to the following rule. The top 12 percent of the associate degree candidates from any college shall be eligible to graduate with distinction if they have achieved at least a grade-point average of 3.50, based on at least 30 credits at the University. The 12 percent should be divided into 2 percent, Summa cum Laude, 4 percent Magna cum Laude, and 6 percent Cum Laude.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revision to Bylaws, Article II, Section 1 (Senate Council)

(Legislate)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

At one time, all changes in Unit Constitutions were reviewed by the entire Senate Council. However, in March of 1992 that process was changed in order to streamline such reviews; responsibility and authority were delegated to a subcommittee of the Council. Language in the Bylaws relative to this functioning subcommittee is currently relatively general, providing minimal guidance on practice. The purpose of the legislation proposed here is to provide more specificity and guidance for the future by detailing a process that has evolved and is currently working well.

The proposed language appears in bold. Deletions are indicated by strike-throughs.

Section 1

Duties:

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

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

(c) It shall provide a mechanism for Council members’ review of all legislative, forensic, advisory/consultative, and informational reports submitted for the Senate Agenda. If Council determines the report is adequately prepared, it will be submitted to the Senate Agenda with the following options:
   1. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda for presentation and discussion.
   2. Place an informational report, mandated or otherwise, on the Senate Agenda only for the purposes of dissemination to the Senate and University community. Decision on whether an item is to be placed on the Agenda for full Senate discussion is to be based on whether a report is adequately prepared and documented.

(d) It shall advise, upon consultation with appropriate Senate committees, the President and Executive Vice President and Provost of the University on the establishment, reorganization, or discontinuation of organizational units and areas of the University that
involve two or more teaching, research, and continuing education functions (whether or not delegation of authority exists). Such advice should be given before official action is taken.

(e) It shall recommend to the Senate the delegation of a standing Constitution Subcommittee with authority and responsibility to carry out specific legislative, advisory and consultative functions relative to properly organized faculty organizations. It shall maintain criteria and guidelines for such delegation and review approved organizations at appropriate intervals. These functions include review of Unit Constitutions, Bylaws and Standing Rules. The subcommittee will consist of two Council members appointed by the Senate Chair and the Senate Parliamentarian and will be chaired by the Senate Secretary.

(f) In coordination with the University administration, it shall represent the Senate in seeking information from officials and agencies external to the University especially those who establish policies and control resources affecting University academic programs. It shall advise the University administration on external government legislation and other external issues that may have impact on the University. It shall advise the Senate on the preparation of statements on such matters. It shall be the Senate advisory body to the University on public and alumni relations, public information, general publications and private fundraising. The Chair shall be the spokesperson for the Council in these matters.

The External Matters Subcommittee is a standing subcommittee of Senate Council that will be charged to deal with issues external to the University. The subcommittee will consist of at least five Council members together with appropriate additional elected faculty senators and resource personnel and will be chaired by the Immediate Past Chair of the Senate. A majority of the subcommittee will be councilors with at least two members from locations other than University Park. The members of the External Matters Subcommittee will serve terms of two years, and may complete the second year of the term even in cases where they are no longer a member of Senate Council.

(g) It shall serve as an advisory body to the Senate officers and the Senate as a whole.

(h) In the event that the Chair of the Senate declares existence of a situation of special Senate concern, the Senate Council shall be empowered to act for the Senate in all matters until this authority is terminated by actions of the Senate.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

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

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

Rationale:

Articulation agreements are put into place as jointly sponsored agreements between Penn State (specifically, individual units of the University) and other higher education institutions. In April of 2011, as part of its Policies and Rules for Undergraduate Students (06-20)\(^1\), the Faculty Senate specified that such agreements

must have a renewal date (no later than five years beyond the initial date of the agreement) at which time the agreement is to be reviewed and either continued or terminated….This five-year review is to be done internally by the sponsoring academic unit and reported to the Senate Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid (ARSSA) or the Graduate Council, as appropriate.

Subsequently, in March of 2015, the University Faculty Senate found the “Faculty Senate process for both original and revised/renewed agreements” to be “somewhat ambiguous and unstructured”\(^2\); at that time, no reviews had yet been submitted—although some had been in place for more than 50 years. Therefore, the Senate voted to create a subcommittee of the Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid (ARSSA) to assume responsibility for articulation agreement reviews. Subsequent subcommittee experience has indicated that: 1) the subcommittee’s work would be facilitated if the review process were better detailed, and 2) it would be helpful for a member of the Office of Global Programs to be added to the subcommittee to inform review of international articulation agreements. In addition, the titles of administrators to be engaged in the process have changed, so that the language of the policy requires an update. For these reasons, the following revisions are proposed.

Bold type indicates new wording; strikethroughs indicate deleted wording.

\(^1\) http://senate.psu.edu/policies-and-rules-for-undergraduate-students/06-20-articulation-agreements/
\(^2\) http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/march-17-2015-agenda/appendix-d/
(i) At least ten elected faculty senators
(ii) One undergraduate student senator
(iii) Executive Director for Undergraduate Admissions*
(iv) The University Registrar*
(v) The Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Director for Student Aid*

2. Selection: By the Committee on Committees and Rules

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

4. Standing Subcommittee on Articulation

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

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

Articulation Agreement submissions will include:

For New Submissions:

1. A cover memo stating what is included
2. The new proposal/agreement which includes:
• information about the partner institution(s),
• rationale for the agreement,
• statistics on the number of students to be impacted by the agreement,
• the processes for admission, advising, and orientation;
• guidelines for renewal or termination; and information about the transfer and evaluation of courses.

The proposal should also include

• the ACUE prospectus memo,
• evidence of consultation with relevant units at Penn State, and
• a draft Memorandum of Agreement that will be signed after final approvals are secured.

For Renewal:

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

For Revision/Termination of Agreement:

1. A cover memo
2. The former proposal/agreement with addendum noting changes to the proposal/agreement
3. Statistics on the number of students participating since initial approval or last review.
4. A draft Memorandum of Agreement if an update and new signatures are required.
5. For termination, an explanation of the reason for discontinuation and plan for phase out.

Revision/Termination of Agreement:

1. A cover memo
2. The former proposal/agreement with addendum noting changes to the proposal/agreement
3. Statistics on the number of students participating since initial approval or last review.
4. A draft Memorandum of Agreement if an update and new signatures are required.
5. For termination, an explanation of the reason for discontinuation and plan for phase out.

Five Year Review:
A cover memo stating from sponsoring unit what is included
The agreement for review

Statistics on the number of students involved per year and the number of students completing their degree through the agreement.

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

Each year the Office of Undergraduate Education will provide to the Senate Office, a list of agreements that require five-year review. The Senate Office will forward all new or revised articulation agreements as well as agreements that are being renewed or subject to five year review to ARSSA. Upon completion of each review, ARSSA will forward its review and recommendation to the Office of Undergraduate Education for approval, if warranted. The Senate Office will provide an annual overview to subcommittee members on policies and workflow procedures on the articulation process.

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

*nonsvoting unless Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws applies
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Revision to the Standing Rules, Article III, Section 7(b) Faculty Athletics Representatives (other than University Park)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the Senate

Introduction

Recently outdated wording in this Standing Rule was identified. The existing wording reflects a situation that no longer exists. The purpose of this legislation is to bring the wording of the Standing Rule into alignment with the current situation. Strikethroughs indicate deleted wording. Bold indicates new wording.

(b) Faculty Athletics Representatives (other than University Park) shall be appointed by the chancellor of each campus that participates in any National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) programs following nomination by the campus faculty organization, to act for the faculty of that campus. The Penn State University Athletic Conference (PSUAC) should use the same process to appoint a Faculty Athletics Representative for all Penn State locations that participate in two-year intercollegiate athletic programs. The Faculty Athletics Representatives shall be tenured full-time Penn State faculty members from their respective campuses.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS
Revision to HR21 Definition of Academic Ranks
(Advisory/Consultative)
Implementation: Upon approval by the President

Introduction

HR21, “Definition of Academic Ranks,” states: Colleges should have their own guidelines for distinguishing between lecturer and senior lecturer or instructor and senior instructor positions, or for promoting from one rank to the other, but all units should operate under the following University assumptions:

1. Although there can be exceptions, the senior lecturer and senior instructor positions are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer before consideration for promotion.

2. The promotion from instructor to senior instructor or from lecturer to senior lecturer should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.

3. The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by both a campus department faculty committee and the Director of Academic Affairs or department/division head, and the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.

Rationale

As this committee noted in our Advisory and Consultative Report on voting rights with regard to the selection of tenure and review committees, “there are no grounds for FT faculty to be involved in the determination of the composition of tenure and promotion committees…. By contrast, it is vitally important that FT faculty be permitted to participate in university governance with regard to matters pertaining to FT faculty.” Removed at Senate meeting.

If HR21 is to provide definitive guidance for the review and possible promotion of FT faculty, it needs to stipulate explicitly that Fixed-Term Review Committees must be
established for the assessment of FT faculty. And it is imperative that HR21 specify the role of FT faculty in selecting Fixed-Term Review Committees.

HR23, “Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations,” sets a minimum threshold for the size of tenure and promotion committees: “the faculty of the unit concerned should determine the size of the review committee, but in no case should a review committee consist of fewer than three members.” We suggest that this standard should apply to Fixed-Term Review Committees as well, though we recommend committees of five members.

Some units at Penn State have already established a procedure for the review and promotion of FT faculty. In the Applied Research Lab (ARL), research faculty have a career pathway (Research Associate to Senior Research Associate to Senior Scientist) that mirrors the ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor. Faculty in these ranks do not have tenure, but they do have a “standing” position, and it is assumed that the positions are permanent (assuming budget stability). Within this 50-year practice at ARL, such positions have only been terminated a few times. In addition to the permanence of these faculty lines, there is a formal, prescribed process for promotion (based on publications, grants received, contributions to the profession, etc.) that is very similar to the P&T review process: candidates assemble a dossier, obtain internal and external letters of recommendation, and an internal ARL promotion committee reviews the materials. At the Senior Scientist level, these dossiers are sent to the University P&T review committee. Moreover, these ARL faculty can obtain graduate faculty status (via a cooperating academic unit) and serve on graduate committees.

In June 2015, the College of Engineering received a committee report on “Fixed-Term Faculty Career Management Guidelines” from a committee charged by Dean Amr Elnashai and chaired by Phillip Savage. That report proposed multiple career tracks for fixed-term faculty members: a Teaching Track, a Research Track, a Professor of Practice Track, and an Engineering Professor Track, each with definitions and requirements for entry-level rank, intermediate rank, and highest rank. The report also laid out procedures for performance reviews, salary increases, and promotions in all tracks—and noted that it “recommends the use of academic ranks (principal lecturer, assistant and associate professor of practice, and engineering professor ranks) that are not currently listed in HR21” (pp. 9-10).

Some of our peer institutions in the CIC have moved in this direction as well (See appendices). In August 2015, Inside Higher Ed reported that Northwestern’s recently adopted system for reviews and promotion of non-tenure-track faculty has met with significant success:

A year after Northwestern University’s Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences introduced new titles for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members, along with
longer contracts and clearer paths to promotion, proponents say the system has helped them recruit quality teachers and attracted outside interest.

Formerly various ranks of lecturer, Weinberg’s full-time, non-tenure-track faculty members are now “professors of instruction” at the assistant, associate and full levels. Proponents say the titles better communicate to those within Northwestern that this is a career path, and to those outside of Northwestern exactly what the job entails.¹

Michigan State University has ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor for FT faculty, as do Wisconsin and Rutgers; Minnesota’s ranks are identical but are titled “teaching instructor,” “teaching assistant professor,” “teaching associate professor,” and “teaching professor.” Iowa has similar ranks for clinical faculty, and Purdue and Nebraska have assistant, associate, and full professors of practice.

Recommendation
The Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations propose revising one section of HR21 as follows. Bold indicates new wording.

FIXED-TERM RANKS AND TITLES:

Ranks and titles vary among units for faculty in fixed-term positions; most units use the titles of instructor, lecturer, or senior lecturer; some may use the professorial ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor, or assistant librarian, associate librarian, and librarian. Units should have clear rationale of the different ranks and titles they choose to use and their expectations for faculty to achieve these various ranks.

Rather than use the titles "lecturer" and "instructor" interchangeably for fixed-term appointments, each college should determine for itself which of the two titles it chooses to use, and then use that title consistently for such appointments.

Colleges should have their own guidelines for distinguishing between lecturer and senior lecturer or instructor and senior instructor positions, for designating a third rank beyond that of senior lecturer or instructor, and for promoting from one rank to the other, but all units should operate under the following University assumptions:

1. **Fixed-Term faculty should become eligible for promotion to the second rank after five years in rank, and would be permitted to compile their promotion dossiers in their fifth year. There should be no fixed time period for promotion to the third rank. Reviews for promotions should be conducted solely with regard to the merit of the candidate.** Although there can be exceptions, the senior lecturer and senior instructor positions are designed to be promotion opportunities, with a recommended period of at least five years in rank as an instructor or lecturer before consideration for promotion.

2. **Reviews for promotion of the full-time fixed-term faculty shall be conducted by Fixed-Term Promotion Review Committees.** Fixed-Term Promotion Review Committees shall be constituted as follows: each of the colleges at University Park shall establish a committee for that college; each of the five stand-alone campuses (Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, Harrisburg) shall establish a committee for that campus; each of the Special Mission Campuses (Great Valley, College of Medicine, and Dickinson Law) shall establish a committee for that campus; and the University College shall establish one committee composed of full-time fixed-term faculty from the campuses within the University College, with no more than one member from any campus. If a unit shall have fewer than seven fixed-term faculty members, at least two members of that unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee shall be drawn from another unit’s Fixed-Term Review Committee. Only full-time fixed-term faculty members in each unit are eligible to serve on and to vote for the members of the review committee in their unit. Only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotions. If there should be insufficient numbers of higher-ranked fixed-term faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost at the request of the academic unit.

3. **The promotion procedure itself should include recommendations by (a) a campus/department faculty committee (b) the DAA or department/division head, and (c) a college level fixed-term promotion review committee with the approval of the campus chancellor and/or dean of the college.**

4. All promotions should be accompanied by a promotion raise, in addition to a merit raise, to be determined and funded by the college.
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MSU Philosophy Department Evaluation
of the Teaching Performance of Fixed-term Faculty

The faculty member must demonstrate excellence in teaching throughout the period of review as determined by the following criteria:

1. content of courses is consistent with course descriptions;
2. courses are well organized, with syllabi and other relevant materials provided to students;
3. courses represent and incorporate current research in the areas taught;²
4. level of difficulty of courses is appropriate for the level and abilities of the students;
5. lectures and discussions are clear, well organized, and informative;
6. evaluation of assignments is responsibly carried out and is explained to the students in a timely fashion and, when appropriate, with written comments;
7. office hours are scheduled and kept;
8. conformity to the Code of Teaching Responsibility.

Evidence that these criteria have been achieved would include syllabi and representative assignments, handouts, exams and presentations used in classes; and student evaluations. Other evidence might include critiques of class visits arranged voluntarily by the faculty member; nominations and awards for excellence in teaching; attendance at workshops, seminars, or conferences on teaching or on areas of philosophy taught by the faculty member; workshops or seminars given to the department or to others about pedagogy or in the areas taught by the applicant; research or publications about pedagogy or the areas taught by the applicant.

² While the position does not require publication of research, MSU is a research university, and our students must be taught by faculty who are current with the literature in the subjects they teach.
Appendix B

Policies Governing FT Faculty Appointments at the University of Chicago

11.2. Other academic appointees. The University also makes academic appointments that are not Faculty appointments, and are for a specified or unspecified length of term. Each of the following appointments shall be made for periods and upon terms consistent with the applicable administrative policies of the University, which are subject to change. No appointments under this section shall be eligible for or carry any implication of indefinite tenure. At the end of the term of appointment, employment by the University ceases unless the appointment is renewed, and the failure to give or receive a notice of termination shall not give rise to any contrary presumptions or implications either as to (1) promotion, or (2) reappointment. These other appointments are as follows:

11.2.1. Clinical appointments in the Division of the Biological Sciences. In the Pritzker School of Medicine, persons engaged in the educational programs of the School may be appointed to one of the following designated positions. Appointments regarding clinical privileges which are made under §11.2.1 shall terminate upon the loss of medical licensure or attending physician privileges, except when the appointee voluntarily relinquishes those privileges upon beginning a medical leave. In such instance where the appointee voluntarily relinquishes attending physician privileges upon beginning a medical leave, the academic appointment shall terminate upon the expiration of the academic appointment or the cessation of medical disability insurance coverage, whichever occurs sooner.

11.2.1.1. Academic Clinical Appointments. Academic clinical appointments shall consist of appointments as Instructor of [Department], Assistant Professor of [Department], Associate Professor of [Department], and Professor of [Department].

11.2.1.2. Clinical Academic Appointments. Clinical academic appointments shall consist of appointments as Clinical Instructor of [Department], Clinical Assistant Professor of [Department], Clinical Associate Professor of [Department], and Clinical Professor of [Department].

11.2.1.3. Clinical Associate Appointments. Appointments may be made as Clinical Associate.
11.2.1.4. Appointments of members of the staff of an affiliated hospital to positions at the University of Chicago will be made in accordance with the University’s academic appointment standards and procedures. Such appointments require the agreement of the affiliated hospital and are subject to continuation of the affiliation agreement between the University of Chicago and the affiliated hospital. An appointment ceases upon the termination of the staff member’s appointment at the affiliated hospital or at the end of the term of the University appointment, whichever occurs first.

11.2.2. Professors from Practice and Clinical Appointments in the Law School. In the Law School, persons engaged in the educational and clinical law programs may be appointed to one of the following designated positions.

11.2.2.1. Clinical Instructors. Appointments as Clinical Instructor shall be made for terms of up to two years. Clinical Instructors shall ordinarily serve in this position for a maximum of four years.

11.2.2.2. Assistant Clinical Professors. Appointments as Assistant Clinical Professor shall be made for terms of up to three years. Assistant Clinical Professors shall ordinarily serve in this position for a maximum of six years.

11.2.2.3. Associate Clinical Professors. Appointments as Associate Clinical Professor shall be made for terms of up to three years. Associate Clinical Professors shall ordinarily serve in this position for a maximum of six years.

11.2.2.4. Clinical Professors. Appointments as Clinical Professor shall be made for terms of up to five years, which may be renewed with no limits on the number of terms.

11.2.2.5. Adjunct Professor from Practice. Part-time and visiting appointments as Adjunct Professor from Practice shall be made for terms of up to five years, which may be renewed with no limits on the number of terms.

11.2.2.6. Professor from Practice. Appointments as Professor from Practice shall be made for terms of up to five years, which may be renewed with no limits on the number of terms.

11.2.3. Clinical and Adjunct Appointments in the Booth School of Business. In the Booth School of Business, persons engaged in the educational programs of the School may be appointed to one of the following positions.

11.2.3.1. Adjunct Assistant Professor of [Area]. Appointments as Adjunct Assistant Professor shall be made for terms of up to five years. These
appointments may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms, though an adjunct assistant professor shall ordinarily serve in this position for no longer than six years.

11.2.3.2. Adjunct Associate Professor of [Area]. Appointments as Adjunct Associate Professor shall be made for terms of up to five years. These appointments may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms, though an adjunct assistant professor shall ordinarily serve in this position for no longer than six years.

11.2.3.3. Adjunct Professor of [Area]. Appointments as Adjunct Professor shall be made for terms of up to five years. These appointments may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.3.4. Clinical Assistant Professor of [Area]. Appointments as Clinical Assistant Professor shall be made for terms of up to five years. These appointments may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms, though a clinical assistant professor shall ordinarily serve in this position for no longer than six years.

11.2.3.5. Clinical Associate Professor of [Area]. Appointments as Clinical Associate Professor shall be made for terms of up to five years. These appointments may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms, though an clinical associate professor shall ordinarily serve in this position for no longer than six years.

11.2.3.6. Clinical Professor of [Area]. Appointments as Clinical Professor shall be made for terms of up to five years. These appointments may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.4. Research Associates, and Lecturers. Research Associates are classified as follows: Research Associate (Professor), Research Associate (Associate Professor), Senior Scientist, Senior Research Associate, Research Scientist, Research Associate (Assistant Professor), Research Associate (Instructor), and Research Associate. Lecturers are classified as follows: Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.

11.2.5. Field Work Personnel. In the School of Social Service Administration appointments may be made to the following additional positions: Field Work Professor, Field Work Associate Professor, Field Work Assistant Professor, and Field Work Instructor. Additionally, in the School of Social Service Administration, appointments may be made to the positions of Senior Clinical Associate and Clinical Associate.

11.2.6. University Librarians. On the nomination of the Director of the Library, appointments may be made to the position: Librarian.
11.2.7. Professors of Practice in the Arts in the Division of the Humanities. In the Division of the Humanities and the College, persons whose responsibilities are for instruction and instruction-related activities in the performing and creative arts programs may be appointed to one of the following positions.

11.2.7.1. Assistant Professor of Practice in the Arts. Appointments as Assistant Professor of Practice in the Arts in the Division of the Humanities and the College shall be made for terms of up to three years and may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms, though an Assistant Professor of Practice in the Arts shall ordinarily serve in this position for no longer than a total of six years.

11.2.7.2. Associate Professor of Practice in the Arts. Appointments as Associate Professor of Practice in the Arts in the Division of the Humanities and the College shall be made for terms of up to five years and may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.7.3. Professor of Practice in the Arts. Appointments as Professor of Practice in the Arts in the Division of the Humanities and the College shall be made for terms of up to five years and may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.8. Adjunct and Clinical Appointments in the Division of the Physical Sciences. In the Division of the Physical Sciences, persons whose responsibility is in the practice oriented master’s degree programs may be appointed to one of the following positions. All such appointments shall end either with the end of the practice oriented master’s degree program or with the end of the appointee’s affiliation with the program. Clinical appointments shall end either with the end of the practice oriented master’s degree program or with the end of the appointee’s affiliation with the program.

11.2.8.1. Adjunct Instructor. Part-time appointments as Adjunct Instructor of [Area] shall be made for terms of up to two years, renewable for a maximum of four years in the aggregate.

11.2.8.2. Adjunct Assistant Professor. Part-time appointments as Adjunct Assistant Professor of [Area] shall be made for terms up to five years, which may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms, although an adjunct assistant professor shall ordinarily serve in this position for no longer than six years.

11.2.8.3. Adjunct Associate Professor. Part-time appointments as Adjunct Associate Professor of [Area] shall be made for terms up to five years, which may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms, although an adjunct
assistant professor shall ordinarily serve in this position for no longer than six years.

11.2.8.4. Adjunct Professor. Part-time appointments as Adjunct Professor of [Area] shall be made for terms up to five years, which may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.8.5. Assistant Clinical Professor. Part-time appointments as Assistant Clinical Professor of [Area] shall be made for terms up to five years, which may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.8.6. Associate Clinical Professor. Part-time appointments as Associate Clinical Professor of [Area] shall be made for terms up to five years, which may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.8.7. Clinical Professor. Part-time appointments as Clinical Professor of [Area] shall be made for terms up to five years, which may be renewed with no limit on the number of terms.

11.2.9. Clinical Appointments in the Division of the Social Sciences. In the Division of the Social Sciences, persons whose responsibility is in the practice oriented master’s degree programs may be appointed to one of the following positions.

11.2.9.1. Assistant Clinical Professor. Appointments as Assistant Clinical Professor shall be made for terms of up to three years. In the last year of the term of the appointment, a faculty committee designated by the Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences shall review the record of each Assistant Clinical Professor and recommend to the Dean one of three dispositions: 1) appointment for an additional term of up to three years as Assistant Clinical Professor; 2) promotion to Associate Clinical Professor; or 3) termination at the end of the last year of the term. The Assistant Clinical Professor shall be given notice of the decision not later than January 15.

11.2.9.2. Associate Clinical Professor. Appointments as Associate Clinical Professor shall be made for terms of up to three years. In the last year of the term of the appointment, a faculty committee designated by the Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences shall review the record of each Assistant Clinical Professor and recommend to the Dean one of three dispositions: a) appointment for an additional term of up to three years as Associate Clinical Professor; b) promotion to Clinical Professor; or c) termination at the end of the last year of the term. The Assistant Clinical Professor shall be given notice of the decision not later than January 15.
11.2.9.3. Clinical Professor. Appointments as Clinical Professor shall be made for terms of indefinite length, which may be terminated only after notice of termination has been given one year in advance of such termination.

11.2.10. Persons with appropriate academic qualifications may be appointed as Associates or Visiting Scholars in Departments, Schools, or the College, or the Institute for Molecular Engineering.
## Fixed-Term Ranks at CIC and Peer Institutions

### CIC Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Titles for NTT Teaching Faculty</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Professor of Practice (only for new, highly qualified hires)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/AcademicAppointments.pdf">www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/AcademicAppointments.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>Instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/FixedTermAppt.htm">www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/FixedTermAppt.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>Various. Assistant Professor of Instruction/Practice, Associate Professor of Instruction/Practice, Professor of Instruction/Practice; Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.northwestern.edu/hr/managers-Universityadministrators/fasis-administrator-tools/fasis-documentation/FASISManual.pdf">http://www.northwestern.edu/hr/managers-Universityadministrators/fasis-administrator-tools/fasis-documentation/FASISManual.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Lecturer, Senior Lecturer (no promotion path to professorial track)</td>
<td>oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Clinical Professor</td>
<td>“Clinical/Professional Faculty is a promotable, but non-tenure track, faculty classification. These individuals provide education and/or supervision of Students engaged in clinical and professional practice. Clinical/Professional Faculty may carry the title clinical professor, professor of practice or teaching professor. Each school may choose the appropriate title for their Clinical/Professional Faculty.” <a href="http://www.purdue.edu/policies/human-resources/vif10.html">www.purdue.edu/policies/human-resources/vif10.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Faculty Titles</td>
<td>Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rutgers University               | Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor           | [www.academicappointmentsmanual.rutgers.edu/recruit/nttofer.shtml](www.academicappointmentsmanual.rutgers.edu/recruit/nttofer.shtml)
                      |                                                                                | [www.academicappointmentsmanual.rutgers.edu/promotions/promoreappt.shtml](www.academicappointmentsmanual.rutgers.edu/promotions/promoreappt.shtml) |
| University of Illinois           | Instructor, Senior Instructor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor | “Other academic” positions “often singularly focused on either the teaching or the research mission of the University. These individuals perform specialized functions and their scope of work is more specific than their tenure-system peers.” (“Employment Guidelines for Specialized Faculty Holding Non-Tenure System Positions,” Communication No. 25, Office of the Provost. provost.illinois.edu/communication/25/ProvostCommNo25_SpecializedFaculty.pdf.) |
| University of Iowa               | Clinical faculty: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor | “Consistent with the University’s need to retain the flexibility to adjust its programs to meet the changing needs of students and society.” (20.9 Clinical Track Policy, www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/10.htm) |
| University of Maryland           | Lecturer, Senior Lecturer                                                     | [faculty.umd.edu/policies/ntt_titles.html](faculty.umd.edu/policies/ntt_titles.html) |
| University of Michigan           | Lecturer I, Lecturer II, Lecturer III, Lecturer IV                           | [www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/](www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/) |
                      | Adjunct Series: Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Lecturer; Intermittent Lecturer |                                                                 |
| University of Minnesota          | Teaching Instructor, Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, Teaching Professor | [www.housing.umn.edu/assets/pdfs/ohr_53518.pdf](www.housing.umn.edu/assets/pdfs/ohr_53518.pdf) |
| University of Nebraska-Lincoln   | Lecturer, Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice | [svcaa.unl.edu/searches-appointments/faculty-titles](svcaa.unl.edu/searches-appointments/faculty-titles) |
| University of Wisconsin-Madison   | Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor               | “On our campus, some professional schools have made use of titles such as clinical professor and |
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professor (CHS) to recognize the high professional achievements of colleagues whose main activities do not merit tenure under our current tenure system but whose contributions are absolutely essential to the success of the school. In other professional schools, hiring is hindered by inability to call a highly qualified instructional academic staff person a teaching professor.” (University of Wisconsin Faculty Document 1489 Madison 6 March 2000. “University Committee Recommendations to create three new honorific titles for academic staff and to amend Faculty Policies and Procedures 5.22.” www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2000/0306/1489.pdf and www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/fpp/Chapter_1.htm.

Non-CIC Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Colorado</th>
<th>Instructor, Senior Instructor, Lecturer; Scholar in Residence; Artist in Residence</th>
<th><a href="http://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-51-policy-approved-faculty-titles">www.cu.edu/regents/policy-51-policy-approved-faculty-titles</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Junior Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor</td>
<td>sites.jhu.edu/council/titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Associate Teaching Professor is limited to distinguished faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Lecturer, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Associate Professor of the Practice, Professor of the Practice</td>
<td>facultyaffairsprovost.duke.edu/titles.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Professor of Pedagogy/Practice/Performance</td>
<td>college.emory.edu/home/administration/policy/licenturer.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td>Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cmu.edu/policies/documents/Lecturers.html">www.cmu.edu/policies/documents/Lecturers.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointments to the position of Assistant Teaching Professor are for terms of three years. Initial appointment as, or promotion to, Associate Teaching Professor is also for a three-year term, but subsequent reappointments as Associate Teaching Professor are for five-year terms. Appointments as Teaching Professor are for five-year terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Changes to Family Leave Provisions in HR23 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations)

(Advisory and Consultative)

Implementation: Upon approval by the President

Rationale

When it was first implemented, the HR23 provision that allows tenure-line faculty to stop the tenure clock was an important acknowledgment of how critical life events might affect faculty on the tenure track. However, this policy is now outdated and needs to be revised. The following revisions will help Penn State University be compliant with current recommendations for work-life balance policies at research universities. The revisions include: (1) changing the one-year limit on stopping the tenure clock to two years, (2) adding foster care to the list of events that can warrant a stay of the tenure clock, (3) adding non-discrimination language (to the effect that faculty shall not be evaluated differently because they obtained a stoppage of the tenure clock), and (4) stipulating that instructions for internal and external reviewers must include non-discrimination language, and advising reviewers that the criteria for promotion and tenure are the same for all faculty, regardless of the length of their probationary period. These revisions follow current best practices for promoting work-life balance, gender equity, and a family-friendly environment in higher education.

1. Number of times the tenure clock can be stopped

Penn State University adopted its current family leave policy (codified in HRG 11) in 2004. It allows the University’s non-unionized employees up to 12 work weeks of unpaid leave in any 12-month period, with exceptions to be granted on a case-by-case basis. The major limiting principle employed here is the amount of requested leave in any 12-month period, with no other limitations placed on the employee over a longer term. By contrast, HR23 imposes a default limit of a single stay of the tenure clock during the faculty member’s probationary period. The current policy states:

Upon the written request of a faculty member, the Executive Vice President and Provost may grant a temporary staying of the tenure provisional period, if in his/her judgment, the academic performance of the provisional faculty member would be adversely affected by: the responsibility as primary care giver after the birth or adoption of a child, a serious personal illness, the provision of care for a seriously ill family member, or any similar situation. This special exception would be for one academic year for a provisional faculty member seeking tenure, and would normally be granted only once. During this period the faculty member would not be evaluated according to the tenure guidelines, and the year would not be counted toward the provisional period.

There are several reasons the policy should explicitly permit more than one stay of the tenure clock during the provisional period. First, experts on work-life balance and gender equity in academe recommend allowing more than one tenure clock extension.1 Accordingly, many major research universities now al-

---

low tenure-line faculty to stop the tenure clock more than once. For example, Effective Policies and Programs for Retention and Advancement of Women in Academia highlights the following policy exemplars:

At the **University of Minnesota**, faculty members may stop the tenure clock for one year for each childbirth, adoption, or foster care placement. They may also stop the clock twice to respond to family members with serious health conditions.

The **University of Chicago** allows faculty members a one-year extension of the tenure clock for the birth/adoption of each child – with no limit on the number of times the policy may be used. For family care-giving responsibilities, a faculty member can request a one-time term extension on their tenure clock.

At **Duke University**, a maximum of three years of tenure clock relief is extended for a number of reasons beyond birth or adoption of a child including personal illness; illness of a parent, partner or child; a house fire or other catastrophic residential property losses; or heavy administrative duties. The stop-the-clock policies apply to men and women. The university reports that both sexes take advantage of them and that no stigma for taking advantage of the policies is tolerated. (pp. 5-6, emphasis added)

Big Ten institutions have the following policies on the maximum number of times faculty can stop the tenure clock (one stop = one year):

- “ordinarily” 1 time (Indiana)
- 1 time (Purdue; policy is ambiguous, may allow more than 1 stop)
- 2 times (Maryland, Northwestern, Rutgers) or “ordinarily” 2 times (Illinois)
- 2 times for childbirth/adoption and/or dependent care; additional stops allowed for other reasons (Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State)
- 3 times (Ohio State)
- Wisconsin automatically approves a 1-year stop for each birth/adoption (we could locate no stated upper limit, although one may exist) and up to 1 year for significant elder or dependent care obligations and other circumstances.
- Nebraska appears to have no stated limit, although one may exist.

Note that “ordinarily” suggests that exceptions may be granted at Indiana and Illinois.

In sum, all Big Ten institutions except for Penn State, Indiana, and possibly Purdue have implemented the best practice of allowing more than one stay of the tenure clock.

Second, it is unreasonable to think that only one maternity, adoption, serious personal illness, or other critical life event during the provisional period would be the norm. There are several reasons that the one-time limit on stopping the tenure clock is likely to disproportionately harm women faculty:

In general, the literature suggests that while men and women as professionals, partners, and parents struggle with the task of achieving a balance between work and family life, the challenge for women is greater than for men, given the simple logistics of the biological clock, the tenure clock, the physical demands of pregnancy and childbirth, the gendered expectations of family obligations, and the ongoing disparity with which women take on the “second shift” through maintenance of children and home. (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004, p. 236)<sup>2</sup>

---

In addition, the current policy disadvantages any professor—male or female—who has the misfortune of experiencing more than one critical life event that adversely affects his or her academic performance. Diseases, serious injuries and accidents, mental health crises, disasters, deaths of loved ones, and elder and dependent care responsibilities don’t follow the timing of the tenure clock. Currently, faculty who stop the clock once have to hope that no significant hardship will befall them or a close family member for the remainder of their probationary period.

Third, the current wording, dictating that the stay of the tenure clock “normally would be granted only once,” heightens the chances of bias avoidance, defined by former Penn State professors Robert Drago and Carol Colbeck as “behaviors designed to escape potential career penalties associated with caregiving commitments” (p. 1223). Bias avoidance helps explain why some faculty at research universities—especially women—do not utilize existing work-family policies such as stopping the tenure clock. HR23’s normative language implies that faculty who request more than one stoppage may appear less productive and committed than those who stay within the limit. Removing the normative language addresses this problem by reducing the stigma of stopping the tenure clock more than once.

Two forms of bias avoidance discussed by Drago and other scholars are relevant here: (1) not asking to stop the tenure clock for a new child and (2) having fewer children than one wants. Drago et al. found that women faculty in their large (N = 4,188), national sample were significantly more likely than men to engage in these (and other) types of bias avoidance. Specifically, 18% of women vs. 15% of men did not stop the tenure clock even though it would have helped them (p < .05). Surveys of faculty at the Universities of Michigan and California showed that 42% and 48% of women faculty, respectively, did not stop the clock even though they could have—primarily due to fear of negative repercussions for their careers.

A related concern is that this normative language may discourage women faculty from considering having another child, even though tenure often overlaps with their prime childbearing years. For instance, 26% of women versus 13% of men in Drago et al.’s study reported that to achieve academic success, they had fewer children than they wanted (p < .01). The University of California Faculty Work and Family Survey (N = 3,483) reported even higher figures for this item: 38% of women compared to 18% of men. The 2010 Commission for Women report, “Work-Family Balance at Penn State,” which was based on focus groups with faculty and staff in 2008-09, found that faculty “voiced concerns that the leave policy does not stop the clock for a second child.” This results in an unfair burden on women faculty, who continue to bear disproportionate responsibility for childcare and other types of caretaking.

In sum, the tenure clock system was not originally designed to allow flexibility for faculty who have significant caretaking responsibilities or who experience serious personal illness or other critical life events that interfere with scholarly productivity. Increasing the number of times the tenure clock can be stopped will enable tenure-line faculty at PSU to continue working toward tenure while also fulfilling their caregiving commitments and responding to unexpected, adverse life circumstances during the probationary period.

2. Foster children

---


6 [http://equity.psu.edu/cfw/docs/work_family_balance_psu_09.pdf](http://equity.psu.edu/cfw/docs/work_family_balance_psu_09.pdf) (p. 17)
Currently, HR23 does not allow tenure-line faculty to stop the tenure clock if they become foster parents. Many of our peer research universities (e.g., University of Minnesota) include foster care, along with adoption, in the list of permissible reasons for stopping the tenure clock. Similar time commitments and efforts are required of foster parents with the placement of a new child in the home as with childbirth or adoption. There is no reasonable justification for not extending the opportunity to stop the tenure clock to new foster parents.

The leave policy for Penn State employees (Guideline 11 – Family and Medical Leave) includes foster children under the section on “leave other than for birth or adoption”:

For purposes of this section, the definition of child shall include a biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child for which an employee is standing in loco parentis, who is under 18, or over 18 and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability.

Upon request, a leave shall be granted if a child is placed with the employee for foster care (within one year of placement) or if a child has a serious health condition and the employee is needed to care for such child.7 (emphasis added)

The recognition of foster care as a legitimate reason for granting family leave to an employee suggests that it should also be an allowable reason for tenure-line faculty to stop the tenure clock.

3. Non-discrimination language

Without explicit instructions for internal and external tenure reviewers, even the best tenure clock policy may not protect faculty from biased or inaccurate evaluation. The first problem is bias:

[S]ome participants in the tenure evaluation (tenure committee members, external reviewers, department chairs, deans, and provosts) view a probationary professor’s decision to stop the clock as a signal that the professor is not committed to meeting the demands of academic work. The mere decision to stop the clock causes some reviewers to negatively evaluate some or all of the tenure candidate’s work record. (Thornton, 2005, p. 85)

Second, tenure reviewers may consciously or unconsciously hold faculty who stop the clock to a higher standard, measuring their productivity by the number of years since they were hired rather than the number of years the tenure clock was running. “For example, taking eight instead of seven years to tenure may suggest to uninformed internal and external evaluators that the faculty member should have an extra year’s worth of research productivity” (Smith & Waltman, 2006, p. 13). Reviewers should not expect an additional year of scholarly activity for each extra year the tenure clock was stopped or comment on any perceived lack of productivity during those year(s).

Research evidence reveals widespread problems with how review committees evaluate faculty who stop the tenure clock and the instructions they do (or do not) receive for evaluating these candidates. For instance, a Center for Business and Economic Research survey of economics department chairs in the U.S. and Canada from 2004 to 2009 (about 175-200 survey respondents per year) showed that “only 25-50 percent of survey respondents, in any given year, report that tenure committees are given correct instructions on how to evaluate a tenure candidate who elected to stop the tenure clock.”8 In the remaining cases, reviewers were “instructed, incorrectly, to evaluate the tenure candidate based on the total number of

---

7 https://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hrg11.html
years the person was on probation – as if the clock had never been stopped” or they were given no “specific instruction on how to evaluate the performance of a probationary faculty member who stopped the clock” (p. 13).

Thornton summarized the problem thus:

If tenure review committees are not given correct instructions regarding how to evaluate the record of a probationary professor, it doesn’t matter if the tenure clock policies are formal or informal, if there are limits to the number of times that the policies can be used, or even what the utilization rates are. Improper implementation of the policy subverts its likely effectiveness and consequently the likely utilization of the policies. (p. 13)

To discourage biased or inaccurate assessment, experts recommend (1) adding non-discrimination language to the tenure clock policy and (2) stipulating in the policy that all reviewers must receive proper instructions for evaluating the dossiers of faculty who stop the tenure clock.9 Many research universities have implemented both of these recommendations. For instance, MIT uses standard language to explain to reviewers that “the time period for this promotion can vary, including one or more extensions of the tenure clock” and reminds them “that the criteria for promotion and tenure at MIT are the same for all faculty regardless of the length of his/her service at MIT.” Examples from other universities include:

When a faculty member who has taken an extension under this section is being reviewed for tenure or promotion to associate professor, the dean, in his/her letter soliciting evaluations from external reviewers, should explicitly state that the candidate has taken an extension pursuant to this policy. The dean should further state that the policy of the University of Pennsylvania is to evaluate the productivity of each candidate who has been granted an extension as if he or she had been in probationary status for the normal duration, so that the candidate is not penalized for having received the extension.10 (University of Pennsylvania)

…if a candidate for tenure has received an extension of the tenure-clock, a statement to that effect must be read aloud at the start of the first meeting of the departmental promotion and tenure committee for that candidate and again at the start of the first DCG meeting. The paragraph may be read by the DEO or by the chairs of the respective committees. The currently approved language for that statement is as follows: "Professor ________ received a one-year [two-year] extension of the standard tenure-clock, approved by the College and the University. This extension does not change the normal criteria for a tenurable record, nor does it imply that Professor ________ will be held to a standard higher than the one he/she would have had to meet if the tenure decision had been made in the year when it was originally scheduled.” This statement will also be incorporated into the template letter for inviting external evaluators, to be used in promotion proceedings next year.11 (University of Iowa)

No person shall be discriminated against in any promotion and tenure proceedings for seeking or obtaining an extension under this provision. (University of Maryland)

Academic appointees shall not be arbitrarily disadvantaged in their promotion, advancement, or compensation because they have elected to take a childbearing or parental leave, to stop the clock, or to defer a personnel review. Personnel reviews that are deferred due to a family accom-
Our recommended revisions to HR23 are modeled on policy language from these and other universities that are leaders in work-life balance policies.

CURRENT POLICY:

B. Staying of the Provisional Tenure Period

Upon the written request of a faculty member, the Executive Vice President and Provost may grant a temporary staying of the tenure provisional period, if in his/her judgment, the academic performance of the provisional faculty member would be adversely affected by: the responsibility as primary care giver after the birth or adoption of a child, a serious personal illness, the provision of care for a seriously ill family member, or any similar situation.

This special exception would be for one academic year for a provisional faculty member seeking tenure, and would normally be granted only once. During this period the faculty member would not be evaluated according to the tenure guidelines, and the year would not be counted toward the provisional period.

This staying of the tenure provisional period is not necessarily linked to a leave of absence with or without salary.

At the end of the stayed year the faculty member would continue on the tenure track.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO HR23:

Additions are in bold and strikeouts indicate deleted text. Deleted text is notated with (Delete) (End Delete).

B. Staying of the Provisional Tenure Period

Upon the written request of a faculty member, the Executive Vice President and Provost may grant a temporary staying of the tenure provisional period, if in his/her judgment, the academic performance of the provisional faculty member would be adversely affected by: the responsibility as primary care giver after the birth or adoption of a child, the placement of a foster child in the home, a serious personal illness, the provision of care for a seriously ill family member, or any similar situation.

This special exception would be for one academic year for a provisional faculty member seeking tenure, and would normally be granted only once. During this period the faculty member would not be evaluated according to the tenure guidelines, and the year would not be counted toward the provisional period.

When promotion and tenure committees are being charged, the statement below should be included as part of the charge. Also, the dean must include this statement in his or her letter when soliciting evaluations from external reviewers.

“The time period for achieving tenure and promotion to associate professor can vary, including one or more extensions of the tenure clock. A faculty member who stops the tenure clock must be evaluated according to the number of years on the tenure clock, not the number of years since
being hired. The faculty member should not be held to a standard higher than the one he/she would have had to meet if the tenure decision had been made in the year it was originally scheduled.”

This staying of the tenure provisional period is not necessarily linked to a leave of absence with or without salary.

At the end of the stayed year the faculty member would continue on the tenure track.
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Principles for the Design of Penn State Health Care Plans
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Implementation: Upon approval by the President

Background

The purpose of this report is to recommend principles for the design of university health care plans. The recommendations were developed by a subcommittee of members from three university committees, with response from the full membership of these committees. These three committees are 1) The University Faculty Senate Faculty Benefits Committee, 2) the University Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, and 3) the President’s Health Care Advisory Committee. This report synthesizes ideas from the results of the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey and several prior reports presented to the University Faculty Senate as listed below. The university-wide Healthcare Plan Survey was released electronically to 15,885 benefits-enrolled employees on August 13, 2015. The intent of the survey was to determine why and how employees chose the health plan they did for 2015, as well as how employees believe the health plans should operate. The survey remained open until October 1. The completion rate was 31% (n=4784). Survey respondents included: 1171 faculty, 3344 staff, 167 technical service, and 82 postdocs; 1695 male, 3008 female; 3843 enrolled in the PPO Blue, 917 enrolled in the PPO Savings Plan, 88 unsure. Prior Senate reports related to Healthcare benefits include:

- Report on Employee Contributions to Penn State’s Self-Insured Healthcare Costs, March 17, 2015
- October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey

Recommendations

1) A principle of choice for employees in health care plans should guide the annual design of plans with consideration of the levels of premium contributions and out-of-pocket contributions shared with employees.
2) A principle for overall cost sharing of 75% university and 25% employee should guide the
determination of contributions to meet the annual full cost of healthcare (university cost,
plus employee premiums, plus employee out-of-pocket costs).

3) A principle of affordability and equity should guide the design of plans to incorporate
features that make the plans affordable for employees below the median salary; however,
the overall contribution of employees above the median salary should not exceed levels
comparable to peer and industry trends.

4) A principle of informed utilization should guide the implementation of a data warehouse
and cost transparency tools that provide the following: a) analytic capabilities for
conducting secure and anonymous studies of university employee health care utilization and
provider costs. This will allow better design of future healthcare plans, contract terms and
vendor management; and, b) cost transparency and analysis tools to aid members in better
understanding the costs and quality of care received, and so plan their utilization of health
care services.

5) The principles of quality, transparency, accessibility, and cost effectiveness should guide the
negotiation and management of contracts for healthcare services.

6) A principle of fostering and promoting a culture of health, which is included as a thematic
priority in the university’s 2016-2020 strategic plan, should guide the design of plan
features and programs that promote healthy choices and activities, shared efforts to
establish tobacco-free campuses, and support the consistent and effective management of
health risks.

Discussion of Recommendations

1) A principle of choice for employees in health care plans should guide the annual
design of plans with consideration of the levels of premium contributions and out-of-
pocket contributions shared with employees.

On the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey, employees expressed the importance of choice in plan
selection depending on individual health care needs, preferences in how the plans work, beliefs
about levels of cost sharing, and degree of financial risk. Many expressed a preference to purchase
insurance and pay a predictable amount each month in order to have financial protection against
unexpected health care events, and for this peace of mind were comfortable with the higher
premiums and the lower out-of-pocket costs of the PPO Blue plan. Some even preferred paying
their share in just premiums and having no more than copays for office visits. Others expressed a
belief that those who use a health care plan should have to pay more of the cost for the plan, and
those who use less health care services should be rewarded. Employees expressing a preference for
the PPO Savings plan welcomed the lower premium, the opportunity to build a tax free health savings account for future healthcare needs, and were comfortable assuming more financial risk for an injury or unexpected health care need.

Employees anticipating healthcare needs such as elective surgery (e.g., orthopedic) or a pregnancy overwhelmingly reported selecting the PPO Blue plan even though premiums and other out-of-pocket expenses in this plan may still result in financial tension at lower incomes. Employees who self identified as single and/or young chose the PPO Savings plan for their current circumstances while those who self identified as older or dealing with chronic health conditions chose the PPO Blue plan. Some planned to switch to the PPO Blue plan because of impending healthcare needs in the upcoming year. Most all employees who self-identified as families with young and active children preferred the protection provided through the PPO Blue plan. These helpful observations point to the importance of a consumer transparency tool, which will inform and create understanding so that employees can make the best healthcare choices for themselves and their families.

Maintaining multiple plans that provide choice on these dimensions is of central importance to employees. Even with choice, shifting some costs to the user through out-of-pocket expenses can preserve affordability as well as support appropriate quality care. Both plans provide financial protection with maximum out-of-pocket costs after which the university pays 100% of all claims. The PPO Blue plan has higher premiums with lower out-of-pocket costs, and the PPO Savings plan has lower premiums with higher out-of-pocket costs. The PPO Savings plan seeks to have an overall lower cost for healthcare by using features that are meant to encourage more informed and appropriate utilization of healthcare services. In the Penn State situation, with employees enrolled in both plans, it is difficult to compare in a transparent way how the plan impacts overall total costs. To examine this question, Table 1.1 below illustrates the costs of each plan separately if all employees were enrolled in that plan.

The current state reflects the projected costs for 2016 for our current employee enrollment of 82% in the PPO Blue plan and 18% in the PPO Savings plan. The 2016 current state of mixed enrollment carries an average yearly cost to the employee of $3,600 in premiums and out-of-pocket costs combined. If all employees were enrolled in just one plan, the PPO Savings plan illustration has a lower average yearly cost to employees of $2,700. With the PPO Savings, the university cost is highest at $178.2 million in part from the contribution of an additional $10.6 million directly to all employees in their Health Savings Account. However, because employee costs would be lowest in the illustrated PPO Savings plan, the total costs for health care would be $222.4 million in that plan, lower than the current 2016 mixed enrollment total of $227.6 million, and lower than the illustrated PPO Blue total of $235.7 million.
Table 1.1: Illustration of Projected 2016 Total Healthcare Costs if All Employees were in a Single Plan (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Full Replacement PPO Blue</th>
<th>Full Replacement PPO Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Cost ($M)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims + Expenses</td>
<td>$202.1</td>
<td>$214.0</td>
<td>$180.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA Seed</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Cost</strong></td>
<td>$204.1</td>
<td>$214.0</td>
<td>$191.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Out of Pocket</td>
<td>$23.5</td>
<td>$21.7</td>
<td>$31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allowed Amount</strong></td>
<td>$227.6</td>
<td>$235.7</td>
<td>$222.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Cost ($M)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$36.1</td>
<td>$44.4</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Out of Pocket</td>
<td>$23.5</td>
<td>$21.7</td>
<td>$31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employee Cost</strong></td>
<td>$59.6</td>
<td>$66.1</td>
<td>$44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penn State Cost</strong></td>
<td>$168.1</td>
<td>$169.6</td>
<td>$178.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Full Replacement PPO Blue</th>
<th>Full Replacement PPO Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Employee Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Out of Pocket</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employee Cost</strong></td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In maintaining a choice in plans, it is important to seek transparency in the costs of the plans in combination with the effectiveness of each plan design to encourage and maintain appropriate and high quality healthcare.

2) A principle for overall cost sharing of 75% university and 25% employee should guide the determination of contributions to meet the annual full cost of healthcare (university cost, plus employee premiums, plus employee out-of-pocket costs).

Historically, the university has used the guide of approximately 17%-18% of the medical plan cost to set employee premiums when budgeting for medical plan costs each year. Penn State budgets to pay from general funds the remaining 82%-83% of the claims charged to the plans. Outside of premium contributions, employees may incur additional out of pocket costs (copays, deductibles, coinsurance). When the additional out-of-pocket costs are combined with the medical plan costs, the total allowable charges are shared between the university and employee at a ratio closer to 75% university and 25% employee. The principle recommended here would use previous years costs to consistently seek a cost sharing balance of 75% university and 25% employee. This cost sharing principle has been recommended by the University Faculty Senate in the 1992 Task Force on the Future of Health Care and Life Insurance, the 1998 Report from the Task Force on the Future of Benefits, and the 2015 Report on Employee Contributions to Penn State’s Self-Insured Healthcare Costs.

Table 2.1 below details the actual and budgeted healthcare expenditures and contributions for the medical plan cost for all active and retired employees since 2011.

Table 2.1: University and Employee Contributions to Total Healthcare Costs (includes retirees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR INFORMATION</th>
<th>Total Claims Paid (% change)</th>
<th>Employee Premium Contributions (% of Total Claims)</th>
<th>Net PSU Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 actual</td>
<td>197,564,929 4%</td>
<td>45,017,602 22.79%</td>
<td>152,547,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 actual</td>
<td>206,349,402 4%</td>
<td>37,752,841 18.30%</td>
<td>168,596,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 actual</td>
<td>217,677,285 5%</td>
<td>41,167,636 18.91%</td>
<td>176,509,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 budgeted</td>
<td>239,138,418 10%</td>
<td>41,383,917 17.31%</td>
<td>197,754,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 actual</td>
<td>220,479,189 1%</td>
<td>42,747,904 19.39%</td>
<td>177,731,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 budgeted</td>
<td>250,868,027 5%</td>
<td>44,441,055 17.71%</td>
<td>206,426,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 actual</td>
<td>236,236,199 7%</td>
<td>45,286,942 19.17%</td>
<td>190,949,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2014-16 years combine the medical plan costs for both the PPO Blue and PPO Savings plans to arrive at the total costs. The figures illustrated in Table 2.1 above may differ from previous reports submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. The figures in this report have been updated by Penn State’s Finance Office to accurately reflect the costs of budgeting and medical expenditures.

The percentage of employee actual premium contributions between 2005 and 2014 ranges between 17.31% to 22.79%, with an average of 19.71% of the total costs of medical plans for healthcare for all active and retired employees. The 2014 and 2015 budgeted costs anticipated higher total medical plan costs that would have resulted in a lower percentage share through employee premiums of 17.31% and 17.71%; however, lower actual total medical plan costs increased the percentage shared through the fixed contributions of employee premiums to 19.39% and 19.17% respectively. These medical plan costs, budgeted and actual claims paid, do not include out-of-pocket contributions paid directly by plan members to providers.

Since 2011, employees have contributed an additional average of 5% to 10% of allowable medical charges through out-of-pocket contributions each year. Table 2.2 below, Employee Out-Of-Pocket Contributions, details the out-of-pocket contributions. It wasn’t until the introduction of deductibles and coinsurance in 2011 that employees’ combined contributions (premiums and out-of-pocket contributions) approximated the 25% contribution to the total healthcare costs for the university. Thus, a frequent perception shared by employees who completed the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey, that their health care benefit has been declining in value, is likely attributable to the increase in out-of-pocket costs since 2011 resulting from medical inflation and the introduction of deductibles and coinsurance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR INFORMATION</th>
<th>Employee Medical Out-Of-Pocket (% change)</th>
<th>Employee Prescription Drug Out-Of-Pocket (% change)</th>
<th>Total Employee Out-Of-Pocket Cost (%change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15,890,082</td>
<td>6,460,526</td>
<td>22,350,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17,179,997</td>
<td>6,277,005</td>
<td>23,457,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>18,073,639</td>
<td>6,649,340</td>
<td>24,722,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For total out-of-pocket contributions from 2013 to 2014, employee out-of-pocket contributions increased 5.0% from $12,350,608 to $23,457,002, and from 2014 to 2015, increased 5.4% from $23,457,002 to $24,722,979.
Table 2.3 below, Total Health Care Costs and Employee-University Share, details the total health care cost for 2013, 2014, and 2015, the combined employee contributions, through premiums, surcharges, and out-of-pocket costs, and the remaining net university cost.

Table 2.3: Total Health Care Costs and Employee-University Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR YEAR INFORMATION</th>
<th>Total Health Care Cost (% change)</th>
<th>Employee Premium and Out-Of-Pocket Contributions (% change)</th>
<th>Net University Cost (% change)</th>
<th>University Percent Share of Total Health Care Cost (% change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>240,027,893</td>
<td>63,518,244</td>
<td>176,509,649</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>243,936,191</td>
<td>66,204,906</td>
<td>177,731,285</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>260,959,178</td>
<td>70,009,921</td>
<td>190,949,257</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total employee contribution increased 4.2% from $63,518,244 in 2013 to $66,204,906 in 2014. When all administrative and claims costs required to provide health care are included, the university contribution increased 0.7%, from $176,509,649 in 2013 to $177,731,285 in 2014. When all employee and university contributions are combined, the total costs of medical care increased 1.6%, from $240,027,893 in 2013 to $243,936,191 in 2014. The overall cost sharing for employees increased by 0.9% from 2013 to 2014, from 73.5% university and 26.5% employee in 2013, to 72.9% university and 27.1% employee in 2014. The employee cost sharing ratio declined from 2014 to 2015 to a 26.8% share of the total health care cost. Over the three years, the employee cost share has been 1.5% to 2.1% higher than the 75% university – 25% employee principle being recommended.

Overall cost sharing for 2015 is illustrated below in Table 2.4, with percentages provided for university payments, employee premiums, and employee out-of-pocket costs separately for the PPO Blue plan and the PPO Savings plan, the combined overall for both plans, and a comparison to the market trend benchmark.
The bar graphs in Table 2.4 show that in 2015 the university paid 74.7% of total healthcare costs across both plans, with employees and dependents covering the remaining costs through premiums at 15.7% and out-of-pocket contributions at 9.6%. This cost sharing ratio is more favorable than market trend of 72% employer and 28% employee. However, the first two bar graphs illustrate inequity between the overall employee contributions of 26.5% to the PPO Blue and 20.9% to the PPO Savings plans. The university contributed 79.1% to the PPO Savings plan costs, but only 73.5% to the PPO Blue plan costs. The principle of cost sharing at 75% university and 25% employee (premiums and out-of-pocket costs combined) should apply within each plan design, thus ensuring equity in cost sharing between multiple plans. Given the principle recommended above, an inequity in university and employee cost sharing between different plans should provide direction for the design of contributions in future years to better achieve the cost sharing goal overall as well as within each plan. It is critical to note as well that the university might budget for a cost share of 75% in an upcoming year, but if the plan utilization is lower than predicted, the fixed contribution of the employees in premiums would result in a lower university cost share when actual costs are calculated in a later year.

The premiums and out-of-pocket levels for each plan are lower than benchmarking data on levels for typical Preferred Provider Organization plans (PSU’s PPO Blue plan) and High Deductible Health
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Plans (PSU’s PPO Savings plan). A 2015 CUPA-HR (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) survey of 363 public and private universities, which included five Big Ten universities and another large state-affiliated university in PA determined the median monthly medical premiums for PPO and HDHP plans as follows with comparable Penn State premiums provided:

- Median monthly medical premiums
  - PPO single: $114 (Penn State is $45-$211 depending on salary, $85 at PSU median salary)
  - PPO family: $476 (Penn State is $140-$655 depending on salary, $263 at PSU median salary)
  - HDHP single: $62 (Penn State is $13-$60 depending on salary, $24 at PSU median salary)
  - HDHP family: $319 (Penn State is $40-$187 depending on salary, $75 at PSU median salary)

Penn State plan premiums, at the median Penn State salary of $56,232 fall well below the market median, and are comparably even lower for the PPO Savings plan. In another recent survey, conducted by the university consulting firm of Willis Towers Watson, involving 23 universities, a comparison of employee health plan contribution levels indicates:

1. Penn State employees’ premium contributions are, on average, $1,000 less per year than premiums in the benchmark plans.
2. In the PPO Savings Plan,
   a. Premiums are over 50% less than those in comparable high deductible health plans
   b. Deductible is at statutory minimum ($1,300/$2,600)—lower than 91% of industry
   c. Coinsurance (90%/10%) is in line with industry
   d. Total out-of-pocket max (excluding deductible) is in line with industry ($2,100/$4,200)
   e. HSA seed is in line with industry ($400/$800) for those that provide one. 54% do not seed accounts.
3. In the PPO Blue Plan,
   a. 18% of employers have an individual deductible of under $400 for a “traditional” PPO plan, like PPO Blue (Penn State’s is $250)
   b. PPO Blue coinsurance is in line with industry (90%/10%)
   c. PPO Blue out-of-pocket maximum ($1,000/$2,000-medical only, excluding deductible) is lower than 93% of employers in industry
   d. PPO Blue prescription Rx out-of-pocket maximum is the lowest ($1,000/$6,000)
   e. PPO Blue copays:
      i. Emergency room: only 28% of employers are below $150 (Penn State is $100)
      ii. Office visit: Penn State is lower than 94% of industry (Penn State is $10)

The comparison above indicates that Penn State plans are in line with industry standards for the level of coinsurance for both plans, and for the level of the out-of-pocket maximum and HSA seed for the
PPO Savings plan. Penn State plans are lower for all other types of out-of-pocket costs to the employee, including being in the bottom 10% for the PPO Savings plan deductible and PPO Blue plan out-of-pocket maximum and office visit copay. In addition to these out-of-pocket comparisons, the PPO Savings plan premium levels are more than 50% lower than comparable high deductible healthcare plans.

Unequivocally, Penn State’s medical plans are of very high value. However, any increases to employee contributions through premium or out-of-pocket costs should have proportionate increases to the university contribution, adjusted from year to year to seek the 75% university and 25% employee cost sharing ratio each year.

3) A principle of affordability and equity should guide the design of plans to incorporate features that make the plans affordable for employees below the median salary; however, the overall contribution of employees above the median salary should not exceed levels comparable to peer and industry trends.

On the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey, lower paid employees express support for premium indexing, and feel that the health plan has become too complicated with the addition of deductibles and coinsurance in 2011. Most importantly, many instances of financial burden were reported as a consequence of large and unexpected bills for accidents, chronic conditions, surgeries, and catastrophic health events. Employees who perceived the PPO Savings plan as unaffordable for lower income employees also reported avoiding care and deferring needed care because of the additional out-of-pocket costs, even when enrolled in the PPO Blue plan. Lower paid employees may not have the savings or liquidity necessary to cover the costs of the increased out-of-pocket expenses.

Various plan design features might provide financial support for employees below the median salary. Such features might include a decreasing deductible as income decreases, lower coinsurance and out-of-pocket maximums, or incrementally higher seeds to the Health Savings Account or Flexible Spending Account as income decreases from the median. Both the Flexible Spending Account and the Health Savings Account allow employees to save tax free money for health care expenditures, thus reducing the impact of out-of-pocket costs for utilizing health care. On the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey, employees shared a frustration with provider billings for care that fell under the deductible or coinsurance. Many felt that these additional costs equated to a loss of value in their plan, or a level of complication in trying to determine if the billings were accurate, or keeping up with paying and verifying payments from spending accounts. Many indicated that they did not seek care because of the potential out-of-pocket deductible costs. University contributions to the FSA or HSA accounts on a yearly basis would reduce the exposure of lower salaried employees to deductible costs. At the lower salary levels, higher seed contributions to the FSA or HSA would especially support employees who lack the ready access to savings to pay for necessary care.

The introduction of the PPO Savings plan in 2014 also introduced a complexity in setting premium ratios to implement equitable indexing separately across two plans and the four enrollment tiers in
each plan: individual, two party, parent-child(ren), and family. The ratios used in 2014, 2015, and 2016 created an imbalance in premium contributions for employees in the PPO Blue plan above the median salary and below the cap of $140,000 in salary. The ratios also created an imbalance between the two plans in the cost sharing for overall health care costs with a 20.9% contribution from employees toward the costs in the PPO Savings plan and a 26.5% contribution from employees toward the costs in the PPO Blue plan. The methodology for indexing needs to be articulated that will provide a basis to set premiums for both plans that create equity in the proportion of cost sharing between the two plans, and progressively support employees below the median with lower premiums with respect to salary. One methodology might be based on a relationship between the additional risk taken on with the higher out-of-pocket costs in the PPO Savings plan versus the higher premium required in the PPO Blue plan. Another strategy might be based on the costs that would be required from all employees if everyone were in the same plan, as those contributions should be the expected costs required to support each plan independently even when enrollment is divided between them in any proportion.

When indexing, a cap should also be used to limit the premium amounts on higher salaries for both plans, and still achieve the overall goal of budgeting approximately 17.5% of the plan’s total cost from employee premiums. A cap is used to prevent an employee from paying more than a reasonable amount of the full real cost of a plan. The 2016 cap of $140,000 resulted in a premium that equaled 38.9% of the full cost of the PPO Blue plan without the additional out-of-pocket costs. A cap of $120,000 would produce a premium at that salary level and above that equals 33.3% of the full cost of the PPO Blue plan without the additional out-of-pocket costs. When adding the average PPO Blue out-of-pocket costs of 8.6% to the lower $120,000 salary cap, the employee would contribute more than 40% to their total healthcare cost when compared to the actual cost of the plan. This amount may exceed peer and industry trends which should be used to set a cap on indexed premiums to limit the maximum contributions by employees in each plan offered.

Another strategy of indexing was offered in the 2015 Faculty Benefits Report on Employee Contributions to Penn State’s Self-Insured Healthcare Costs, presented to the University Faculty Senate on March 17, 2015. This report recommended that instead of using a ratio to calculate employee premiums based on individual salary, the university could contribute an equal dollar amount at established income tiers to employees regardless of the plan they select. Employees in the lower tier would have a larger university contribution that eliminated premiums and also had an additional amount left over that could be contributed to an FSA or HSA account. Employees in the PPO Blue plan, after the university contribution, would have a larger balance due to meet the cost of the plan that would be their premiums because the full cost of their plan is 12% to 14% higher than the PPO Savings plan at each coverage tier level. This strategy of cost sharing could be based on an equal dollar contribution to all employees to reach the 75% share of the university based on total healthcare costs, regardless of the plans offered. Then, the employee would chose between plans to pay a combination of premiums and out-of-pocket levels that fits their desired level of assumed risk.

Regardless of the strategy the university identifies to provide premium relief for lowered salaried employees, the principles for establishing indexed premiums should be clearly articulated and presented to the University Faculty Senate for consultation. The inclusion of incentives to further
reduce out-of-pocket costs through the demonstration of engagement in positive lifestyle behaviors should also be considered.

Other considerations for affordability, equity, and fairness should include the utilization of surcharges, being mindful of cost impact to employees as well as effectiveness. On the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey, some respondents expressed the excellent value of the PPO Blue plan in comparison to plans from former employers and spousal employers. This value supported their acceptance of the spousal surcharge. But other respondents perceived the spousal surcharge as a violation of the value for family within the university community. Also, employees at the lower incomes expressed a belief that the spousal surcharge added an additional financial burden and should also be indexed. Given the overall health insurance market conditions, employers are required to provide healthcare to full time employees. In many circumstances these plans are of low value, prohibit the addition of spouses who are eligible for benefits from another employer, and even pay employees not to insure their spouses. Over 30% of employers have spousal surcharges today and it’s expected to increase to 60% in three years. In many cases, paying a surcharge is less costly than paying for the insurance plan offered through the spouse’s employer. The effectiveness of the surcharge for Penn State employees, and the impact of a spousal surcharge on premiums for employees who earn less than the median salary should be evaluated for future plan design.

4) A principle of informed utilization should guide the implementation of a data warehouse and cost transparency tools that provide the following: a) analytic capabilities for conducting secure and anonymous studies of university employee health care utilization and provider costs. This will allow better design of future healthcare plans, contract terms and vendor management; and, b) cost transparency and analysis tools to aid members in better understanding the costs and quality of care received, and so plan their utilization of health care services.

A data warehouse provides the opportunity for an employer to inform strategy through data-driven decision making. Because data is presented on an aggregate basis, no specific member data is provided to the employer, preserving employee privacy. An example of how the data warehouse can be used is to extract utilization of medical services for the group of participants who have been diagnosed with diabetes. To what degree is the group seeing a physician and filling necessary prescriptions? Are they having regular A1C tests? Depending on how robust the data warehouse is, other claims data such as vision, dental and unscheduled absence from work data can be included, to provide further specificity around where the opportunities exist to better manage care and to determine correlations between health and other components of the total compensation program. Programs, services, plan design and cost-sharing can all be positively influenced by the utilization analyses that are enabled through a data warehouse. The long-term health consequences of a plan design can be analyzed to ensure a continued high quality of health.

It is expected that a vendor will also provide members with a cost transparency tool to evaluate provider charges for anticipated health care services, with some measure of the relative quality of providers in services to be provided. On the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey, employees
expressed some resistance to what they felt was pressure to become educated healthcare consumers, preferring that the university just provide the best plan for their healthcare needs. Other employees expressed a desire to have more information to guide their decision making in selecting health care services. Regardless of the plan design offered, it is important for employees to understand that there is shared accountability regarding choice and the most educated and effective use of healthcare services.

A cost transparency tool for employees could also integrate the costs for services that are covered as preventive at 100%, as well as provide the amounts of covered and out-of-pocket costs prior to a visit to their provider. On the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey, several employees reported a surprise cost for lab work ordered at, or for their well-visit that they believed was covered as preventive at 100%. It is unclear to employees how providers code these yearly “preventive” lab tests, or additional follow-up diagnostic tests as a result of preventive visits and tests. Not being able to anticipate potential out-of-pocket costs contributes to the perception expressed on the survey of complexity in the plans and the erosion of healthcare provided by the plans. While the current preventive schedule can be found at the following website, http://ohr.psu.edu/assets/benefits/insurance/health/documents/PreventiveSchedule.pdf, this information should be integrated into a cost transparency tool.

Employees in the PPO Savings plan reported on the October 2015 Healthcare Plan Survey being charged the full cost of services initially, then having to advocate for themselves to get the negotiated in-network rates for their bills. Information on the costs of services from in-network providers available through a cost transparency tool could reduce the avoidance of care by members not knowing what costs to expect from a provider, and give reliable information to select quality healthcare services. Having this information empowers employees to ask questions of their providers prior to receiving services to ensure that they are getting the right care at the right time at the best price.

5) The principles of quality, accessibility, transparency, and cost effectiveness should guide the negotiation and management of contracts for healthcare services.

With a greater understanding of utilization and cost patterns, the university can negotiate contracts for specific services to support quality and achieve greater affordability. As one example, when labs are drawn at a physician’s office or hospital, the costs can be inflated by 50%-700% as compared to fees at stand-alone facilities. The savings add up for the members in lower out-of-pocket costs, as well as the university in their share of costs. The negotiation of contracts to provide university health plan members specific services should insure that members retain equal access to the services, and that employees should not be required to use services that are unacceptable to their chosen in-network provider or create undue hardship in using. The opportunity to steer healthcare services to Penn State Health partners on a negotiated basis should be considered. Regardless of the type of service, convenience, accessibility and efficiency are all critical to the success of any efforts to steer members to the most cost-effective quality services.
The effective management of prescription drug costs is tantamount to the sustainability of a cost effective, affordable benefits program. A strong Pharmacy Benefits Manager partnership, whether through the claims administrator, or a separate contract carve out, is imperative. In addition to aggressively negotiating the Pharmacy Benefits Manager relationship, the university may want to consider potential changes to the pharmacy benefits design to adjust the share of costs according to market comparisons, and to incentivize lower costs to the employee and the university.

For the PPO Blue Plan:
- Increase separate out-of-pocket maximum (currently at $1,000 per subscriber) OR integrate the pharmacy deductible into total coinsurance out-of-pocket maximum,
- Increase specialty drug maximums paid by member per prescription (currently at $50/fill),
- Incorporate a more stringent mandatory generic policy,
- Implement mandatory mail order for maintenance drugs after 2 retail refills.

For the PPO Savings Plan
- Establish minimums paid per prescription fill by member across all drugs (generic, mail order and specialty),
- Implement a more stringent mandatory generic policy,
- Implement mandatory mail order for maintenance drugs after 2 retail fills

Increased pharmacy costs within both plans should fall within the goal of principle two to maintain an overall 75% university and 25% employee cost share.

6) A principle of fostering and promoting a culture of health, which is included as a thematic priority in the university’s 2016-2020 strategic plan, should guide the design of plan features and programs that promote healthy choices and activities, shared efforts to establish tobacco-free campuses, and support the consistent and effective management of health risks.

The University can play a role in achieving a healthy academic community by infusing health into everyday operations, business practices, and academic mandates. Examples include embedding health in all campus policies such as creating a tobacco-free institution, a supportive campus environment that includes healthy food choices as the default, areas to promote physical activity, and opportunities to support personal development. The following are examples of strategies already in place that support a culture of health:

**Tobacco Surcharges.** Tobacco surcharges are one tactic employers are using promote a culture of health as well as to defray the cost of additional claims that tobacco users incur. Depending on the study, the additional claims a tobacco user incurs to a health plan each year is between $1,000 and $3,000 annually. For Penn State employees, tobacco-cessation products are available with no cost-sharing through both the PPO Blue and PPO Savings plans. However, the effectiveness of the tobacco surcharge on health plan premiums for Penn State has been limited. Instead of debating the effectiveness of this surcharge to promote a culture of health, the Faculty Senate together with the
administration, should work in a collaborative way with local communities, employees, and students to begin the process of establishing tobacco-free campuses with expanded cessation support for employees.

**Value Based Benefits Design (VBBD).** This program is specifically focused on supporting the consistent management of health conditions. It is available to those enrolled in the PPO Blue Plan who have or who may be diagnosed with Diabetes, High Blood Pressure and/or High Cholesterol. VBBD programs promote individual health and management of chronic conditions by removing cost barriers to appropriate, high-value care; in the PPO Blue plan design, the costs of all treatment and services related to the condition are covered at 100% as detailed below:

**DIABETES**
- 100% coverage and waived copayment for primary care provider and specialist office visits
- 100% coverage for tests such as lipid panels (with no deductible)
- 100% coverage for important supplies including glucometer, test strips, needles and syringes (with no deductible)

**Hypertension**
- 100% coverage and waived copayment for primary care provider and specialist office visits
- 100% coverage for tests such as basic metabolic panels (with no deductible)

**High Cholesterol**
- 100% coverage and waived copayment for primary care provider and specialist office visits
- 100% coverage for tests such as liver function and lipid panels (with no deductible)

To be eligible for this coverage, one must opt in with Highmark following diagnosis and re-enroll January 1 of each subsequent year. Members must also remain in the PPO Blue Plan and follow the in-network doctor’s plan of care.

The VBBD is an example of how plan design assists members in acquiring appropriate care to mitigate against greater health care expenses if a condition is not managed with the best ongoing medical care. The university should research other conditions that might also benefit from supportive ongoing care through plan design features, adding them to the current VBBD program, or expanding such care to the PPO Savings plan through VBBD or some similar plan design feature.
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Moving Forward

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Background

*Social Dynamics: Moving Forward*

Current events that are showing a trend in societal activities are cited in the Discussion and Conclusion of the Informational Report by the first Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force titled “Progress to Date and Steps for Moving Forward”, University Faculty Senate Agenda, April 28, 2015, Appendix K, http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/april-28-2015-agenda/appendix-k/.

Recent events have certain events to people’s attention. Some of these are highlighted in the Discussion and Conclusion, and include:

- The Ferguson Missouri protests
- Penn State students participation in the “die-in” protests
- Misconduct by student organizations
- Increasing racial tensions prevalent in today’s societies
- Fraternity fall-out at the University of Oklahoma

The document goes on to further point out that “The lessons learned over the course of the last two years have suggested both possibilities and challenges for any committee going forward, that is charged with enhancing the diversity mission of the University”. Taking a cue from the above, it is important to identify the communities that are represented within the Penn State body the recommendations will serve. In broad terms, the local community consists of Pennsylvanians, and students, faculty and staff who are from out of State. The international community includes all people from other nations. These people have in fact been addressed at times as Penn State Ambassadors to the various nations they come from. Among all these, people with diverse opinions, beliefs, and preferences must also be recognized. In short, the Penn State body is a sampling of humanity world-wide. The task can therefore be summed up as “building an all-inclusive society in an atmosphere of tolerance, acceptance, and appreciation of the differences between people”. One approach to achieving this is through “conversations”. Considering the different styles by which people communicate, each person has the responsibility of identifying the style of the “other person”, and adapt to it in an atmosphere of cooperation, and conciliation. To ensure that the bond is sustained, it is imperative that efforts are made by both parties to demonstrate respect for each other.
The trend in recent times indicate that the whole nation will find such “conversations” engaging, and the conversations will attract participants of diverse nature. The statement “Diversity is council, Unity is command” (Cyrus the Great: 600 – 529 BCE) suggests that by engaging diversity in humanity, we would gain from different points of view and diverse perspectives.

Considering the diverse nature of societal dynamics, conversations are developing based on different endeavors which may be considered as the platforms for these conversations. To cite an example, the music industry in taking the “conversation” to the national level, is planning a two-hour concert that has variously been advertised as Shining A Light: A Conversation About Race, and Shining A Light: A Concert for Progress on Race in America.

Diversity as used in this report involves all underrepresented people as well as the social majority. In one area, racial relations, efforts that are being made in various forms such as Black Lives Matter have developed some momentum. As has been suggested by others, the title could just as well be All Lives Matter.

Individual incidents of note have occurred on the Education Platform such as the resignation of the President of the University of Missouri, and the efforts made by the University of Michigan to increase underrepresented minorities in their freshmen that has resulted positively. While these events have drawn national attention, it will be worthwhile to create a national platform using Education as a basis. The objective will be to “educate” people to help them identify misinformation and misconceptions that can lead to negative attitudes and behavior. An example of such negativity is clearly demonstrated in the CNN/HBO documentary Terror in Mumbai; http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/terror-in-mumbai/. Penn State can establish such a platform, and apply its instructional prowess to conduct such education. “Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world” (Madiba Nelson Mandela: 1918 – 2013). The future can only be the result of what people plan and execute today. It will be helpful if the platform has a high profile. To this end, it might be useful if someone, perhaps of the stature of Ms. Oprah Winfrey, could be attracted to partner with Penn State. The conversations may be titled Conversations About US. US may refer to Pennsylvania State University as a body, or U.S., or all of mankind as the problem of diversity impacts humanity as a whole, and as inferred above, Penn State has representatives in many parts of the world. Positive results that such conversations can lead to are exemplified by acts of selflessness as demonstrated in Egypt's Muslims attend Coptic Christmas mass, serving as "human shields", http://english.ahram.org.eg/News/3365.aspx, Muslims protect Christians in Kenyan bus attack; tell terrorists 'You'll have to kill us all', http://www.myfoxboston.com/news/muslims-protect-christians-in-kenyan-bus-attack-tell-terrorists-you'll-have-to-kill-us-all/11641792, and the nonfiction movie, Lone Survivor, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lone_Survivor_%28film%29. The excellent recent work of Penn State in drawing speakers of the highest caliber for our Martin Luther King events suggests that this is feasible.

Penn State: Moving Forward

The numbers provided in the tables below present a breakdown by ethnicity of students, and faculty and staff. The numbers give a clear indication of the need for efforts to attract more
diverse students, and faculty and staff. The question of retention is also important, and can be addressed by creating focus groups where international students can meet. Also faculty and staff should be advised on sensitivity towards minority groups. Some suggested approaches for Penn State for improvement is to become

☐ an active participant with the Institute on Teaching and Learning through The Compact for Faculty Diversity,

☐ an institutional partner with the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity, and

☐ an institutional member of the Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC)-New Jersey-Eastern Pa. – Delaware Region.
The following tables can be found at


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total University</th>
<th>Am Ind/ Alaska Native</th>
<th>Black/ African American</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/ Pac Island</th>
<th>Two/ More Races</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Race/ Ethnicity</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Inter- nat’l</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+University Park</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>8,477</td>
<td>30,571</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>6,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Commonwealth Campuses</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>7,160</td>
<td>21,319</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson School of Law - Unified</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Law</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+College of Medicine</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA College of Technology</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,959</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,695</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,923</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,542</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,980</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,830</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Including World Campus</td>
<td>5,947</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5,334</td>
<td>5,556</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>19,328</td>
<td>66,581</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>9,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Full-Time Employees by Race/Ethnicity

#### Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total University</th>
<th>Hisp/Latino</th>
<th>Am Ind/Alaska Native</th>
<th>Black/African American</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/Pac Island</th>
<th>Two/More Races</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</th>
<th>Inter-nat'l</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Colleges/Schools</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Support Units</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>11,220</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Commonwealth Campuses</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>419</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>15,605</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA College of Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>16,486</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix N
3/15/16
**Recommendations:**

1. The Office of Educational Equity and Campus Environment should enlist a cadre of students, faculty, and staff to (a) develop a diversity action plan, in collaboration with unit administrators to enhance recruitment and retention of students, faculty, and staff, (b) develop recommended standards and metrics, centered on the objectives of the University’s Diversity Statement, for assessing recruitment and retention; (c) work with relevant stakeholders, such as Human Resources, unit administrators, and others to develop unit plans for effective implementation of the goals and metrics for administrative assessment.

2. The Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment should sponsor an annual report from the Office of Educational Equity and Campus Environment assessing its programs, initiatives and other significant work, and provide an opportunity for Senators to pose questions.

3. The Office of Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations should prepare a written articulation of standards and objectives that link development campaign themes to diversity initiatives. That office should provide summary information, annually, to the university faculty senate assessing the implementation of those standards and providing senators with an opportunity to pose questions.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Nominating Report for 2016-2017

(Informational)

The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules identified the following nominees to stand for election to three extra-senatorial standing committees. Additional nominations may be made from the floor of the Senate on March 15, 2016.

**Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities**

*University Park* *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- William Kelly, Professor –in-Charge, College of Arts and Architecture
- Richard Robinett, Professor of Physics, Eberly College of Science
- Kim Steiner, Professor of Forest Biology, College of Agricultural Sciences

*Locations other than University Park* *Elect two* (one member, one alternate)
- Mohamad A. Ansari, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Penn State Berks
- Dawn Blasko, Associate Professor of Psychology, Interim Associate Dean, Penn State Erie, the Behrend College
- Deborah Gill, Associate Professor of Spanish, Penn State Dubois

**Deans/Chancellors* *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- Lori Bechtel-Wherry, Chancellor, Penn State Altoona
- Barbara Korner, Dean, College of Arts and Architecture
- Paula Milone-Nuzzo, Dean, College of Nursing

**Standing Joint Committee on Tenure* *Elect two* (one member; one alternate)
- John W. Bagby, Professor of Information Sciences and Technology, College of Informational Sciences and Technology
- Mark A. Brennan, Jr., Professor and UNESCO Chair in Community, Leadership, and Youth Development, College of Agricultural Sciences
- Michael Bérubé, Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Literature and Director of the Institute for the Arts and Humanities, College of the Liberal Arts

**University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee* *Elect three.*
- Richard Duschl, Kenneth B. Waterbury Chaired Professor in Secondary Education, College of Education
- Michael Fidanza, Professor of Plant and Soil Sciences, Penn State Berks
- Gul Kremer, Professor of Engineering Design and Industrial Engineering, College of Engineering
- Jeffrey Laman, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering
- Matthew T. Wilson, Professor of English and Humanities, Penn State Harrisburg
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
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ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2016-2017

(Informational)

PENN STATE ABINGTON
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2017
Le, Binh P.

Term Expires 2018
Brown, Thomas

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

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
SENATORS (9)

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

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

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

Term Expires 2020
Elias, Ryan

PENN STATE ALTOONA
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2017
Rowland, Nicholas J.

Term Expires 2018
Mahan, Carolyn G.
Term Expires 2019
Hayford, Harold
Seymour, Beth
Singer, Richard

Term Expires 2020
Brunsden, Victor W.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE
SENATORS (7)

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

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

Term Expires 2019
Shapiro, Keith D.
Kenyon, William

PENN STATE BERKS
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2017
Bartolacci, Michael
Nasereddin, Mahdi

Term Expires 2019
Snyder, Stephen

Term Expires 2020
Ansari, Mohamad
Aynardi, Martha W.

SMEAL COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
SENATORS (5)

Term Expires 2017
Miles, James A.

Term Expires 2018
Harrison, Terry P.
Posey, Lisa L.
Term Expires 2020
Guay, Terrence
Preciado, Felisa

COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATIONS
SENATORS (3)

Term Expires 2017
Haigh, Michel M.

Term Expires 2019
Connolly-Ahern, Colleen

Term Expires 2020
DiStaso, Marcia

COLLEGE OF EARTH & MINERAL SCIENCES
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2017
Yarnal, Brenton M.

Term Expires 2018
Patzkowsky, Mark
Radovic, Ljubisa
Smithwick, Erica

Term Expires 2019
Forest, Chris
King, Beth
Taylor, Ann

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
SENATORS (6)

Term Expires 2017
Kulikowich, Jonna M.

Term Expires 2018
Passmore, David
Myers, Jamie

Term Expires 2019
Duschl, Richard
Plummer, Julia

Term Expires 2020
TBD
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
SENATORS (15)

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

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

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

Term Expires 2020
Cusumano, Joseph
Melton, Robert
Nembhard, Harriet

PENN STATE ERIE, THE BEHREND COLLEGE
SENATORS (8)

Term Expires 2017
Blasko, Dawn G.
Lasher, William C.

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

Term Expires 2019
Lobaugh, Michael
Barney, Paul

Term Expires 2020
Blakney, Terry
Troester, Rodney L.
PENN STATE GREAT VALLEY
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2017
Litzky, Barrie E.

Term Expires 2020
Jablokow, Kathryn W.

PENN STATE HARRISBURG
SENATORS (7)

Term Expires 2017
Wilburne, Jane M.
Woessner, Matthew

Term Expires 2018
Subramanian, Rajarajan
Hengameh, Hosseini

Term Expires 2019
Meyer, Jennifer
Wilson, Matthew

Term Expires 2020
Douds, Anne

COLLEGE OF HEALTH & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
SENATORS (8)

Term Expires 2017
Ricketts, Robert D.
Tews, Michael

Term Expires 2018
Shurgalla, Richard

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

Terms Expires 2020
Duffey, Michele

COLLEGE OF INFORMATION SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGY
SENATORS (3)
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Term Expires 2018
Trauth, Eileen M.
Friedenberg, Marc A.

Term Expires 2020
Glantz, Edward J.

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2018
Jett, Dennis C.

DICKINSON LAW
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2019
Welsh, Nancy

Term Expires 2020
Butler, William E.

PENN STATE LAW
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2017
Backer, Larry C.

Term Expires 2019
Scott, Geoff

COLLEGE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS
SENATORS (20)

Term Expires 2017
Dietz, Amy
Lee, Barrett
Nelson, Keith
Shen, Shuang
Luke, Nancy

Term Expires 2018
Eckhardt, Caroline
Jolly, Rosemary
Marsh, John
Safran, Janina
Thomas, Darryl
**Term Expires 2019**
Falk, Daniel  
Gouran, Dennis  
Linn, Suzanna  
Makoni, Sinfree  
Wagner, Johanna

**Term Expires 2020**
Abel, Jonathan  
Berube, Michael  
Casper, Gretchen  
Furfaro, Joyce  
Miles, Mary

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES**
SENATORS (3)

**Term Expires 2017**
Copeland, Ann W.

**Term Expires 2018**
Harwell, Kevin R.

**Term Expires 2019**
Hswe, Patricia

**COLLEGE OF MEDICINE**
SENATORS (30)

**Term Expires 2017**
Bascom, Rebecca  
Boehmer, John P.  
Freiberg, Andrew S.  
Kass, Lawrence E.  
Ropson, Ira J.

**Term Expires 2018**
Davis, Dwight  
Eckert, Jill  
Han, David C.  
High, Kane M.  
Meyers, Craig  
Neves, Rogerio Izar  
Potochny, John  
Vrana, Kent  
Walker Eric  
Yun, Jong
Term Expires 2019
Berg, Arthur
Bruno, Michael
Cockroft, Kevin
Enama, Joseph
Levin, Martha
Palmer, Tim
Ray, Chet
Song, Jim
Wenner, William

Term Expires 2020
Kaag, Matthew
Lopez, Hector
Robertson, Gavin
Ruggiero, Francesca
Silveyra, Patricia
Trucia, Cristina

MILITARY SCIENCES
SENATORS (1)

Term Expires 2019
Garey, Richard

COLLEGE OF NURSING
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2017
Brown, Raymonde A.

Term Expires 2018
Ebken, Diane C.

RETIRED FACULTY SENATORS
SENATORS (2)

Term Expires 2018
Jurs, Peter C.

Term Expires 2020
Clark, Mary Beth
EBERLY COLLEGE OF SCIENCE
SENATORS (13)

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

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

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

Term Expires 2020
Banyaga, Augustin

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
SENATORS (31)

Beaver (2)
Term Expires 2018
Mookerjee, Rajen

Term Expires 2020
Pierce, Mari

Brandywine (3)
Term Expires 2017
Blockett, Kimberly

Term Expires 2018
Azemi, Asad

Term Expires 2019
Lawlor, Timothy M.

DuBois (2)
Term Expires 2017
Loeb, Robert

Term Expires 2019
Hufnagel, Pamela P.

**Fayette** (2)
Term Expires 2019
Eberle, Peter M.

Term Expires 2020
Conti, Delia.

**Greater Allegheny** (2)
Term Expires 2017
Jaap, James A.

Term Expires 2020
TBD

**Hazleton** (2)
Term Expires 2018
Marko, Frantisek

Term Expires 2019
Petrilla, Rosemarie

**Lehigh Valley** (2)
Term Expires 2018
Krajsa, Michael J.

Term Expires 2020
Egolf, Roger A.

**Mont Alto** (3)
Term Expires 2018
Dendle, Peter J.

Term Expires 2019
Borromeo, Renee

Term Expires 2020
TBD

**New Kensington** (2)
Term Expires 2018
Kalavar, Jyotsna M.

Term Expires 2019
Bridges, K. Robert

Schuylkill (2)
Term Expires 2019
Andelin, Steve

Term Expires 2020
TBD

Shenango (2)
Term Expires 2017
Saltz, Ira S.

Term Expires 2020
TBD

Wilkes-Barre (2)
Term Expires 2018
Ofosu, Willie K.

Term Expires 2020
TBD

Worthington Scranton (2)
Term Expires 2019
Hinchey, Patricia M.

Term Expires 2020
Aebli, Fred J.

York (2)
Term Expires 2017
Sutton, Jane S.

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

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

(Informational)

Introduction

A joint informational report from the President’s Commissions for Equity (The Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity; the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity; and the Commission for Women) is mandated to be presented to the University Faculty Senate by the Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment. Each Commission has representation on the Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment. The three President’s Commissions for Equity are supported by the Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity and the Vice Provost for Educational Equity serves on the Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment. The structure of this report is as follows: an introductory section from the Chairs of the three Commissions describing routine collaborations; and individual reports from each Commission describing their respective activities and impact.

Information

Dear members of the University Faculty Senate:

The Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity; the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity; and the Commission for Women would like to express appreciation for the opportunity to report jointly to the University Faculty Senate on our activities and impact. Individual reports for each commission are included. However, with this initial section, we’d like to highlight the ways in which we routinely collaborate and support each other’s work for equity and diversity, and bring diversity perspectives to many University initiatives.

Public advocacy

The President’s Commissions for Equity work together to increase public awareness around matters of equity and make policy recommendations. For example, when negative comments surfaced regarding the choice by the Penn State Homecoming committee to bring John Amaechi, a retired basketball player who is gay, to Penn State for Homecoming, we published a piece in The Daily Collegian in support of the choice and Mr. Amaechi. We have also advocated in support of other high-impact diversity concerns such as equitable childcare and healthcare, and promoted respectful Halloween celebrations, following news of inappropriate costumes. Recent public advocacy achievements include the new preferred name and vendor equity policies.

Institutional workforce development (recruitment, retention, succession)

The commissions actively seek to broaden the perspectives of administrators at all levels of University governance. To ensure appropriate representation of underrepresented populations and articulate the views of our various constituencies, the Commissions take part in searches for executive-level hiring. Searches that have benefited from our engagement include the vice provost for Educational Equity, vice president for Strategic Communications, and dean of Penn State Law and School of International Affairs. We then invite those new hires to meet with us to learn about the value of equity and diversity at the University and the missions of the President’s Commissions for Equity. Finally, we have an ongoing working relationship with the Office of Human Resources, and were among those who participated in early focus groups that led to the revised performance management system.
Institutional planning and assessment

The President’s Commissions for Equity help to enhance the quality of education, institutional planning, and community cohesion by participating in the discussion and authoring letters and reports on General Education reform, the University Strategic Plan, and campus engagement. Furthermore, many members of the Commissions served on Framework review teams during the 2010-2015 strategic planning review period.

Commission leadership served as key informants in the external evaluation of diversity programming and infrastructure. This assessment was conducted by Halualani and Associates to benchmark nationally and against our peer institutions.

We hope this brief report stimulates your interest in the work of the Commissions and we look forward to speaking with you during a future Faculty Senate meeting.

Sincerely,

Amy Dupain Vashaw
Chair, Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity

Jamie Campbell
Co-chair, Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity

Suzanne Weinstein
Co-chair, Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity

Vicki L. Hoffman
Co-chair, Commission for Women

Angela M. Rogers
Co-chair, Commission for Women
COMMISSION ON LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER EQUITY (CLGBTE)

Created in 1991, the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity is an advisory group to the President of Penn State. The Commission serves to improve the climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender members of the Penn State community by examining current policies and practices, addressing issues, and initiating and promoting programs that result in a more equitable and supportive environment.

KEY INITIATIVES FOR 2015–2016

Celebrate the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity’s Twenty-fifth Anniversary
- A celebratory gala event will be held on Thursday, April 21 highlighting the progress of the LGBT community at Penn State, nationally, and internationally.
- Support programs throughout the year that reflect the Commission’s twenty-five years of progress.

Fund and Support LGBT Scholarship and Programs
- An academic symposium will be held in conjunction with the Commission’s twenty-fifth anniversary gala, providing opportunities for scholars working in all areas of LGBT and gender identity research to highlight their work.
- In conjunction with the registrar, work to identify relevant course work across the Penn State system, amplify what is already happening, and identify areas of needed growth.
- Support course offerings for the Sexuality and Gender Studies Minor.
- Benchmark resources at peer institutions to support LGBT-themed teaching and scholarship.
- Encourage development of tenure-track faculty positions focused on LGBT research and scholarship.

Promote LGBT Health Care and Restroom Access Policies
- Advance policy to establish restroom access according to an individual’s gender identity.
- Promote and support University health care services for transgender staff and faculty.

Support LGBT Contacts and Resources at all Campuses
- Work with the Office of Student Affairs and other Penn State offices to identify, train, and connect individuals to help implement the recommendation by the University Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment that there be liaisons on each campus to provide support and resources for LGBT persons and issues.

Build Community and Support for LGBT Students
- Develop informational materials to distribute during Move-In Weekend, student recruitment events, and New Student Orientation.
- Present Penn State Reads with a suggestion for the 17-18 book selection.
- Partner with the Office of Admissions to change the undergraduate application to add a transgender option for gender identity and the opportunity to request information about LGBT resources.

Advance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at Penn State
- Partner with CORED and CFW to host an annual promotion and tenure symposium to address issues important to early tenure-line faculty from underrepresented groups.

Enhance Community Building and Interaction for LGBT Students, Faculty, and Staff
Strategically expand the use of social media platforms to allow community members to interact with each other more frequently and engage in meaningful dialogue.

**Improve Support for LGBT Employees**
- Organize informational sessions and materials on the changes to University benefits.
- Organize informational sessions and materials on retirement planning.
- Promote Safe Zone Training for all faculty and staff.

### COMMISSION ON RACIAL/ETHNIC DIVERSITY (CORED)

The Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity (CORED) was founded in 1989. The Commission's primary function is to advise the President of Penn State and advance the University's diversity strategic plan, *A Framework to Foster Diversity at Penn State*. CORED examines University policies and practices, performs needs assessments, makes recommendations to support diversity and equity goals, and implements initiatives to foster a welcoming campus climate at Penn State. CORED's motto is Teamwork, Collaboration, and Communication.

### CURRENT INITIATIVES AND ACTIVITIES

CORED jointly works with the Commission for Women and the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity to host an annual promotion and tenure symposium to address issues important to early tenure-line faculty from underrepresented groups. The eleventh annual Pre-tenure Symposium, *Equity and Inclusion: Successfully Navigating the Promotion and Tenure Process*, was held on Friday, October 16, 2015.

Discussions about best practices for preventing first-generation and low-income students from incurring large amounts of debt are ongoing within CORED. The Commission is reviewing the recommendations made by the CORED-initiated 2009–11 Task Force on Student Institutional Debt and investigating how and to what extent recommendations from that task force are being implemented.

The Commission actively works to increase the connection and support of diversity efforts at all Penn State campuses. One of these efforts is to annually host a Commission meeting at a campus other than University Park. This spring the Commission will host a regional campus meeting for the southwest region of Pennsylvania at Penn State Greater Allegheny.

CORED continues to work on a staff mentoring program. Several models have been evaluated. During the 2015–16 academic year, the Staff Issues Management Team is working with the Office of Human Resources to implement the new program.

The theme of stereotyping was continued at our 2015 Spring Symposium with keynote speaker Valerie Purdie-Vaughns from Columbia University, whose research focuses on stereotype threat and micro-aggressions. The symposium also included a Q & A session, a panel of Penn State students sharing first-hand experiences, and a discussion with more than twenty college administrators involved in faculty hiring to develop strategies for attracting diverse faculty.

### ISSUES MANAGEMENT TEAMS

**Academic Team**
The Academic Team works to increase the University’s understanding of diversity issues relating to curriculum and faculty. In addition to organizing an annual Promotion and Tenure Symposium for underrepresented tenure-
line faculty, workshops, symposia, and talks are sometimes organized to raise the awareness of current diversity-related issues relevant to faculty.

**Outreach Team**
The Outreach Team actively promotes CORED’s mission and accomplishments. The team works to raise awareness of the Commission within the Penn State community through special programs, advocacy, and publicity for various programs and events.

**Student Team**
The Student Team members are strong advocates for students and work diligently to ensure that the voices and concerns of multicultural students are heard. This team actively partners with the numerous multicultural student organizations across the University to increase the student voice on the Commission.

**Staff Team**
The Staff Team explores issues surrounding diversity within the Penn State workforce. Most recently, the team has focused its efforts on the recruitment and retention of staff at Penn State. The team is currently implementing strategies to target a more diverse population for recruitment, and addressing issues to retain and promote diverse staff.

**COMMISSION FOR WOMEN (CFW)**

**MISSION**

Established in 1981, the Commission for Women (CFW) serves as an advisory group to the President on the status of women at Penn State, advocates for women’s concerns, and recommends solutions. 2016 is the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Commission.

Specifically, the CFW:

- examines and makes recommendations about issues that affect women employees and students, including workplace and classroom climate; recruitment, advancement, and retention; mentoring; professional development; maternity and childcare policies; salary equity; work-life balance; and intercollegiate athletics;
- collaborates with Penn State units, colleges, campuses, and organizations in support of gender equity initiatives; and
- recognizes and celebrates contributions and achievements of women at Penn State.

**STRUCTURE AND PROGRAMMING**

**Committees and Objectives**
The CFW creates and dissolves committees as needed. The committees work to carry out its mission. Some of our most active committees and their objectives are:

- **Assessment Committee**: Collects and analyzes data related to the status of women at Penn State, and publishes the “Status of Women at Penn State” report.
- **Awards Committee**: Solicits nominations and selects the annual Achieving Women and Rosemary Schraer award recipients.
- **Campus Liaison Committee**: Coordinates communication with local CFW groups at all Penn State campuses.
• **Educational Programs Committee**: Arranges speakers and programs for our monthly open outreach meeting.
• **Employment and Family Policies Committee**: Investigates and advocates on issues such as breastfeeding support, dependent care issues, and workplace equity and advancement.
• **Faculty Focus Committee**: Advocates for workplace equity needs from a perspective that reflects the unique needs of tenure-track faculty. Collaborates with the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity and the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity on the symposium, “Equity and Inclusion: Successfully Navigating the Promotion and Tenure Process.” This event is usually held in mid-October at the Foster Auditorium in Paterno Library.
• **Luncheon Committee**: Plans and executes the annual Awards Luncheon event held every April. Typically, more than 500 people attend this signature event.
• **Marketing Committee**: Promotes the work of the CFW to the University community.
• **Membership Committee**: Recruits members for the CFW and helps them engage with their work.
• **Mentoring Program Committee**: Plans and manages the mentoring program.
• **Personal Safety and Sexual Assault Awareness Issues Committee**: Investigates, advocates, and supports programming related to ending sexual violence.

**Supporting Professional Development**

The CFW:
• Partners with the Office of Human Resources Center for Workplace Learning and Performance to develop opportunities for personal and professional development.
• Serves on the steering committee for the Administrative Fellows Program.

**Conclusion**

The President’s Commissions for Equity undertake vital work and initiatives that benefit faculty and the University community as a whole. Ongoing collaborations, especially through the Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment, are valuable to the University Faculty Senate.

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT**

• Kimberly Blockett
• Anthony D’Augelli
• Dwight Davis
• Erinn Finke
• Patreese Ingram
• Beth King
• Robert Loeb, Vice Chair
• Jennifer Sliko Meyer
• Daniel Stern
• Holly Thuma
• Tramble Turner, Chair
• Roberto Valdes
• Johanna Wagner
• Marcus Whitehurst
Introduction

For the past nineteen years, Penn State has analyzed the rates at which its provisionally appointed faculty members achieve tenure. Tabulations are shared annually with Penn State’s deans and with the University Faculty Senate. This report and an archive of prior years’ reports are available on the Department of Planning and Institutional Research web page (www.opia.psu.edu/planning_research/reports/tenureflow.html).

Distribution of Penn State Faculty

In fall 2015, Penn State employed 6,127 full-time faculty members, including lecturers, librarians, and research faculty (Table 1). Of these, 2,911 were either tenured or on the tenure track.

Table 1. Full-Time Faculty by Tenure Status, Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure-Track Progression of Assistant Professors

Over the past decade, an average of 163 faculty members have entered provisional status annually at Penn State. Table 2 shows the tenure achievement rates for entering cohorts for whom sufficient time has passed to allow outcomes to be observed. Specifically, tenure rates in Table 2 are calculated from the time of appointment through the seventh year (which allows for the handful of individuals who “stop the clock” for one year during the provisional period). It is extremely rare for a faculty member to stop the tenure clock more than once, although it is permitted under University policy. For the last ten entering cohorts – that is, from those beginning in 1999-00 through those beginning in 2008-09 – 59% of new entrants received tenure by the end of their seventh year. This does not mean that 41% were denied tenure because assistant professors leave the tenure track for many reasons.

Table 2. Tenure Rates over the Past Decade by Gender and Minority Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Number of Entrants - All</th>
<th>Percent Tenured - All</th>
<th>Number of Female Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Females Tenured</th>
<th>Number of Male Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Males Tenured</th>
<th>Number of Minority Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Minorities Tenured</th>
<th>Number of Non-minority Entrants</th>
<th>Percent Non-minority Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00 through 2008-09</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 1 & 2 Notes

- Each cohort includes new entrants into provisional status. So, for example, faculty members who have not completed dissertations and who may have been hired initially into a fixed-term position are included in a tenure cohort for the year in which they formally entered the tenure track. The cohorts also include library faculty of equivalent rank. As explained in the narrative, Tables 1 & 2 track cohorts through the seventh year – that is, one year past the normal tenure-decision point. Therefore, in Table 2, tenure rates include individuals who "stopped the clock" for one year. Typically, there are about 20 or so such cases, University-wide, in any year's cohort.
- These cohorts include all Penn State locations except for the Pennsylvania College of Technology. Cohorts prior to 2008-09 do not include the Dickinson School of Law.
- Minority faculty include all faculty members whose race/ethnicity is not White. This category includes all faculty whose race/ethnicity is reported as international.
Table 2 also provides tenure rates by gender and minority status. As in prior years, there remains a noticeable gender gap. The lowest gap in the five year rolling average was 5% for the 2003-04 cohort; the gap for the 2008-09 cohort is 13%. In aggregate over the past decade, the tenure rate for minority faculty (defined as Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, multiracial, and international) were lower than that of non-minority (White) faculty (55% compared to 61%). Overall, the aggregate tenure rate for females over the past decade is lower than for males (55% compared to 59%). On average the minority tenure gap does seem to be slowly narrowing. The difference between five-year rolling averages for tenure achievement for minority versus non-minority faculty over the past decade peaked for the 2002-03 and 2003-04 cohorts at 7% and has declined to 3% for the current cohort (data not shown).

Comparative data on this topic are very limited, but apparent disparities in tenure rates by gender and race/ethnicity may be related to differences across academic fields. Demographic groups are distributed disproportionately across academic units and aggregate tenure rates differ substantially by discipline. For example, a 2007 report of the Modern Language Association\(^2\) found tenure rates in the fields it represents—which include relatively large numbers of female faculty members—to be around 35%. This is in stark contrast to Penn State’s overall tenure rate of 59% over the last decade.

In order to explore this issue, faculty in the 2008-09 cohort were divided into four broad discipline areas for comparison: arts and humanities, biological sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences.\(^3\) Almost half of the cohort (48%) are in disciplines categorized as social sciences, 20% are in the physical sciences, 16% are in the biological sciences, and 16% are in the arts and humanities (Figure 1).

**Figure 1. Cohort Distribution by Discipline Category**

Within these categories, women make up 50% of the faculty in the biological sciences faculty, 44% in the social sciences, 35% in the arts and humanities, and 6% in the physical sciences (Table 3). Minorities make up 44% of the faculty in the social sciences, 39% in the biological sciences, 34% in the physical sciences, and 15% in the arts and humanities. For this cohort, aggregate tenure rates were higher for males in the arts and humanities and biological sciences, but higher for females in the social sciences (Table 4).

---


\(^3\) A list of University department assignments to the discipline areas is available from Penn State’s Department of Planning and Institutional Research.
Minority tenure rates were lower than non-minority rates in the biological sciences and social sciences, but were higher in the physical sciences. Comparisons by gender were impossible in the physical sciences and by minority status in the arts and humanities due to the small numbers of women and minorities, respectively, in these areas for this cohort. The small number of women and minorities in some of these disciplinary areas, as well as the lack of key tenure predictors such as research productivity, make drawing conclusions from such data inadvisable, however these findings do suggest that this is an area worth further exploration. National data at the discipline-level are not available for comparison.

### Table 3. Disciplinary Category by Gender and Minority Status, 2008-09 Cohort (N=162)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Category</th>
<th>Percentage Female</th>
<th>Percentage Male</th>
<th>Percentage Minority</th>
<th>Percentage Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Tenure Rates by Group and by Disciplinary Category, 2008-09 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Biological Sciences</th>
<th>Physical Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tenure cases reviewed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of female cases reviewed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of male cases reviewed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of cases granted tenure</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female cases granted tenure</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of male cases granted tenure</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of minority cases granted tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-minority cases granted tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blank cells indicate small numbers of faculty in these categories (N<=5), whose confidentiality would be compromised by inclusion in this table.

As noted, Table 2 only indicates the percentage of those who began on the tenure track and received tenure. Table 5 provides information about subsequent Penn State employment status at the end of that seven-year period. As shown in Table 5, small numbers (10% of the 2008-09 cohort) of individuals not receiving tenure remain employed at the University in some full-time capacity at the end of the seven-year window. Of these, five remain in provisional status due to tenure stays, five were subsequently terminated or have upcoming termination dates, and the remaining six are in non-tenure-track, primarily fixed-term, academic positions. Historically, the University has not, as a matter of general practice, retained individuals who have been denied tenure in a subsequent academic appointment.
Table 5. Tenure Outcome and Subsequent Penn State Employment Status at the end of Year Seven for the Past Five Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Number of Entrants</th>
<th>Percentage Tenured and Still Employed</th>
<th>Percentage Not Tenured but Still Employed</th>
<th>Percentage Not Tenured and Not Employed</th>
<th>Percentage Tenured and Not Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07 Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08 Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07 Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08 Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 Male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 Male</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07 Male</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08 Male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 Minority</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 Minority</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07 Minority</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08 Minority</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Minority</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 Non-minority</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 Non-minority</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07 Non-minority</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08 Non-minority</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Non-minority</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National higher education databases do not normally include tenure achievement rates comparable to the Penn State data in this report. Table 6 summarizes information collected in 2015 for the 2007-08 cohort, through a special one-time data exchange among twelve peer universities that participate in the American Association of Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE). Data was provided by Boston, Cornell, Michigan State, Purdue, and Rutgers Universities, and the Universities of Arizona, California – Davis, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota – Twin Cities, Nebraska – Lincoln, and Wisconsin – Madison. In all cases except for Penn State, the data are for a single (main) campus. As Table 6 shows, Penn State’s tenure rate of
63% (N=160) for the AAUDE cohort study was typical for this group of universities, for which the average rate was 65% (N=1,326). The different male-to-female and minority-to-non-minority patterns at Penn State were also similar, but slightly more extreme than those reported by peer institutions in the AAUDE study (Table 6).

Table 6. 2007-08 Cohort Seven-Year Tenure Achievement Rates from Participating AAUDE Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Number of Entrants – Penn State</th>
<th>Percent Tenured – Penn State</th>
<th>Number of Entrants – 13 AAUDE</th>
<th>Percent Tenured – 13 AAUDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for Penn State, these are main campuses only and exclusive of medical schools. Counts and averages for 13 AAUDE universities are inclusive of Penn State.

Approval Percentages of Upper-Level Reviews

Tables 7 through 9 summarize data for Penn State including Hershey, but excluding the Pennsylvania College of Technology, for each typical tenure review year. The tables present data for the normally sequenced (second-, fourth-, and sixth-year) reviews. Not all units report the information for year 2 and year 4 reviews in a timely manner, so Tables 8 and 9 are incomplete. Usually only 6-10 cases per year are dealt with out of the normal sequence (for example, as third- or fifth-year reviews). There are many possible paths through the review process (with campus committees, department, division, and school committees, college committees, and the University committee). These tables present the most common decision points in the tenure review process. In brief, for Abington, Altoona, Berks, Erie, and Harrisburg, the respective chancellors sign off at the dean/VP level — that is, they are not tallied in the campus chancellor column. For the other 14 campuses comprising the University College, both the campus chancellor and the vice president for commonwealth campuses (who serves as dean of the University College) sign off. Great Valley faculty fall under the purview of the vice president for commonwealth campuses. Faculty in the Applied Research Lab are eligible for promotion only, not tenure, and are not reflected in these data.

Tables 7 through 9 demonstrate that the large majority of upper-level reviews at Penn State are consistent with recommendations coming from departments and campuses. Final outcomes have, likewise, historically been consistent with the recommendations that the University committee and the President receive.

As noted in Table 9, in 2014-15, 88 cases made it to the dean/vice president of research level of six-year review. Seven of those cases were denied at that level and 81 cases (including seven early-tenure cases) continued to the University-level of review. Of the 81 cases presented to the University-level of review, 79 carried a positive recommendation from the respective dean. At the University-level of review, 79 cases were reviewed positively and all were approved by the President. This pattern is typical. Prior annual versions of this report have shown that the University-level approval percentage has almost always been over 90%.
This report indicates whether faculty members received tenure; it does not explain why some faculty members do not receive tenure. Many individuals leave voluntarily, not necessarily because they were denied tenure. Penn State has been exploring some of those matters via an annual faculty exit survey and interview process, conducted since 1997. The most recent Faculty Study, as well as an archive of prior exit studies is available online at the Department of Planning and Institutional Research web page (http://www.opia.psu.edu/planning_research/reports/facultyexitsurvey).

Table 7. Year Two Tenure Reviews, 2008-09 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Campus Chancellor</th>
<th>Dept/Div/ School Head</th>
<th>College Dean/Sr VP Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases reviewed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female cases reviewed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male cases reviewed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive recommendations</td>
<td>18 (100%)</td>
<td>107 (100%)</td>
<td>127 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female positive recommendations</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>47 (100%)</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male positive recommendations</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
<td>44 (100%)</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>63 (100%)</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Year Four Tenure Reviews, 2008-09 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Campus Chancellor</th>
<th>Dept/Div/ School Head</th>
<th>College Dean/Sr VP Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases reviewed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female cases reviewed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male cases reviewed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive recommendations</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>59 (100%)</td>
<td>65 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female positive recommendations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male positive recommendations</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
<td>36 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>35 (100%)</td>
<td>40 (98%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Year Six and Early Tenure Reviews, 2008-09 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review History</th>
<th>Campus Chancellor</th>
<th>Dept/Div/School Head</th>
<th>College Dean/Sr VP Research</th>
<th>University Final Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases reviewed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female cases reviewed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male cases reviewed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority cases reviewed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive recommendations</td>
<td>15 (83%)</td>
<td>72 (99%)</td>
<td>79 (90%)</td>
<td>79 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female positive recommendations</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
<td>36 (90%)</td>
<td>36 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male positive recommendations</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
<td>43 (90%)</td>
<td>43 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>28 (100%)</td>
<td>32 (91%)</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority positive recommendations</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
<td>43 (98%)</td>
<td>47 (89%)</td>
<td>47 (98%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Considerations for Rewards and Recognition of International Engaged Faculty and Staff

(Informational)

Introduction

The Senate Committee on Global Programs, in conjunction with the Committee on Faculty Affairs, has been charged to bring forth recommendations to reward and recognize faculty that are engaged in international programs. This report is presented to provide our Faculty Senate membership with suggestions to create a more transparent process of encouraging and supporting faculty to continue their efforts in global programs and initiatives.

Information

Awards for Global Engagement should be considered for faculty and staff members in recognition of outstanding contributions to global education and international programs at the University or in their field or discipline. In addition to honoring individual faculty and staff members, the award—by identifying excellence in global engagement and by recognizing outstanding work—serves as a resource and inspiration to other faculty and staff. With the University placing an increased emphasis on its global footprint, we must continuously reward and recognize those interested in addressing some of the world’s most pressing problems.

Discussion and Conclusion

International engagement is defined as international research, teaching or service functions that impact communities in the United States or abroad. To recognize faculty, all available means of recognition and reward are important. Relatively modest measures may reap significant benefits. This also implies well-understood methods or metrics of assessing the quality of the research, teaching, and public engagement, appropriate to the discipline or field. Two categories have been outlined as possible avenues for consideration—rewards and recognition.

A. Rewards

Rewards could be monetary or for career development. This would only apply to academic travel, not travel related to research or to international meetings; a more specific definition is needed.

a. Monetary Rewards

Ideally, faculty should be compensated or reimbursed for academic travel. There are many formulas used to accomplish this, but the goal should be to incentivize travel among faculty who would otherwise not be able to participate, and increase participation by faculty who already travel.
b. Suggestions

1. Fund in full or in-part faculty traveling on specific missions (e.g. related to the Global Programs strategic plan)

2. Monetary reward for faculty who have shown meritorious international service

3. Monetary incentive/reward for travel to countries where Penn State has international students
   1. Use a portion of the fee paid by international students studying at Penn State to create a fund for faculty to travel back to the students’ country to work on academic or collaborative ventures.
   2. Would possibly give countries incentive to send more students if they saw it as a benefit to their communities. Alumni in those countries might also contribute to this fund for the same reason. Eventually these funds could be used as endowments.

B. Recognition

International travel related to global programs should be considered academic in nature. Faculty with 4 weeks of vacation may not want to give up a week of vacation to travel with students over their spring break, even if faculty are willing to pay for the travel themselves. Time dedicated to designing, developing, and maintaining programs must be recognized through both the promotion and tenure process and awards.

Considerations

1. International academic travel should be a specific part of faculty dossiers for promotion and tenure

2. Recognize faculty at non-UP campuses through tracks that are specific to their international efforts. For instance, efforts to internationalize the curriculum takes on different meaning in a campus with less than 1000 students. Efforts by faculty in this regard are in no way comparable to those done at UP but they are significant and should be duly recognized.

3. Create categories of awards to recognize achievements of faculty and staff for exemplary accomplishments in teaching, research, and public service in the international arena.

4. Develop an annual awards ceremony to publicly recognize award winners at UP and non-UP campuses.

C. Future items for consideration

Implementing any of these recommendations will require further conversations with administrators, faculty, and staff to produce a process that is fair and transparent. Future
conversations will include implementation strategies as well as pathways for supporting such efforts. We acknowledge that in addition to these, other questions that must be raised at the onset include:

1. How willing is PSU administration and the Office of Global Programs to match these contributions and efforts?

2. What methods are needed to build buy-in of Deans and Department Heads?

3. What strategies can be designed to encourage faculty and staff to apply for these awards?
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At its September 18, 2015 meeting, the Penn State Board of Trustees approved the recommendation to transition from the current enterprise learning management system (ANGEL) to Canvas. Canvas offers students and faculty new ways to manage, navigate and access their courses online.

Launched in 2011, Canvas is currently used by over 800 learning institutions. Canvas is available to Penn State through the University’s membership with Unizin, a non-profit technology consortium that was formed in 2014 as a way to enable universities to reach their goals with digital learning. The consortium focuses on improving the way educational content is shared by providing a common digital infrastructure. In November 2014, it was announced that Penn State had become a founding member of the organization. Penn State began using ANGEL in the fall of 2001. In October 2014, Blackboard, ANGEL’s parent company, announced ANGEL’s end-of-life date will be in December 2017.

Students, faculty, and staff throughout Penn State were invited to participate in a pilot of the Canvas learning management system (LMS) during the spring 2015 semester. Information Technology Services (ITS) and Outreach and Online Education expanded the pilot of Canvas in the fall 2015 semester and sought interested instructors, including those who teach large enrollment courses, to participate. The purpose of the pilot was to broaden awareness and participation in the evaluation of the potential of Canvas to positively impact the teaching and learning experience at Penn State. See attachment for Canvas usage statistics for the pilots.

Surveys were conducted with faculty, staff and students participating in the pilot. Feedback was very positive. 90% of faculty, 85% of staff, and 70% of students agreed that Canvas would be a suitable replacement for ANGEL. Faculty, staff, and students agreed that Canvas is easy to use. Faculty enjoyed using Speedgrader, which cut down grading time on written assignments by 50%. Students were very impressed with the mobile app.

The transition to Canvas must be completed no later than December 2017 at which time the current ANGEL license / support agreement expires. The scope of this transition includes:

- 79% current PSU course offerings
- 28,000 active course sections within an academic year
- 8,400 faculty, instructional designers, support staff
- 88,000 students
The first full semester of using Canvas (spring 2016) will be a ramp-up period designed to start the transition from the fall 2015 limited pilot to the full University-wide adoption. This period will allow for the development and implementation of migration services, training resources, and initial integration of third-party learning tools. For planning purposes, courses will not be taught in ANGEL after June 30, 2017. To allow time for content to be migrated to Canvas as well as for students to complete deferred grades, instructors will be able to access ANGEL online through December 31, 2017.

For more information about Canvas, visit the Website at http://canvas.psu.edu.

Attachment:

Canvas Pilot Usage Statistics

Provided below are the Canvas usage statistics collected during the spring and fall pilots of 2015. University-wide, more than 200 faculty and TAs and 8,000 students are using this course management system. This number is expected to increase dramatically during the spring 2016 semester and beyond. ANGEL end of life is set for December 2017. Courses will be transitioned from ANGEL to Canvas, with most all courses running in Canvas after spring 2017.

**Spring 2015 Pilot**

**Participants**
- 61 faculty
- 60 staff (IDs and support)
- 2,385 students (maximum enrollments)
- 81 course sections (8 World Campus / 73 Resident Instruction)

**Campus Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>York</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington Scranton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts and Architecture</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>HHD</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>IST</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2015 Pilot**

**Participants**
- 132 faculty
- 80 staff (IDs and support)
- 7,597 students (maximum enrollments)
• 207 course sections (39 World Campus / 168 Resident Instruction)

## Campus Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Allegheny</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Alto</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Campus</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Scranton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenango</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh Valley</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## College Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>IST</th>
<th>Medical School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>HHD</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2016 Ramp Up Participants (as of 1/17/15)

- 1125 courses active
- 923 faculty listed
- 28000 enrollments

Submitted By:

Jennifer Sparrow, Ed.D.
Senior Director, Teaching and Learning with Technology
Jls997@psu.edu

Terry O’Heron
Director of Operations, Teaching and Learning with Technology
Tno1@psu.edu

Brian Young
Manager, Learning Tools and Service Management
Teaching and Learning with Technology
Bxy8@psu.edu
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LIST

Report on changes to Research Computing at PSU

(Informational)

Introduction

This report provides a summary of the two major recent transitions in research computing aspect of the university. The first major change was the transition to the Institute for Cyberscience (ICS, https://ics.psu.edu) with a shift of research computing to be managed within the Vice President for Research Office. With this transition, the major high-performance computing center and its staff were moved into a new organizational structure called the ICS Advanced Computing Infrastructure (ICS-ACI, https://ics.psu.edu/advanced-cyberinfrastructure/). The second major change was the creation of a faculty governance structure to manage the new structure for research computing at Penn State. This structure is called the Shared Governance of Research Computing and Cyber-Infrastructure (RCCI, https://rcci.psu.edu). Here we provide a summary report on this transition in two parts with a focus on these changes in relation to the research community at Penn State.

Part 1:
Update on: RCC Transition and ICS-ACI Updates

This part is summarized by the memo submitted to the Senate Committee on Research by: Padma Raghavan, Associate Vice President for Research and Director of Strategic Initiatives, Director of the Institute for CyberScience, and Distinguished Professor of Computer Science and Engineering; Wayne Figurelle, Assistant Director of ICS; and David Spielman, ICS Communications Specialist

This memo is included as an appendix.

The critical links to information include:
ICS, https://ics.psu.edu
ICS-ACI, https://ics.psu.edu/advanced-cyberinfrastructure/

(Note: Currently, Padma Raghavan is the Vice President for Research at Vanderbilt University.)

Part 2:
Update on: Shared Governance of Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure (RCCI)

Penn State approaches the governance of Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure (RCCI, https://rcci.psu.edu) in a unique manner, utilizing a shared approach that engages faculty, IT professionals, and administrators from across the University, and providing a structure through
which researchers can elevate their questions, suggestions, and problems to the highest levels of the University.

**Mission & Goals** ([http://rcci.psu.edu/mission/](http://rcci.psu.edu/mission/))

As adapted from the RCCI Mission and Goals webpage, the mission of Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure governance is to enable Penn State effectively to deliver the full spectrum of computing and data services required for current and future directions in research. To do this, RCCI Governance establishes faculty-led governance structures intended to be inclusive, forward-looking, and conducive to substantive involvement of stakeholders (faculty, IT professionals, students, and administrators) in decisions concerning research cyberinfrastructure resources, facilities, and services. Research cyberinfrastructure is critical to all researchers at Penn State, from focused high-performance computing users to users in the “long-tail” of research who work on local systems and individual desktop and laptop computers.

Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure governance seeks to:
- establish “faculty governance” of Research Computing;
- connect faculty and IT professionals at every level;
- establish go-to individuals in every local unit (College, Institute, etc.);
- create clear channels of communication, bottom-up, top-down, and across the three IT domains (research, teaching, enterprise systems);
- create a broadly inclusive central forum for discussion and advice;
- create a manageably small Executive Committee to advise the Chair and the VPR;
- establish clear relationships among the research computing entities at the Colleges and Institutes including the Institute for CyberScience (ICS);
- establish clear relationships between ITS and research computing entities at the Colleges and ICS; and
- put the VPR in charge of advocating for research computing and arguing for the funding research computing needs to work well; foster entrepreneurial activities.

**Governance Structure** ([http://rcci.psu.edu/structure/](http://rcci.psu.edu/structure/))

The Governance Structure is modeled after a shared governance approach across the spectrum of users and staff. This is outlined here: [http://rcci.psu.edu/structure/handbook/](http://rcci.psu.edu/structure/handbook/).

The core of the approach is based on using the Communities of Practice to keep track of the resources required to maintain a world-class computing environment at the university. These communities of practice create a network at the base of a dynamic, organic governance structure. The CoPs are organized into a set of Working Groups in which the primary governing work is done. The two layers above the CoPs are the Advisory Council (AC, [http://rcci.psu.edu/advisory-council/](http://rcci.psu.edu/advisory-council/)) and the Executive Committee (EC, [http://rcci.psu.edu/executive-committee-2/](http://rcci.psu.edu/executive-committee-2/)). The AC consists primarily of the Chairs of the Working Groups and includes key links to other computing and IT staff as they relate to research pillar of the university. The RCCI AC has a set of co-chairs. The members of the EC are
nominated by members of the research computing community and chosen by the Provost. The EC reports directly to the Provost on all matters related to the RCCI. The working relationships between the WGs, the AC, the EC, the VPR, and the Provost create the critical links between the research computing user community and the administration. This provides a flexible governance structure that puts the key university-level decision-makers together with those who have direct knowledge of the rapidly changing computing landscape. As a whole, this entity will “serve to influence the direction of all services, systems, policies, and processes that affect research computing and cyber-infrastructure at Penn State.”

**Research Guru**  (http://rcci.psu.edu/research-guru/)

The formal title for this position is the Senior Advisor for Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure. Greg Madden was hired as the first Research Computing Guru and he serves on the Executive Committee, the Advisory Council, and each of the Advisory Council’s working groups. As stated on the Research Guru website:

“the role of the Senior Advisor is to provide advice to, receive advice from, and be fully aware of all relevant activities taking place in the AC, the working groups, the EC, and across the University. The goal of the Senior Advisor is to identify and eliminate every
point of friction in research computing and cyberinfrastructure across Penn State, ranging from the smallest technical issues to the largest policy issues.”

**Working Groups** ([http://rcci.psu.edu/working-groups-2/](http://rcci.psu.edu/working-groups-2/))

Initial working groups are:
- Data Centers Working Group
- Data Governance Working Group
- High-Performance Computing Working Group
- IT/HR Job Classification and Compensation Working Group
- Research Network and Data Classification Policies Working Group
- Software Working Group

Additional Working Groups are to be added as necessary based on the needs of the research community.
Appendix:
To: Chris E. Forest, Associate Professor of Climate Dynamics and Chair of the University Faculty Senate Committee on Research
From: Padma Raghavan, Associate Vice President for Research and Director of Strategic Initiatives, Director of the Institute for CyberScience, and Distinguished Professor of Computer Science and Engineering; Wayne Figurelle, Assistant Director of ICS; and David Spielman, ICS Communications Specialist

Subject: RCC Transition and ICS-ACI Updates
Date: October 22, 2015

Summary
This memo briefly presents the transition from the former Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure (RCC) from Information Technology Services (ITS) to the Institute for CyberScience (ICS) as a new unit known as Advanced CyberInfrastructure (ICS-ACI). Details about the current operations and future plans of ICS-ACI are also included.

The Former RCC
The organization that ICS inherited operated very differently from how ICS-ACI operates now. RCC did not work with users through service level agreements (SLAs). Rather than providing a subscription service, they used a partner model, in which researchers made an initial investment in a cluster and were then given higher priority in using the cluster over non-partners. This arrangement resulted in 85% of the system being used by 53 partners and only 15% used by 858 non-partners.

As this pie chart demonstrates, a minority of the researchers used a majority of the system. A surprising 12% of the system was used by one user; another 40% by 2-16 users; 40% more by 92
users; and the remaining 106 users were left with 8%. This disparity in usage becomes even more concerning in light of the RCC cost share model, in which 17% of the costs were covered by 53 partners, while the remaining 83% of the costs were paid by Penn State. As should be apparent, the RCC model gave preferential access to a few users at the expense of the broader research community and operated on a non-sustainable financial basis.

Course Correcting and Current Operations
When ICS inherited RCC, the new ICS-ACI inherited a number of challenges. The first was providing equal access to research computing resources for the Penn State research community. To achieve this, ICS-ACI instituted service level agreements to establish how much users would pay and what they would get for it. In contrast to the RCC, ICS-ACI created open and transparent policies to govern services such that no user gained access to resources unfairly and so that the research community could view the policies at any time. Uniform access across the university-wide research community was paramount, in addition to bringing in new communities with data-intensive processing needs.

ICS-ACI also adopted a radically different organizational structure than the RCC to promote project-based operations and increase organizational agility. Under the RCC, ten level-3 or 4 techs reported to a single IT manager in a top-down structure. There were no teams and no apparent emphasis on tasking and outcomes. ICS-ACI however is organized as a matrix organization, as the following image demonstrates:

Structured as a matrix organization, ICS-ACI can respond to new demands and challenges quickly and efficiently by re-tasking employees around the needs of the current projects. There
are also opportunities for career development and professional advancement through a structure such as this, rather than a flat organization. ICS-ACI now has career tracks with clear milestones, allowing it to recruit and retain the best talent.

In another departure from its predecessor, ICS-ACI involved faculty in its governance; and the ICS-ACI Coordinating Committee, consisting of faculty and IT colleagues, oversaw the creation of the service level agreement process and the ICS-ACI governing policies. This move to involve stakeholders in IT governance coincides with a broader trend at Penn State. Based on the recommendations of a task force charged by the Provost, Penn State faculty have created an Advisory Council for Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure, an Executive Committee of that council, and introduced a new senior advisor for research computing and cyberinfrastructure (often called the “Research Guru” for short). ICS-ACI seeks similarly to involve Penn State faculty in its governance and policymaking. ICS-ACI policies and service level agreements set clear expectations for users, but a one-size fits all approach does not work for a diverse research community; so, ICS-ACI employs an exceptions process for researchers whose needs require case-by-case policy exceptions. Whether these are approved or denied is decided based on faculty input.

While ICS-ACI took on the responsibility for maintaining the RCC’s Lion-X clusters, it also moved forward with its own new ACI system, which launched August 17th, 2015. This system provides a number of subsystems, such as ACI-b, ACI-i, ACI-u, and ACI-e. ACI-b handles batch processing of jobs. ACI-i offers users interactive sessions and the use of a graphical user interface, like the old Hammer system. ACI-u generates customizable environments for users through the use of virtual machines and instances. ACI-e tackles emerging technology, such as the Hadoop cluster. ACI-b was the first system made available to the public on August 17th, and ACI-i just recently completed its testing period and became available to ACI users. ACI-u is under development and should be available before the end of the semester. These various subsystems allow researchers greatly increased flexibility over the Lion-X systems.

To provide access to these systems, ICS-ACI developed access models in consultation with the Coordinating Committee. The principle method of gaining access to the ACI cluster is through the Guaranteed-Response Time or GReaT Model, providing access to ICS-ACI within a guaranteed time frame with burst available. “Bursting” refers to using more resources than one is allocated to use for a short period of time. The default burst capability for GReaT model users is 4X their core allocation. Researchers may choose to subscribe for access to standard-memory (256 GB RAM) or high-memory (1TB RAM) cores. This model guarantees response times of one hour or less to participating subscribers that have fully-executed service level agreements. The GReaT model offers other benefits, including 5 TB of Group storage at no cost to the researcher if they subscribe for at least one full node (20 processors), priority over non-GReaT queues, and no walltime limit.

One clear benefit of a subscription service is the facilitation of uneven computational workflows. If a researcher purchases a workstation or computes on a cluster without bursting, unused cycles are lost. One might imagine a faucet that is always on, regardless of whether anyone needs the water. Many researchers do not need to run their jobs at a steady state but instead compute for a period and then do very little computing during post-processing of the data. These researchers
would need 1) access to enough processors to get their data in a timely manner when processing is desired and 2) the ability to use compute time when they need it, rather than being required to use it constantly to maximize value. ICS-ACI addressed these needs with the adoption of a 90-day sliding window that tracks usage each day. On the 91st day, the usage from day 1 rolls off the sliding window, and the research group’s balance increases by that amount. As a result, researchers may use their compute allocation whenever they choose, either through a steady state or through periods of burst activity and inactivity.

ICS-ACI’s focus has been the adoption of policies and services that provide flexibility for researchers and enable them to do their work in as many ways as is feasible. Even the charge-out model reflects this focus on researcher flexibility. Computer processing capacity is charged as “notional core-months” and storage capacity as “notional TByte-months.” PIs will enter into a Service Level Agreement (SLA) whereby they plan to charge at least twelve (12) months of services to a non-ICS-ACI source. PIs may charge services to any funding source(s) at the following rates:

- $33 \times \text{number of cores} \times \text{number of months for standard-memory cores (256 GByte RAM)}$
- $63 \times \text{number of cores} \times \text{months for high-memory cores (1 TByte RAM)}$
- $25/\text{month per 1T Byte of storage}$

While these are nominal published rates, Provost Jones is providing substantial additional funds to encourage the use of these services for University-sponsored research. At the end of each month, PIs will be credited with additional research support funds on a two-to-one basis. They will receive two notional core-months or two TByte-months for each one they have paid for with non-ICS-ACI funds. These doubled ICS-ACI research support funds will be deposited in an ICS cost center, to which PIs may charge services for University-sponsored research. PIs have multiple ways to distribute charges to their sponsored project or non-ICS-ACI funds and to use their additional compute time.

1. Option 1: A PI may charge the initial GReaT services 100% to their non-ICS-ACI accounts and choose to delay use of ICS-ACI research support funds until after his or her other sources of funds are depleted.
2. Option 2: A PI may use GReaT services for a mix of sponsored and University-supported research by authorizing charges that match their usage to the appropriate accounts. Sponsored research may be charged to the sponsored project account, while University-sponsored research may be charged to the ICS-ACI research support funds or to other sources from Penn State. A PI may charge services for University-sponsored research to their ICS-ACI research support funds as soon as they have been accrued on a monthly basis.
3. Option 3: A PI may access their ICS-ACI research support funds at a steady rate throughout their plan to reduce the direct charge to their sponsored budget. For example, a PI could charge as little as $11 per standard-memory notional core-month to non-ICS-ACI sources and the remaining $22 to their ICS-ACI research support funds. Similarly, a PI could charge as little as $21 per high-memory notional core-month or $8.33 per 1
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TByte of storage per month to a non-ICS-ACI account, with the rest funded by the ICS-ACI research support funds.

Whether PIs use their ICS-ACI research support funds from the very beginning of their plan, as in option 3, or wait to use the funds until the end, their effective costs over a period of three years will be the same. The flexibility built into this charge-out model allows researchers to decide how they want to allocate their financial resources and to be able to change these allocations over the course of their SLA.

ICS-ACI seeks also to design, build, and operate state-of-the-art computational clusters. ICS-ACI currently operates over 16,000 processing cores, 2.5 Petabytes of parallel file storage, high-speed interconnects, and a large software stack supporting all aspects of research. The new ACI system constitutes about 6,000 of the 16,000 cores and provides 15 Dell M1000E Blade server enclosures with 240 M620E Blades, 27 Dell R920 servers, 21 Dell R720 servers, 2 Dell R720XD and 6 Dell R620 servers. Each standard memory node consists of 20 Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2680 v2 processors at 2.80GHz with 256GB of RAM at 1866MHz and Mellanox FDR Infiniband interconnects.

The ICS-ACI system storage and data archive capabilities include 2.5 PB capacity on NAS storage, 2.5 PB on GPFS storage, and 4 PB of tape backup storage for archiving. The NAS storage system has multiple Nexenta NAS pools that service users’ Home, Work and Group storage. The system is deployed on Dell Nexenta reference architecture. The GPFS storage pool is provided on an IBM Parallel Scratch storage system, and the Tape Backup system is an IBM TS3500 Tape system. The entire architecture employs a research-centric software stack available to users that is driven by the research community. The customized environments allow researchers to deploy software from pre-compiled and tested software catalogs. The software stack supports both commercial and opensource software.

Hardware alone, however, does the research community little good without the support researchers need to use it. ICS-ACI operates the i-ASK Center, a technical support help desk, which provides basic and advanced support for all users. Guaranteed-response times and escalation policies ensure that i-ASK meets users’ support needs in a timely manner. ICS-ACI also provides online support and training for conducting research on the ICS-ACI system and supplements these with in-person training sessions. Users may also request individual training or group training on specific areas based on need working in conjunction with ICS. For example, ICS will provide user support for the needed software libraries, specialized applications, and programming languages. New groups to the ACI system currently participate in onboarding training sessions held in Computer Building with ICS-ACI staff, during which researchers learn about the systems, some basic commands, and they log into ACI for the first time to ensure that their accounts are active and functional. The training materials from these sessions are available on the website, which has been expanded greatly in the past three months.

Future Directions
ICS-ACI is currently hard at work on providing more ways for researchers to do their work. ACI-u should afford access to research computing for users who do not require high-performance computing but need high-throughput computing instead. Many users of the Lion-X
clusters submit thousands of single-processor jobs and do not need access to hundreds of processor, parallelized processing. These users may find the 10 processor minimum of ACI too high for them but should find an excellent fit for their research needs in ACI-u. Those who need a custom environment will also find ACI-u useful and exciting. For users who do not wish to subscribe to a service that provides access to central hardware, ICS-ACI plans to offer hosting plans, whereby researchers may place their own hardware that conforms to ICS-ACI specifications within ICS-ACI clusters, giving them access to ICS-ACI support staff, networking, storage, power, and research software. ICS-ACI also works with XSEDE to provide information for faculty about obtaining allocations of XSEDE resources and hosts informational sessions and workshops through the Penn State XSEDE Champion Igor Yakushin, an ICS-ACI Software Systems Engineer.

Various services plans are also under development. ICS-ACI aims to allow PIs to purchase ICS-ACI technical services, such as programming, code optimization, and consulting. An archival plan is on the horizon that would allow PIs to purchase ICS-ACI archival services for their research data that do not fit other Penn State services. In addition, ICS-ACI continues to develop and deploy user training materials and is looking into avenues for delivering ongoing user development through workshops, seminars, and online self-guided tutorials. Users may already obtain grant proposal support text from ICS-ACI staff to help explain the service model and facilities, and ICS-ACI intends to continue building on these resources to assist faculty in winning awards.

ICS-ACI has begun taking applications for the ICS-ACI Explore Program, which enables faculty to advance computational and data-enabled research that can enhance the visibility of Penn State and to facilitate the development of competitive proposals to external funding agencies. ICS-ACI’s priority is to support faculty seeking to “explore” new research directions that represent a departure from prior or ongoing work. Projects comprising of collaborative and interdisciplinary efforts in emerging areas along the University and ICS theme of “building our digital future” (e.g. big data and simulations) will be given special consideration. Allocation of ICS-ACI computing and data resources and/or a science gateway will be made available for a period of 3 to 12 months based on a review by ICS advisory faculty. This program provides another means of access to computational resources for the Penn State research community.
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SENATE COUNCIL

Nominating Committee Report for 2016-2017

(Informational)

The Nominating Committee consisting of the elected representatives of Senate Council was convened on January 12, 2016. Additional nominations may be made from the floor of the Senate on March 15, 2016.

CHAIR-ELECT OF THE SENATE

- Laura L. Pauley, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering
- Matthew Woessner, Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Policy, Penn State Harrisburg

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(One to be elected to one-year term)

- Roger A. Egolf, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Penn State Lehigh Valley
- Keith D. Shapiro, Associate Professor of Art, College of Arts and Architecture
- Ann H. Taylor, Director of the John A. Dutton e-Education Institute, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT

(One to be elected, term expires 2019)

- Victor Brunsden, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Penn State Altoona
- Rosemary J. Jolly, Weiss Chair in the Humanities, Professor of Comparative Literature, English, Bioethics, African Studies, and Women’s Studies, College of the Liberal Arts
- Nicholas J. Rowland, Associate Professor of Sociology, Education, Human Development, and Social Sciences, Penn State Altoona
- Erica Smithwick, Associate Professor of Geography, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Grade Distribution Report

(Informational)

In March 1987, the Senate passed legislation requiring an annual review of grade distribution data for baccalaureate students. The attached tables show data that have been provided by the Registrar' Office for each spring semester from 1975 to 2015. The report focuses on spring semesters 2004 to 2015 and detailed data for spring semester 2015. The Undergraduate Education Committee formed an exploratory sub-committee to study the trends.

Tables Attached Include:

Table 1 - Percentage of Grades Awarded in 0 - 499 Resident Instruction Courses Comparison for Spring Term/Semester 1975 to 2015

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

Table 2 - Summary of Grade Distribution for Resident Instruction Spring Semester 2015 (All locations - All Courses for All Colleges except the College of Medicine and Dickinson School of Law)

- For all the freshmen and sophomore courses (0-399), descriptively, it appears that a greater percentage of grades in the range A-B are awarded at University Park compared with other campuses. Additionally, there is a higher percentage of grades assigned below a B at campuses other than University Park.

- While in previous years World Campus exhibited a grade distribution which was very similar to that of the university in aggregate, in spring 2015, it seems more closely aligned with the distribution at the other campuses.

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

- The percentage of students earning a semester grade point average within the range of 3.00-3.99 has increased since 1992. Comparatively, the proportion of students earning a semester grade point average in the range of 2.00-2.99 has decreased since 1992. However, the changes in both these ranges have been relatively modest since 2004. Finally, the share of students earning semester grade point averages below 1.99, and the
proportion with a semester grade point average of 4.00, appear to have remained stable since 2008.

Table 4 - Spring Semester Grade Point Averages and Dean’s List - Summary by College for Spring Semester 2015

- Computing differences between 2005 and 2015 semester grade point averages for baccalaureate degree-seeking students reveals that two academic units have grade point increases of 0.12 or more: Smeal College of Business and Agricultural Sciences.

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

- This report shows a significant drop in the semester GPA between 2005 and 2015 for baccalaureate Inter-college programs. However, it’s important to note that there were only 4 students enrolled in these programs in 2005, compared to the 141 enrolled in 2015.

- Although we report World Campus grade distribution, as we do for other campus locations, it should be noted that World Campus does not employ its own, separate faculty. Therefore, the grades reported for World Campus offerings are grades that have been entered by Penn State faculty from throughout our campus locations.
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Table 1
Percentage of Grades Awarded in 0 - 499 Resident Instruction Courses
Comparison Spring Term/Semester 1975-2015

Graph comparing the average grade awarded in 0 to 499 resident instruction courses during the spring semester between the years of 1975 to 2015.
### Percentage of Grades Awarded in 0-499 RI Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Average Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1976: 8 week drop rule in effect
- 1984: 10 week late drop rule in effect, switch from terms to semesters
- 1988: Plus/minus grading began
- 1990: 12 week, 16 credit late drop rule in effect
- 2008: World Campus included
## Table 2
Summary of Grade Distribution for Resident Instruction
Spring Semester 2015 (6/27/15)
(All Campuses, All Courses for All Colleges, Except HY and DN)

### 0-499 Level Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-499 not UP or WC</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>136,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-499 UP</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>195,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-499 WC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grades</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>108,085</td>
<td>48,558</td>
<td>36,618</td>
<td>43,012</td>
<td>24,051</td>
<td>17,945</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>12,671</td>
<td>11,837</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,315</td>
<td>16,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 0-499</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>353,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 0-399 Level Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-399 not UP or WC</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>120,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-399 UP</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>144,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-399 WC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>16,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grades</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>80,215</td>
<td>37,517</td>
<td>28,553</td>
<td>34,754</td>
<td>19,697</td>
<td>14,929</td>
<td>23,149</td>
<td>11,274</td>
<td>10,477</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>14,677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 0-399</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>281,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 400-499 Level Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400-499 not UP or WC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>16,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499 UP</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>51,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499 WC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grades</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27,870</td>
<td>11,041</td>
<td>8,065</td>
<td>8,258</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 400</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>72,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 500-599 Level Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-599 not UP or WC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-599 UP</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>10,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-599 WC</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grades</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9,107</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 500</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>15,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportion of Grades Awarded in 0-399 Level Courses

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

- A to A minus: 42 percent
- B plus to B minus: 29 percent
- C plus to C: 14 percent
- D: 4 percent
- F: 4 percent
- Other: 7 percent

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

- A to A minus: 45 percent
- B plus to B minus: 31 percent
- C plus to C: 12 percent
- D: 3 percent
- F: 2 percent
- Other: 7 percent
Pie Chart showing the proportion of grades awarded in 0-399 level courses for the World Campus as follows:

- A to A minus: 36 percent
- B plus to B minus: 29 percent
- C plus to C: 13 percent
- D: 4 percent
- F: 8 percent
- Other: 10 percent

Pie Chart showing the proportion of grades awarded in 0-399 level courses for Other Campuses as follows:

- A to A minus: 39 percent
- B plus to B minus: 28 percent
- C plus to C: 15 percent
- D: 5 percent
- F: 5 percent
- Other: 8 percent
## Summary of Grade Distribution for Resident Instruction

**Spring Semester 2015 (6/27/15)**

*(All Locations, All Courses for All Colleges, Except HY and DN)*

### Total 0-399 Level Courses (GPA = 3.08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by %</strong></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by Count</strong></td>
<td>476</td>
<td>76552</td>
<td>35386</td>
<td>27011</td>
<td>32701</td>
<td>18576</td>
<td>14074</td>
<td>21862</td>
<td>10614</td>
<td>9148</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3854</td>
<td>13856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total 400 Level Courses (GPA = 3.34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by %</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by Count</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25954</td>
<td>10310</td>
<td>7609</td>
<td>7726</td>
<td>4102</td>
<td>2828</td>
<td>3835</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Courses Level 0-499 (GPA = 3.14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by %</strong></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by Count</strong></td>
<td>478</td>
<td>102506</td>
<td>45696</td>
<td>34620</td>
<td>40427</td>
<td>22678</td>
<td>16902</td>
<td>25697</td>
<td>11910</td>
<td>10290</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>15711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total 500 Level Courses (GPA = 3.75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by %</strong></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution by Count</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7616</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
All University Distribution of Semester Grade Point Averages for Baccalaureate Students
Spring Semester

Graph showing the percent of grades awarded for baccalaureate students across the entire University during the spring semester between the years of 1992 to 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2007 Spring Semester

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

2008 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,002 4,071 15,816 32,032 3,711 57,632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.5% 7.1% 27.4% 55.6% 6.4% -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,214 4,380 16,551 34,835 4,207 62,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.6% 7.0% 26.6% 56.0% 6.8% -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,314 4,451 16,581 34,983 4,396 62,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.7% 7.1% 26.4% 55.8% 7.0% -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,216 4,310 16,518 35,757 4,752 63,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.5% 6.8% 26.0% 56.3% 7.5% -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2013 Spring Semester

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

### 2014 Spring Semester

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

### 2015 Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 1.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>1.00 – 1.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>2.00 - 2.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>3.00 - 3.99 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>4.00 Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>16,780</td>
<td>38,848</td>
<td>5,081</td>
<td>67,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Students</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Grade Point Averages and Dean's List
Summary by College, Spring Semester 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Number on Dean's List</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent on Dean's List</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2005 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2005 Semester GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>5,858</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Mineral Sciences</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>9,646</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Development</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Science and Tech</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-college</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUS</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,857</td>
<td>67,484</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Associate Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Number on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2005 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2005 Semester GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Science and Tech</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Provisional Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Number on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent on Dean’s List</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Semester GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2005 Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2005 Semester GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondegree</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements for Dean's List can be found in policy G-8.
Penn State Space Report:

Slide 1: Introduction
Ford Stryker will present an informational report on Penn State Space Report.

- As of November 2015, we have approximately 32.2 million GSF containing 20.2 million ASF in 1,907 total Buildings at our Penn State Campuses and University Park.

Slide 3: Space Inventory Components
- Building
- Room
- Square Foot
- Function of Space
- Prorated Facilities and Administration Function of the Space Based on Time
- Specific Room Use Code
- Occupant – User ID
- PI Assigned to the Space
- Research Expenditure Information tied back to the PI/College

Slide 4: Old Main Building First Floor Plan
- Assignable Area
- Nonassignable Area

Slide 5: Space Guidelines
1. Classroom
2. Class Laboratory
3. Faculty Office
4. Library
5. Physical Education
6. Special Class Laboratory
7. General Use
8. Research Office
9. Research Laboratory
10. Public Service Office
11. Staff Office
12. Physical Plant
13. Demonstration
14. Public Use
15. Administration Support
16. Auxiliary/Intercollegiate Athletics
17. Housing and Foods
18. Non-Institutional
19. Unassigned

**Slide 6: Total ASF by Major Function – University Park:** Pie Chart
- Auxiliary & Intercollegiate Athletics 31%
- Instruction 22%
- Office 9%
- Research 10%
- Support 24%
- Other 4%

**Slide 7: Total ASF by Major Function – Campuses & Special Mission:** Pie Chart
- Auxiliary & Intercollegiate Athletics 20%
- Instruction 47%
- Office 6%
- Support 20%
- Other 5%

**Slide 8: Total ASF and Present of Space by Room Function - Instruction Space:** Chart

**Slide 9: Total ASF and Percent of Space by Room Function - Office and Research Space:** Chart

**Slide 10: Total ASF and Percent of Space by Room Function - Support and Other Space:** Chart

**Slide 11: Total ASF and Percent of Space by Room Function - Auxiliary and Intercollegiate Athletic Space:** Chart

**Slide 12: Total Assignable SF/FTE Enrollment - Fall 2012 Big Ten Ranking:** Chart
- Michigan
- Wisconsin
- Ohio State
- Minnesota
- Iowa
- Nebraska
- Penn State
- Michigan State
- Purdue
- Indiana
Appendix X
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Slide 13: Total ASF by facilities & Administration Function - University Park: Pie Chart
- Auxiliary Enterprises (21.3%)
- Departmental Administration (4.2%)
- Departmental Research (2.2%)
- Electro Optics Center (<0.5%)
- General Administration (1.9%)
- Instruction (10.9%)
- Library (2.4%)
- Non-Assignable (31.7%)
- Operations & Maintenance (8.1%)
- Organized Res - On Campus (9.5%)
- Organized Res - Off Campus (<0.5%)
- Other Institutional Activity (5.4%)
- Specialized Service Facility (0.8%)
- Sponsored Instruction (<0.5%)
- Sponsored Projects Administration (<0.5%)
- Student Services (0.7%)
- Applied Research Lab (<0.5%)

Slide 4: Questions

Fall 2015 University Park Classroom Space:

Slide 1: Fall 2015 University Park Classroom Space
- 351 General Purpose Classrooms
  - 20,206 Seats
  - 344,131 ASF
  - 2.5% of UP ASF

Slide 2: Fall 2016 – University Park
- 55 Rooms will be reassigned (1,779)

Slide 3: All priority scheduling and special arrangements rescinded for General Purpose Classrooms

Slide 4: GPC Scheduling Protocol
- Regular Sequence Courses
- Non-standard Courses
- All other events and uses

Slide 5: CollegeNet
- Course schedule for regular sequences complete
- Non-standard sequences underway
- Provost and FR&P Director to review prior to publication
• Corrections or modifications completed
• General Purpose Classrooms open for events approximately April 2016
• Manual process to add events via Registrar

Slide 6: CollegeNet Event Scheduling
• Event Scheduling phase underway
• Planned implementation August 2016

SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
• Mark A. Casteel
• Kevin M. Cockroft
• Peter M. Eberle
• Michelle L. Frisco
• Dennis L. Gingrich
• Darian M. Gist
• David J. Gray
• Patricia M Hswe
• Nicholas P. Jones
• Lance C. Kennedy-Phillips
• Rodney P. Kirsch
• Gul E. Kremer, Chair
• David J. Lieb
• John Messner
• Keith E. Nelson
• Padmavathi Patil
• Wayne P. Robbins
• Cynthia K. Robinson
• Ira S. Saltz, Vice Chair
• Alex E. Shockley
• Rachel E. Smith
• H. Ford Stryker
• Brenton M. Yarnal
• Jong Yun
As of November 2015, we have approximately 32.2 million GSF containing 20.2 million ASF in 1,907 total Buildings at our Penn State Campuses and University Park.
Space Inventory Components

- Building
- Room
- Square Foot
- Function of Space
- Prorated Facilities and Administration Function of the Space Based on Time
- Specific Room Use Code
- Occupant – User ID
- PI Assigned to the Space
- Research Expenditure Information tied back to the PI/College
Space Guidelines

1. Classroom
2. Class Laboratory
3. Faculty Office
4. Library
5. Physical Education
6. Special Class Laboratory
7. General Use
8. Research Office
9. Research Laboratory
10. Public Service Office
11. Staff Office
12. Physical Plant
13. Demonstration
14. Public Use
15. Administration Support
16. Auxiliary/Intercollegiate Athletics
17. Housing and Foods
18. Non-Institutional
19. Unassigned

Total ASF by Major Function – University Park

- Instruction 22%
- Auxiliary & Intercollegiate Athletics 31%
- Office 9%
- Research 10%
- Support 24%
- Other 4%
Instructional Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Function</th>
<th>University Park Percent of Total Space</th>
<th>Campuses Percent of Total Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 – Classrooms</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 – Class Labs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 – Library</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 – Physical Education</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 – Open/Special</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 – General Use</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – Demo/Clinical</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – Public Use/Performance</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total ASF and Percent of Space by Room Function

#### Office and Research Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Function</th>
<th>University Park Percent of Total Space</th>
<th>Campuses Percent of Total Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 – Faculty Office</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 – Research Office</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Public Service Office</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 – Research Labs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support and Other Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Function</th>
<th>University Park Percent of Total Space</th>
<th>Campuses Percent of Total Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Admin Office</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – Physical Plant</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – General/Admin Support</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – Non-Institutional</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – Unassigned</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Total ASF and Percent of Space by Room Function

### Auxiliary and Intercollegiate Athletic Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Function</th>
<th>University Park Percent of Total Space</th>
<th>Campuses Percent of Total Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary/IA Space</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – Auxiliary/IA</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – Housing &amp; Food Service</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Assignable SF/FTE Enrollment Fall 2012 Big Ten Ranking

- **Michigan**
- **Wisconsin**
- **Ohio State**
- **Minnesota**
- **Iowa**
- **Nebraska**
- **PENN STATE**
- **Michigan State**
- **Purdue**
- **Indiana**
Fall 2015
University Park Classroom Space

351 General Purpose Classrooms
20,206 Seats
344,131 ASF
2.5% of UP ASF

Fall 2016 – University Park

55 Rooms will be reassigned
1,779 Seats
• All priority scheduling and special arrangements rescinded for General Purpose Classrooms

GPC Scheduling Protocol

• Regular Sequence Courses
• Non-standard Courses
• All other events and uses
CollegeNet

• Course schedule for regular sequences complete
• Non-standard sequences underway
• Provost and FR&P Director to review prior to publication
• Corrections or modifications completed
• General Purpose Classrooms open for events approximately April 2016
• Manual process to add events via Registrar

CollegeNet Event Scheduling

• Event Scheduling phase underway
• Planned implementation August 2016
MINUTES OF SENATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, February 23, 2016 – 1:30 p.m.
102 Kern Graduate Building


Absent: M. Aynardi, Larry Backer, M. Hanes, K. Jablokow, E. Knodt, Tramble Turner

- CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ansari called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 23, 2016, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2016

The minutes of the January 12, 2016, meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

Chair Ansari welcomed all new and continuing members and special guests.

Additional announcements by Chair Ansari:

The Faculty Advisory Committee met this morning with President Barron and Provost Jones and discussed the following topics:

- PA Budget and State Appropriation
- Capital investment across the University and the University Strategic Plan
- Internal monitoring of transfer credits
- Future Healthcare Benefits
- Update Searches: Dean, Penn State Law and Dickinson; CISO; Vice President for Information Technology
- Optimizer for classroom scheduling
- Updates on: Canvas; Admissions and LionPath; Worklion; Strategic Plan; Budget Update

Chair Ansari announced that there will be an FAC meeting and Senate Council meeting to be held on Tuesday, April 5, 2016.
The link to the online Committee Preference Form will be sent to 2016-2017 Senators in mid-March. Councilors were encouraged to discuss committee assignments with their caucuses.

Senate Councilors were asked to consider the number of reports that have been submitted and the time needed to entertain nominations from the floor for officer positions, the academic trustee nominee, and for several committee slots during the Senate meeting on March 15, when making decisions on whether an informational report should be presented at the March 15 Senate meeting, or posted online.

He thanked Nickie Schlegel for her service to the Senate and wished her the best in her new position in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences.

He also thanked Provost Jones for the additional financial support for the Senate to implement BoardEffect software that will help automate some Senate office processes.

Executive Vice President and Provost Nick Jones discussed the ramifications of the state budget stalemate and the need to reduce expenses due to the budget uncertainty. He pointed out that agricultural research and agricultural extension do not receive support from Education and General funds, so the lack of a state appropriation hits those programs hardest.

The Provost reported on the status of the searches for the Dean of Penn State Law and the School of International Affairs, the Chief Information Security Officer, and the Vice Provost for Information Services. He addressed the issues with the CollegeNet optimizer and mentioned that the Board of Trustees would have a vote of concurrence on the University’s Strategic Plan during its meeting on Friday. The Provost went on the record to thank Chair Ansari for his letter, on behalf of the University Faculty Senate, to Chair Masser regarding faculty input in the draft of the University Strategic Plan. Provost comments at the board meeting will address shared governance at Penn State. In response to questions about the memo pertaining to travel, Provost Jones emphasized that units have discretion as to approving travel, and described the university’s budget cycle.

Vice Provost Blannie Bowen discussed steps being taken by Vice Provost Lance Kennedy-Phillips to develop an infrastructure for General Education assessment as well as assessment of all majors, minors, and certificates. Chair Ansari will invite Vice Provost Kennedy-Phillips to speak to the Senate at the April meeting.

Vice President Rob Pangborn reported 5,200 paid accepts to date; the target is 16,000. Eighteen million records were moved from ISIS to LionPATH, and that process was highly successful. Starfish is coming online.

Vice Provost Marcus Whitehurst reported the statement on diversity was unveiled on February 22.

Senate officers and the Executive Director had no comments. There were no council comments or questions.
• ACTION ITEMS

No input has been received from Curricular Affairs and Faculty Affairs on the proposal from the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences to change the name of the Department of Meteorology to Department of Meteorology and Atmospheric Science. That proposal will be considered at the April 5 meeting.

The College of Liberal Arts proposal to change the name of the School of Languages and Literatures to the School of Global Languages, Literatures, and Cultures. On an Eckhardt/Wilson motion, Senate Council voted to support the proposal as submitted. The Provost will be notified of this action.

The following five senators were elected for two-year terms to Committees and Rules: Mark Casteel, Gul Kremer, Jonna Kulikowich, Salvatore Marsico, and Jane Sutton.

• DISCUSSION ITEMS

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Minutes from the January 20, 2016, Graduate Council meetings are posted on the Graduate School website at http://www.gradschool.psu.edu/gradcouncil/2015-16-graduate-council-meetings/.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR MARCH 15, 2016

Legislative Reports

Special Senate Committee on Implementation on the General Education Reform — Implementation of the New Integrative Studies Requirement in General Education. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Szczygiel/Wilson motion.

Curricular Affairs — Implementation of Updated General Education Learning Objectives. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Taylor motion.

Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid — Graduating with Distinction and Honors. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Szczygiel motion.

Committees and Rules — Revision to Bylaws, Article II, Section 1 (Senate Council). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Wilson motion.

Committees and Rules — Revision to Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6b (Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Brunsden motion.
Committees and Rules — Revision to the Standing Rules, Article III, Section 7 (b) Faculty Athletics Representative (other than University Park). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/ Szczyyiel motion.

Curricular Affairs and Undergraduate Education and Admissions, Records, Scheduling and Student Aid — Revisions to Senate Policy 59-00 Requirements for the Minor. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Taylor motion.

Curricular Affairs — Policy 42-10 Course Uniformity. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Taylor/Nousek motion.

Undergraduate Education and Curricular Affairs, Revision to Senate Policy 42-23: Credit Requirements by Types of Instruction. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Wilson motion

Advisory/Consultative Reports

Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations — Revision to HR21 Definition of Academic Ranks. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wilson/Wolfe motion.

Faculty Affairs — Changes to Family Leave Provisions in HR23 (Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations). This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Taylor motion.

Faculty Benefits — Principles for the Design of Penn State Health Care Plans. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Wolfe motion.

Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force — Moving Forward. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Taylor motion.

Informational Reports

Committee and Rules — Nominating Report for 2016-2017; Senate Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities; Standing Joint Committee on Tenure, University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wolfe/Kuldau motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

Elections Commissions — Roster of Senators by Voting Units for 2016-2017. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Wilson motion.

Educational Equity and Campus Environment — Joint Report from the President’s Commissions for Equity (The Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity; the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity and the Commission for Women. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Myers/Koch motion. Twenty minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.
Faculty Affairs — Faculty Tenure Rates: 2015-16 Annual Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Taylor motion. Ten minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

Global Programs — Recommendations for Rewards and Recognition of International Engaged Faculty and Staff. The first word of the title was changed to “Suggestions”. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Koch motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

Libraries, Information Systems and Technology — Informational Report for Canvas. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Koch motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

Research and Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology — Report on changes to Research Computing at PSU. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Taylor motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

Senate Council — Nominating Committee Report for 2016-2017; Chair-Elect, Secretary, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Wolfe/Koch motion.

Undergraduate Education — Grade Distribution Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Grimes/Wilson motion. Five minutes was allocated for presentation and discussion.

University Planning — Penn State Space Report. This report was placed on the Agenda on a Koch/Wilson motion. There will be no presentation. Questions will be invited and may be submitted via email to senate@psu.edu.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR MARCH 15, 2016

The Agenda was approved on a Brunsden/Myers motion.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned onto a Wilson/Szczygiel at 3:24 p.m.

Daniel R. Hagen
Executive Director
Date: March 1, 2016

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Daniel R. Hagen, Executive Director

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

MONDAY, March 14, 2016

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

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

TUESDAY, March 15, 2016

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
Faculty Affairs  202 Hammond Building
Faculty Benefits  519 Elliott Building
Intra-University Relations  217 Forest Resources Building
Outreach  214 Business Building
Research  217 Grange Building
Undergraduate Education  110C Chandlee Lab
University Planning  324 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Bldg.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Global Programs</td>
<td>412 Boucke Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology</td>
<td>510A Paterno Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>409H Keller Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Student Senators Caucus and Orientation</td>
<td>114 Kern Graduate Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Commonwealth Caucus Meeting</td>
<td>Assembly Room, Nittany Lion Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>University Faculty Senate</td>
<td>112 Kern Graduate Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: March 1, 2016

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

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

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2016 – 8:15 PM

102 KERN BUILDING

The Health Care Advisory Committee

David Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance/Business
Greg Stoner, Sr. Director for Compensation and Benefits

To join the evening caucus meeting by phone or video, please dial 440351 for video or 814-867-5845 and enter the ID# 440351 for phone.

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2016 – 11:15 AM

ASSEMBLY ROOM, NIJTANY LION INN

MEET THE CANDIDATES

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

Agenda

I. Call to Order

II. Announcements

III. Candidates for Chair-Elect

IV. Candidates for Secretary

V. Candidates for Faculty Advisory Committee

VI. Adjournment and Lunch