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M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, January 27, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate Building with Jonna Kulikowich, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Kulikowich: The December 9 Senate Record, providing a full transcription of the proceedings, was sent to the University Archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to this document?

Seeing none, may I hear a motion to accept?

Senator: So moved.

Chair Kulikowich: Second?

Senator: Second.

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, say nay. The ayes have it. The motion carried. The minutes of the December 9 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Kulikowich: The Senate Curriculum Report of January 13, 2015, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETING OF JANUARY 13, 2015

Chair Kulikowich: Minutes from the January 13, 2015 Senate Council meeting can be found at the end of your agenda. Included in the minutes are topics that were discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President at the January 13, 2015 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Kulikowich: Out of courtesy to our presenters and your fellow senators, please turn off your cell phones and pagers at this time.

If you are unable to attend a Senate meeting in person, you can join from your computer via Mediasite. Instructions for the use of Mediasite are posted on the Senate website, or call the Senate office for assistance. All senators using Mediasite, please use the “ask a question box” to send a message that you have successfully connected to the live feed so that we may add your name to the attendance list as being present.

As a reminder to senators joining today’s meeting by Mediasite, we are again using the voting system at polleverywhere.com/factultysenate. Instructions for using this voting system were emailed to all senators
and are posted on the Senate website. For those of you on Mediasite today, please log into polleverywhere.com now so that you are ready to use it when we vote.

As a reminder, parliamentary procedure states that any motion from the floor, including amendments, must come to the Chair in writing.

The Senate Officers have completed visits to Penn State Hershey, Altoona, Fayette, Schuylkill, Hazleton, Wilkes-Barre, Worthington Scranton, and Penn College. The officers have conducted a debriefing meeting with Provost Nick Jones and Vice President Madlyn Hanes on January 22, 2015. The summary report will be submitted for review for consideration by the Senate Council on February 24, 2015 for the March 17, 2015 plenary meeting.

We welcome Jon Leslie, who will assist us with technical operations for our plenary meetings that include audio and video recording of our meetings. We thank Joe Savino who has provided us technical assistance in the past. Joe provided years of service to the Senate. Thank you, Joe, for the assistance you have provided us.

President Barron has approved the changes in the Constitution, Article II, Section 3 and 5 (Membership) that were approved by the Senate on December 9, 2014. These changes pertain to membership for the two Schools of Law, Dickinson Law and Penn State Law.

At the January 13 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following reports on the Senate Agenda and website only: from Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid, ‘Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program’ and from the Elections Commission: ‘University Faculty Census Report 2015-2106’. These reports will not be discussed at today’s meeting. If you have questions or comments about these Informational reports, you can email senate@psu.edu. Your questions will be forwarded to the appropriate committee chair for response. The remaining Informational reports on the Senate Agenda will be presented today.

The Senate Council Nominating Committee, comprising the elected members of Senate Council and chaired by Brent Yarnal, Immediate Past Chair of the Senate, has begun the process of developing slates for the election of Chair-elect, Secretary, five members of the Committee on Committees and Rules, and one member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. Further, and for the first time, a preferred candidate for Academic Trustee will be nominated. On January 16, the Governance and Long Range Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees approved the procedure submitted by the Committee on Committees and Rules for nomination of the preferred candidate as the Academic Trustee. If you wish to nominate an individual for any of the positions mentioned in my announcements, then please contact Immediate Past Chair Brent Yarnal, or a member of the Nominating Committee of the Senate Council. Please bear in mind that nominees must agree to stand for election.

I would like to announce two upcoming events that you might consider attending. The first is Penn State's second Engaged Scholarship Symposium, which will provide an opportunity to learn more about engaged scholarship and how it enriches student learning. The symposium, which is co-sponsored by the University Faculty Senate, will take place on March 31 at the Penn Stater and is open to faculty, staff, and students from all Penn State locations. Those unable to attend the full day can register for just the morning or afternoon sessions; those unable to attend in person can register to view a live stream of the symposium. Registration for the event is now open, and I encourage you to share this opportunity with units, campuses, colleges, and departments.
The second event is the 16th Annual Engagement Scholarship Consortium Conference to be held at the Penn Stater on September 29 and 30. This international conference will showcase engaged scholarship and community engagement efforts, highlight new thinking and directions, and spotlight Penn State's leadership in this fast-developing field. The call for paper, poster, and workshop proposals is now open and closes March 20. For more information, go to engagementscholarship.org.

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

President Barron mentioned the six areas he is emphasizing. He reported that the report of the Task Force on Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment will be released in the near future. He has read the report and will announce action steps in response to the report soon after the report is released.

He responded to one question pertaining to background checks.

**NEW BUSINESS – NONE**

**FORENSIC BUSINESS**

**Chair Kulikowich**: On Friday January 16, Senator Ann Taylor submitted a Forensic Report on Administrative Policies at Penn State. Her report, which appears as Appendix B in the Agenda, is a follow-up to discussion on the topic at the January 13 Senate Council meeting. Twenty minutes has been allocated for this forensic report. At this time, I invite Senator Taylor to come forward to introduce the subject.

**Ann Taylor, Earth & Mineral Sciences**: Thank you. I am grateful for this opportunity. I think just talking with a few people, this is something that several of us, at least, are very interested in-- I appreciate this chance.

I tried to keep the forensic report short, so hopefully you did have a chance to read it-- some of the highlights. As you know if you have ever looked at GURU, our University's searchable policy manual, there are eight categories of policies at the University. One of them is the administrative policies, the AD policies. That is what we are going to be looking at today.

The AD policies fall under the jurisdiction, if you will, of the Board of Trustees and officers of the University. That section of GURU is overseen by the Office of the President.

There are 81 AD policies-- I counted-- and five administrative guidelines that are somewhat connected to those and are guidelines, not policies. Today I want us to be thinking about the policies that affect us as faculty. There are plenty of policies that do not necessarily impact us, or we are not the significant audience for them, like the policy on lost and found. I would like us to look at the ones that do.

For example, in September, Regis Becker stood here and led a wonderful forensic session on policy AD-88, which is the Code of Responsible Conduct, and policy AD-86, the Acceptance of Gifts and Entertainment. These were new policies, and they were looking for input from the faculty. I remember it as a good discussion, very lively, and people being very happy that we were able to have that opportunity.
In fact, policy AD-00, which is the Policy on Policies, says that when new policies are put forth, new AD policies, that people that are significantly affected by them should be consulted-- but there is not a mechanism stated for how that would be done.

We had questions that in my limited time I will-- John is going to help me keep track of time-- I wanted us to look at. These came out of discussions in my own college, in Earth & Mineral Sciences. I think all of us as faculty will agree that they are important things to consider.

The first is how to navigate these policies. I have used GURU a ton. I have been at Penn State for 21 years. I have gotten very adept at navigating it. As any of you who have done the same will know, often these policies are written appropriately in a lot of legalese. It can be hard for the average faculty member, the average staff member, to make sense of what does this mean for me, and what does it say I have to do and I do not have to do.

One of the suggestions-- the first question, is beyond GURU, do we need a portal-- a website is what I am envisioning-- where someone can ask a question. Like, I am traveling abroad for the first time in my career next semester, what do I need to know? It would provide-- maybe it links to existing resources, maybe there is a nice layperson write-up on that already. If not, then this site would provide that kind of information.

I have been offered a gift by someone I just did a speaking engagement for on behalf of the University. What can I and can I not do? If you will remember that particular example, when we had our forensic with Regis, we learned a lot of things that we can and cannot do that are not specifically written into the fine print of the associated policy. We were lucky to have a University official explain to us what was really meant. The idea is, this portal would do that.

That was my first question for you all. I would love to know what you think, if you think this is also a need, as some of our colleagues in Earth & Mineral Sciences do-- or if you think that the resources we have through GURU are sufficient. Any thoughts? Good idea, bad idea?

Carolyn Mahan, Altoona: I have not used GURU as much as you have. I guess my question would be, is there a searchable tool in GURU now, or would this have to be programmed in? What are you thinking as far as making this happen?

Ann Taylor: Good question. Yes, you absolutely can search GURU. The issue is what the search results give you is the policy, the legalese. This would be-- and it would take work, and so part of this forensic is trying to see, is this worth exploring-- it would mean an interpretation of policy, something a little more friendly.

If you look at some of the policies, there may be a list of 10 other policies at the bottom that it says, see also. This would be helping someone kind of make a little quicker, easier sense of that-- but yes, you can search GURU. I do all the time.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I would like to thank Annie for bringing this up. I think that there would be utility for a portal that would be perhaps more immediately user friendly. If so, one thing you might include in it would be contact information.

Some of us have excellent content supports within our own college, with other units. Sometimes it is not
clear which of a dozen people should be the first go-to person or something.

**Ann Taylor:** Excellent, excellent. Yeah, and if you have been here a long time, you might know-- most people do not. That is a good point.

**Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley:** I think it is a great idea. Now, it might be difficult anticipating every possible question. In fact, one problem I have with FAQ sites often is that there are a lot of questions there, and none of them quite seem like what I am asking.

It might be better if there was like a help line, that someone either by email or by phone, that if the University had an employee whose job would be answering specific questions and getting back to you within 24 hours-- a single person who maybe they just directed it to-- somebody who knows the policies of the University real well and could just direct a person's question to the custom person to answer that particular question. I think that might be the best way to handle this. I do not know how, with a University this complicated, with this many policies, you write an online manual that answers everything.

**Ann Taylor:** Sure. That is a great idea. Maybe it is a combination of the two. Maybe the portal answers the questions we think-- the real common ones. Then, OK, you do not see your question here, ask.

**Roger Egolf:** If these things were answered by email, maybe an archive of the answers could be put together, and then it would build up and eventually answers to almost everything are there. It would take a while, but there are a lot of websites like that for various things, like for fixing your car or something like that. Eventually, a lot of answers get put on websites, and maybe it could work the same way.

**Ann Taylor:** Great idea. Maybe one more on this, and we will move to our-- I am warned I need to keep us going.

**Colleen Connolly-Ahern, Communications:** The question then would be who would be answering, because HR's interpretation of a set of guidelines might be different than it is being interpreted within the colleges, so you might need some sort of consortium so that anybody following the rules would in fact be following the rules.

**Ann Taylor:** Great point. I would suggest that we would start with-- there is a designated office, like in this case, the Office of the President, who oversees each of the categories in GURU. That might be the starting point. That is a really good point.

All right, thank you. That was very helpful.

The second question. Do we need a mechanism-- We had this, I think, wonderful experience in the fall where we were able to provide input on two new policies. Does the Senate want to request a formal mechanism for making sure that that continues to happen with new policies, if they are going to have a significant impact on faculty? Your thoughts on that?

At the moment, there is not. Some have come to the Senate. Some have not. Some have gone to Senate Council only, but not the full body, for input-- and everything in between. Great idea, bad idea?

**Patricia Koch, Health & Human Development:** I think it would be a good idea to establish a formal mechanism for this to happen. We have expressed so much positivity about the consultation that was given
to us-- I think it is with AD-47-- that happened in the fall. I know at that time it was referred to Faculty Affairs to make some recommendations for faculty to work on the consultative group for that policy, and that that has worked out very well. We have communicated with Tim Balliett about that, et cetera.

It occurred to me through that process that it would be best if we did have a formalized structure and process to do this so that it would not be just kind of random or spontaneous when such things would arise. I would agree that I think it is time that we put forward some mechanism for this to happen.

Ann Taylor: To easily provide input, yeah-- clear mechanism.

Kim Steiner, Agricultural Sciences: I think we have a mechanism, but I do not-- the thing is, you cannot tell whether it is working. In the past, we have routinely had AD policies come through Faculty Affairs for review and discussion and then brought before the Senate, as perhaps an Advisory Consultative Report with opportunity for input. I think that is because the administration has routinely been cognizant of the Senate's interest in these things and willing to accept their input.

I guess we do not know when it does not happen unless somebody happens to look in GURU and see a change has been made that was not brought before the Senate. I think it has worked in the past, and it just depends on the goodwill of the administration to continue working that way. I do not know whether we could even create a policy to make it happen, because it does depend on collaboration between us and the administration.

Ann Taylor: Absolutely. I think you hit on the same thoughts that we had, which is that when it does happen, it is great. Some of the concerns that some of the faculty in our college had was that sometimes it only goes to the committee, like Faculty Affairs, but does not see the light of day at the full plenary-- so all faculty are not able to provide input.

Sometimes they do not come forth at all, and faculty do trip upon them and maybe are in violation and did not realize, or something of that sense, or go to review a policy and find they cannot make heads or tails of it. They cannot figure out-- I will tell you, some of my colleagues will get overly concerned thinking that it means something that I am lucky enough to have been involved in some conversations that I know it does not-- they panic.

It is just trying to make sure-- the thought is to have a process that flows-- so that the policies come into the Senate through whatever appropriate committee, perhaps, then makes it to the Senate floor for that full input so that not only can we provide that input, but we can get a record of that input. As we know, every single word we say here is transcribed.

Then if there is ever a question, well, what was meant, we cannot just take someone’s word for it, but we can actually go back and look at the spirit of the policy.

We can keep talking about that particular issue, but the third question actually looks at-- so we have been talking about new policies. The other issue was what about these existing policies that are, at least in my college, causing some concern or confusion, and might we need a mechanism for making sure that those-- not all at once, there are 81-- they do not even need to all be reviewed, because as I said, maybe the lost and found and other ones do not need to be reviewed by the Faculty Senate.
Should there be a mechanism, and what might that look like for reviewing AD policies that are already in existence?

**Rosemarie Petrilla, Hazelton:** This is just some information I stumbled upon. You can get a subscription to GURU so that when any policy changes, you will get an email. For me, that is particularly helpful as a program coordinator, when I have to have program policies in congruency with the University policy. I found that to be a very helpful resource.

**Ann Taylor:** Thank you for mentioning. I hand that tip out a lot too. They say they still do not always understand the policies, but at least they are notified. You are right.

Any other thoughts or input? I am not hearing a lot of angst about not at least looking at this, but maybe they have not been voiced yet.

**Kim Steiner:** Again, I sense you are about to sit down, so I would just like to return to your first point and emphasize my agreement with some of the suggestions I heard, because I have been here 40 years, and I still do not entirely understand how this University works.

Oftentimes you do not even know who to ask-- you do not know where to go. I think it was Roger's suggestion or maybe Carolyn's. To have a help desk-- or just someone who at least knows who can answer the question to direct you to the right place-- would be extremely nice. I think that would be a great outcome of this forensic session.

**Ann Taylor:** Great. Thank you.

**Anne Rose, Liberal Arts:** You know, what makes me nervous, if you want to hear nervousness about this, is that in some ways you are talking about this as information, when you talk about posting and explanations and we all Google and try to find questions that are relevant to us on the internet and that sort of thing, and you get clarification.

These policies are-- yes, they are information, but they are not simply information. They are also information that profoundly impacts all of us and students as well, but certainly employees. Also in that sense, it is potentially legally binding information.

If you want, again, worries, my worry is that there will be some relatively simple supplemental explanation of what something might mean-- is it going to be legally binding on the University if it shows up, for example, on the website? Is this person who is Googling going to get essentially legal advice that they could then take back and do-- you know, this is not just sort of another website in that sense. These are personnel matters at the deepest moment.

I am certainly with Carrie if nothing else. I am not sure I like this at all. As you know, I very often do not like lots of things.

Basically, the notion of a simple elucidation of a policy in another 400 or 500 words worries me profoundly, and I do think Carrie is right that far better to have people, individual contact people who are designated and understand that they have some legal obligation to provide and to investigate and that whatever they say, again, will be legally binding.
Ann Taylor: Excellent points, Annie. I did not mean to give the impression that I was suggesting that some unofficial person would be providing this information, and I absolutely would expect that it would tie into the policies. It would be that kind of pointing people to the right place, the right information where needed, adding a little bit more explanation about it that would, again, be whatever body is supposed to be overseeing that policy, not someone separate, so that it would be legally binding information. Absolutely.

Anna Butler, Senate Staff: There is a Mediasite comment from Asad Azemi, Brandywine. He says, I suggest review of AD policies every seven years, or a set number of years.

Ann Taylor: OK, so I am hearing support for the idea of reviewing existing policies. I was imagining the same idea, that there would be some time rotation. Reviewing them once and then forgetting about them again probably will not help us either.

Thomas Poole, Vice President for Administration: Now would be the perfect time for me to admit that I am the Policy Steward of the AD Policies.

The AD policies are currently undergoing-- all policies at the University are currently undergoing-- a very systematic review right now. This is a very timely subject, and I appreciate the feedback. Part of the intent is for us, with every policy, to list who the policy steward is and who the content expert would be for that policy. For example, I am responsible for the posting of the AD policies, but I am not the content expert on international travel, et cetera, et cetera.

That hopefully will be clarified in the coming weeks and months. Certainly, I would like to work with you and talk about ways in which we can bring some of these reviews before you.

Ann Taylor: That is excellent. Thank you so much. I was wondering if anyone would fess up.

Thank you, again. I am assuming we are out of time. That was extremely helpful to me and I hope for all of us. Thank you.

Chair Kulikowich: Thank you, Annie.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – NONE

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Chair Kulikowich: We will use clickers for voting today. This system provides a precise count for each vote taken. It also allows for confidential voting and gives immediate results. Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Raise your hand if you need a clicker.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6 (Senate Committee Structure)
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: We have two Legislative reports from Committees and Rules. The first report appears as Appendix C in the Agenda. It is called Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article II, Section 6, (Senate Committee Structure). Because this report is Revisions to the Standing Rules, we will vote on this report today. Committee Chair Mark Casteel will respond to questions.
This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote? Those joining by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

This is the first of the legislative reports from Committees and Rules. It appears as Appendix C. It is called Revisions to the Standing Rules, Article 2, Section 6, Senate Committee Structure. Because this report is Revisions to the Standing Rules, we will vote on this report today. This is the one that pertain to the topic of varsity head coach searches. And we are using the system polleverywhere.com/facultysenate for the vote.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 147 in favor and 5 opposed. The motion carries.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
Changes to the Bylaws, Article II (Senate Council), Section 1
Committee Chair Mark Casteel

Chair Kulikowich: The second Legislative report from Committee and Rules appears as Appendix D in the Agenda.

Because this report is Revisions to the Bylaws, we will discuss the report today and vote on it at the March 17 University Faculty Senate meeting. Committee Chair Mark Casteel will respond to questions.

Jamie Myers, Education: I am supportive of the flexibility that this change gives to Senate Council for informational reports. I just wanted to express that I am wary also that it may become a way to avoid consultation with a Senate committee.

The way I see it, any report that comes to Council that wishes to be presented to the Senate should be relevant to some Senate committee, therefore probably should be sent to that Senate committee for consultation before arriving at the Senate. This change will end-around that kind of process. I just wanted to emphasize that.

Mark Casteel: Quick response. There are many members of the committee that had a similar sort of view on that. I think our dividing line was simply, we will put this forward, we will keep an eye on how it plays out, and go from there.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: These reports still would have to come to Council to get put on the agenda. Senator Myers' objection is well noted, that things should not end-around the committees.

I do not think this does that, because I think Council is a way that if something should go to the committee, Senate Council would not put it right on the agenda. Instead, Council would now be aware of it and would ask that it go to committee rather than go directly to the agenda.

This is more a way of putting things on the agenda that, say, come from the administration that is informational, that does not necessarily need to go through a committee first and is timely. Something is coming along that is going to change an administrative policy, and by sending it to a committee first, it is going to take so long to do that that the new policy will be in effect before it ever gets to the Senate.
I think the Council would only use this mechanism at times when it is very necessary to get something on the agenda in a very timely manner. There were a few things that came up in this past year that Council struggled with on how to get it on the agenda because it had not gone to a committee yet, and there was no good mechanism— it was important that the senators see it before it got implemented.

Mark Casteel: Thank you, Roger.

Chair Kulikowich: Voting on this report will occur at the March 17 meeting. Thank you, Mark

GENERAL EDUCATION PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT TASK FORCE
Revision to Goal Statement and Learning Objectives for General Education
Task Force Co-Chairs Mary Beth Williams, Janet Schulenberg, Maggie Slattery, and
Task Force Member Peggy Van Meter

Chair Kulikowich: We have a Legislative report from the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force to vote on today. This Legislative report appears as Appendix E in the agenda.

Task Force Co-Chairs Mary Beth Williams, Janet Schulenberg, Maggie Slattery are attending today’s meeting. Janet and Task Force members Norah Shultz and Peggy Van Meter will respond to any questions. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Is there any discussion?

Janet Schulenberg, Task Force Co-Chair: I have a few words to say as well. The General Education Task Force has recommended that in advance of considering any other proposed curricular change to general education that we seek agreement on what the University intends for all Penn State undergraduates to learn through their general education curriculum.

To this end, we have proposed the revised General Education Goal Statement, which includes seven unranked and interrelated learning objectives. The proposed learning objectives update our program to reflect changes in knowledge and society. They are informed by the mission and values of Penn State, contemporary scholarship on general education, participation in an institute on general education and assessment, consultation with scholars, and widely solicited stakeholder feedback.

The seven learning objectives are meant to be accomplished through the curriculum as a whole. No single course will need to address all or even most of these learning objectives, although each of our Gen Ed domains has clear connections to one or more of the objectives. No domain is solely responsible for any single learning objective.

Revision of the objectives allows the development of a curriculum that provides students with opportunities to practice these skills without adding new boxes for them to check. As students gain expertise and domain content, they can apply that knowledge to these ways of thinking. It will also allow the design of program-level evaluation that identifies areas where the curriculum is particularly strong and areas where we would benefit from improvement. Such a process would allow us to make tweaks to general education on a more responsive basis than is currently possible. Even without any further curricular changes, enabling this type of program level coherence may lay a foundation to insure nationally recognized excellence for student learning in general education.

Chair Kulikowich: The Parliamentarian has been handed a written statement, and I will ask him to read it on behalf of the authors.
Larry Backer, Parliamentarian: Thank you very much. I have been asked to read a statement by the Black Leadership Union here at Penn State-- it reads as follows.

To the Faculty Senate,

As student leaders, we understand the importance of a diverse learning experience. We value and appreciate the classroom as a place for not only principle understanding but also as a melting pot of critical thinking and global perspective. We appreciate the opportunity to be included in the process of revamping the general education program in an attempt to make it more suitable for addressing issues of effective communication, key literacies, critical, integrative, and analytical thinking, global learning, social responsibility, and creativity.

In our meeting with the General Education Task Force, as well as attending the retreat for the Task Force, we learned of the direction the program planned to take. And as members of the multicultural community, we stand by the inclusive work of all who attended. The new additions to the program are reflective of student opinion, as there was student involvement in multiple capacities. We are very appreciative of the opportunity to be welcomed into the conversation and were pleased to learn that members of the Penn State community at all levels were also made a part of the process. We are elated to be provided with the resources that make it possible to stay involved in the future, as we see it's very important that we, the students and the receivers, have a say in what is to come for those who follow us. We value the education of the generations to come as much as we value our own.

As asserted by educational reformer John Dewey, ethical principles in life should not be separated from ethical principles in school. To be educated is to be moral, to hold ideas that improve conduct and abandon those that worsen it. Teaching students ideas about power and privilege is intrinsically moral and the very responsibility of this institution, especially in light of recent happenings in our nation. The danger of bureaucracies is limited communication. And as a sample of the university community, as a part of the university community, we are delighted to break through this wall and proclaim our support of the proposed changes offered by the General Education Task Force. With honor, the Black Leadership Union.

It is individually signed.

Chair Kulikowich: Additional discussion?

Ira Saltz, Shenango: I must say, those objectives and all that are quite excellent, and it has been a wonderfully open process. I do want to thank the Task Force for that.

I am just wondering, one of the things that was in an earlier version of the work I saw was including personal finance among the literacies. I notice that is not in this final report. I am concerned about that. We serve-- especially Shenango in the west-- a lot of students from low and low-middle income households who would benefit, I think, greatly from personal financial literacy.

Peggy Van Meter, Task Force Committee Member: Absolutely. I think President Barron alluded to that in his earlier comments. It has not really gone anywhere. It just is not explicitly written in itself. If you look under the key literacies and quantitative reasoning-- that a course that would address personal financial issues could certainly be considered one that would address that objective. There are others there as well.
It is not the case only for the finances. You may not see several areas where there is explicit language, and that is because we wanted to write objectives broadly enough that they could be realized in a variety of ways. I would see it as falling under key literacies as well as critical thinking, for example. Does that address that?

Ira Saltz: I guess that I would like to have seen it among the list of literacies-- that I would like to have seen it remained in the report on the list of literacies. I am just afraid it is going to be a forgotten item.

Peggy Van Meter: My hope would be that people like you would keep it from being forgotten. That is, if we think about proposing classes that would address that area and having those as Gen Ed courses-- I think about in mathematics, the Mathematics of Money course is one that currently can address some of those issues.

Nothing in these objectives would preclude that and would certainly encourage innovative faculty to come up with ways to address that.

Ira Saltz: I guess my only concern is that down the road with it not being written in as one of the literacies, someone is going to say, now, how does this fit in-- someone puts forth an idea that a personal finance class should be counted in general education, I am not sure that everyone is going to see where that fits and why that belongs.

Peggy Van Meter: Yeah, I believe that what will need to happen, not just with respect to this issue but others, that will fall with the Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs to be able to develop the appropriate descriptions to capture that, and then those will live on. Those descriptions will live on so that future committees would be able to understand the criteria used for reviewing those courses.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: I, too, like the students, am very pleased to see this report coming forward. On behalf of members of the Liberal Arts Caucus, who met prior to this full Senate meeting, though, I move an amendment to make a small addition to the section on key literacies, in order to recognize the importance of world languages as another form of literacy.

I hope this will be received as a friendly amendment in the general spirit of enhancing this learning objective. I would like to make it clear there is no intention here to require world languages. In fact, there are other items already listed here among types of literacy that are also unlikely to become requirements. As the proposal indicates, these are general learning objectives that might appear in various ways in multiple curricular plans. Its key literacy is item B, and we are proposing the addition of the three words in red.

Here, the intention is to acknowledge the importance of world languages in two respects. One is the value of being able to use a second language to understand the past and the present and to communicate with others who use that language. Despite the evident predominance of English, the utility of additional languages is widely recognized. In a world in which language use is changing, the most common first languages in the world may now be Mandarin, Hindi, Spanish, then English, depending on the data used.

In addition, as we think towards including a research-based approach to general education, recent research has shown that speaking more than one language-- which was once frowned upon in the US because bilingualism is often associated with recent immigrants-- now research shows that knowing more than one
language is simply good for the brain. Some of the world's leading research in this regard is being conducted using MRIs and other tools to map brain activity, among psychologists here at Penn State with National Science Foundation funding.

I also note that while most of our CIC peers do not include languages in their General Education statements, some do. If I am reading their websites right, Indiana University and the University of Illinois do. I hope that we can be leaders in this regard, just as with health and wellness, which we include in our learning objectives here-- it is the word right after the insertion that we are proposing-- which we include in our learning objectives here, although some others do not.

On behalf of my Liberal Arts colleagues, I move the addition of the words "linguistic" as the type of literacy, and then in parentheses, to clarify, "world languages."

**Chair Kulikowich:** Is there a second for the motion?

**Senators:** Second.

**David Smith, Executive Director, Division of Undergraduate Studies:** I am just curious whether the Task Force has discussed this topic at all. It seems an important part, obviously. I am curious that this seems to be a topic that was perhaps discussed in the Task Force, and I am curious where that discussion led.

**Janet Schulenberg, Task Force Co Chair:** World language has been discussed in a number of ways within the Task Force. For example, in the Themes and Exploration Subcommittee, there was specific acknowledgement that world language education is an important component of a university education for many students. There was a desire to include world language education as an option for students, especially through a thematic pathway, for example.

More recent iterations of the prototype curricula that present those integrative components include the opportunity for world language and we, as a Task Force discussed, and I think fairly vigorously affirmed, the desire to preserve world language as a substitution or some other optional part of general education for students.

The implications for adding it as a key literacy have not been discussed by the Task Force. Off the top of my head, it would suggest that we are building world language into one of the expected outcomes for our students. There would be some ramifications to consider for all Penn State students to engage with the General Education program if that were to be added.

**Peggy Van Meter:** If I can add-- I am sort of pointing at Rick, because you chaired this group-- there was an explicit discussion of this topic in one of the breakout sessions at the retreat held just two weeks ago. If you go on the Gen Ed website for the Task Force, under the Blogs tab, the session was called Firewalls and Substitutions. There is a summary of that discussion available there.

Essentially the conclusion was that we want it to be possible for students to take world language courses and be able to use them. That possibility exists under our current substitution practices, and there was no intent for that to change. There was agreement from that group that we probably need to do a better job of advertising those substitution opportunities for students and letting them know about those possibilities.
I also would add, in relation to this, I think that this also relates to the first question we got, about why is no finance there. I think that there is a long laundry list. We could all make an argument for our specific area. Why is it not listed there specifically? I think you start to quickly realize that it becomes an extremely long list.

What we want is to have objectives that make it possible for people to propose courses that could fit as Gen Ed requirements, while not privileging any specific domains or areas.

Anthony Christina, Law: Just a point of order. Is this a friendly amendment, or is this to be treated as a regular amendment-- and does that change the—there is no voting threshold difference?

Chair Kulikowich: We are discussing the amendment of linguistic world languages, which has been seconded.

Anne Taylor, Earth & Mineral Sciences: This one was one that was a new thought for me, as were-- I am a member of the Task Force, and I have learned so much from my colleagues. I appreciated the arguments that Carrie put forth. I had not thought about things that way.

I can see a topic like personal finance in what has already been covered, especially quantitative. I must say, this important issue, which is important to me as well as a parent-- I have a Penn State student in my house-- well, he is not in my house, he is on campus-- another rising one. I do believe this is an important component that does not fit in my mind in any of the other areas, and so I welcome the opportunity to see this new addition.

Laura Pauley, Engineering: For the key literacies in that second sentence, I am asking for an interpretation; if you are indicating that every student should meet each of these items in the list, or if this is a suggested list to choose from for individual students.

Janet Schulenberg: It is not a list for students to choose from in any way. The idea is that the curriculum needs to be structured to offer students the opportunity to learn these things. Within this list, we attempted to make sure that each of the domains could see themselves and that we were addressing some of the key literacies that are emerging as important to society-- so that we would as a whole offer students opportunities to learn.

Laura Pauley: Are you indicating that every student must satisfy each of those items in the list?

Peggy Van Meter: No. Currently there is not-- if I can interpret your question, it is like is each of these things a checkbox a student has to take a class in? Is that correct?

Laura Pauley: Right.

Peggy Van Meter: No. That is not the current plan. The idea-- and this is what Janet was getting at-- is that the objectives can serve as an organizational framework for the faculty that are involved in general education instruction, and for the institution in terms of the curriculum as a whole. So it would not necessarily be listed as a requirement.

Laura Pauley: I see that sentence as being-- it could be interpreted in either way, and I do not think we are stating our objectives clearly if the sentence can be interpreted in two different ways.
Peggy Van Meter: I am sorry, are you looking just at the first sentence under B?

Laura Pauley: The second sentence in B-- "literacy acquired in multiple areas, including"-- are you saying must include or may include?

Peggy Van Meter: No. “Including” is intended to mean that these things can be included within this. Christian can say that louder. Yes. Chris?

Christian Brady, Dean, Schreyer Honors College: I rise in support of the amendment. First, incredible work. This is a long thought-out process, and I know it has been well thought out.

I also recognize that you have to have certain big categories, and you want things to cascade from there. I am appreciative of that as well. I think as Carrie said in the justification for the amendment, languages is important. It is something that is of rising importance in our world, and if we are going to have something like information technology up there, then we certainly should highlight one of those areas as languages and linguistics in the broad category, and I do think it is very distinct from intercultural or multicultural. I think it is big enough that it merits being up on the list and distinct from any of the other categories that are present currently.

Chair Kulikowich: There are two more questions here. Then I will-- there is a motion?

Larry Backer: Call the question.

Chair Kulikowich: Is there a second? The question has been called and seconded.

Larry Backer: If they want to continue talking, they can vote the motion down.

Chair Kulikowich: The Parliamentarian says that if you would like to continue the discussion, you can vote this motion down. Let me clarify with the parliamentarian.

I am going to ask the Parliamentarian to confirm, because I want to make sure-- there has been a motion to call the question. It has been seconded.

Larry Backer: Right. We can debate the merits of strategies to call the question. We cannot like the idea that people use the question in ways that you may not find useful. There, however, are rules, and we have been bound by them for many years. Whether you like them or not, whether they apply to you advantageously at this point or not, the rules are the rules, and that is what keeps us moving as an organization that is as fair as it can be to everyone.

The question has been called solely on the motion to add that language to this report. If you want to vote yes, vote yes. If you want to vote no, vote no. The discussion about the motion as a whole, the report as a whole, remains open. There is also a possibility of course, as we discussed the motion in chief, to raise additional motions as and when you think it is of value to the body. Merely because we are going to vote on this motion does not mean that you cannot amend the motion further or not as you like, or discuss the main motion further or not as you like. The discussion is over.

All right, this is what is happening. We have had a motion that is before the body. The motion which we are considering-- there has been an additional motion to amend it. What we have been talking about, and
the only thing we have been talking about quite technically, are those three words and two symbols.

Once the question is called on the amendment we vote on the amendment. The three words are approved and added to the report or not.

We then revert back to the report, which you can discuss as you like. Yes, you vote on the question.

If you want to continue discussion, vote no. If you want to stop discussion, vote yes. That is simple. Vote no, talk more. Vote yes, talk less. You can take a vote, if you like.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Are we ready to vote? There has been a call of the question. It has been seconded. It is related to the amendment.

Again, to confirm, A means you are ending debate. B means no, you want to continue the discussion on the amendment.

Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept, press A. To reject, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 93 in favor and 62 opposed. We need a 2/3 vote, the discussion continues. I am informed by Mohamad, and according to parliamentary rules, that we are discussing the amendment.

**Sydney Aboul-Hosn, Liberal Arts:** I just want to say that I support the amendment. We discussed this in the Liberal Arts Caucus. There are two points that I would like to make that some people may have been missing, which is first of all, this would not necessarily--it would fit under global education, but the point is, here, that the intellectual exercise of learning a foreign language is different than any of the other items on that list of literacies. It is not just about global communications. It is also about the academic exercise and the brain exercise in learning another language.

The second point is, if you look at that list of literacies, there is nothing on that list that is actually literally about literacy. There is nothing about language on the list of literacies. That is why I think linguistic and world languages is important to be included there as a category.

**Anna Butler, Senate Staff:** There is a Mediasite comment from Rebecca Bascom, Medicine: I strongly support this amendment. It has been said that the hardest thing to know is what you do not know. The pursuit of a second language is an effective means to alert us to the limitations imposed by our culture and language. My support is also based on my personal experience as a French Studies undergraduate major who subsequently pursued a career in medicine and medical research.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Any additional discussion on the amendment?

**Richard Singer, Altoona:** I do not disagree that language is a good thing to study. However, I am not sure why it is that we are insisting we do that under the umbrella of general education. I believe if you want to study a language, we have plenty of opportunity to study language here along with some majors that actually require it. Whereas, again, I do not disagree about having language at the University here, I just do not see where it belongs in the General Education context.
John Moore, Retired Faculty Senator: I think at the current moment, language is part of General Education here at Penn State. I think that I want to strongly support Senator Eckhardt's motion, because I think if we use the word literacy, the very word itself suggests to me something done in letters. It is a type of language. I think only by extension does the word literacy apply to these other forms of knowledge, which are all valuable. I really do think that her amendment strengthens this entire section, and I want to support it in the strongest possible way.

Robin Bower, Beaver: It just happened that way. I would like to speak strongly in support of this amendment as well. Dean Brady had mentioned that this whole process was hard fought by a number of extremely dedicated people, and he lay the emphasis on the dedication.

I would like to lay the emphasis on the thought. A lot of people put their heads together to come to an understanding of what this General Education revision should be, and some of that is reflected in this document. I think if we read that second sentence, "Literacy required in multiple areas, including textual, quantitative, information technology, linguistic, world languages, health, intercultural, historical, aesthetic, 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," in no way does that sentence enjoin upon every student at Penn State University that he or she should devote any part of his or her general education specifically to the study of world languages. It merely invites those students to be able to and acknowledges the value to students who elect to do that within the scope of the substitutions that the General Education Task Force voted to allow. Thank you.

Keith Nelson, Liberal Arts: I strongly support the amendment. I also note the nature of the dialogue that we have had here. It seems to me that there are quite a few clarifications and ambiguities in the current document. I suggested before that this document should be linked to the assessment and the resources for general education.

If you think about it, how are we going to decide whether anything on this list-- the main seven things and then other things mentioned under that-- are being achieved? I think that the Task Force maybe could have more dialogue with the Senate, take more time, and make sure that the assessment spells things out, because if we do not assess by the time people leave whether they have achieved any of the main objectives outside of course assessments, or any of the subtopics outside of class assessments, we do not know what is going on.

I would urge us to take more time to have that spelled out and to link it to the specific proposals on curriculum. Any way that can be done-- but I do support the amendment in the current context.

Kim Steiner, Agriculture: I just want clarification. I think you said this, but I am not sure it is well understood on the floor. That is, if we add these three words, that does not mean that a foreign language will be required in general education, is that right? That is my understanding as well. I like the idea of putting those three words in there. I think that is a great addition.

My bigger point is that having been in the Senate for a number of years, I have seen us discuss just the smallest part of a big issue to great lengths, and when we are finally done with that small part, as a result of an amendment to the motion, we are so fatigued by the discussion that we pass the rest of it without any more discussion. This is like 1/100th part of the whole thing. I would urge us to get off of this, and I would like to hear other opinions about other parts of it. I personally do not have any, but I would like to hear what other people have to say.
Chair Kulikowich: Is there any further discussion on the amendment? Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the amendment, press A. To reject the amendment, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 101 in favor and 50 opposed. The motion carries. Now we go back to the main motion, additional discussion on the main motion, as amended.

Emily Miller, Education Student Senator: I have a statement on behalf of the Faculty Senate Student Caucus.

Over the past several years, the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force has collaborated with faculty, staff, and students to renew General Education at Penn State. After several retreats, town halls, and online discussions, the task force has presented to us today the beginning of changes that will work to create a more innovative and encompassing general education curriculum through the adoption of strengthening objectives and support of the institution.

With the recent support shown by the University Park Undergraduate Association and Council of Commonwealth Student Governments on behalf of their constituents across the University, the Senate Student Council urges the faculty Senate to be cognizant of the stance taken by the student body to support both the revision to goals statement and learning objectives for General Education as well as the proposal on institutional support and resources for General Education. Thank you.

Chair Kulikowich: Do we have a question or a comment here?

Ira Saltz: I think. I guess that-- I teach Mathematics of Money, and it partially relates to personal finance. It does not completely.

I still see nothing in those key literacies that would cover personal financial literacy. I would like to make an amendment that we add in personal financial literacy also among that list, understanding that not every student would have to take it. It would just be one of their options.

Chair Kulikowich: Need a second to that motion.

Senators: Second.

Chair Kulikowich: Do you have the specific term that you would like to use?

Ira Saltz: I guess personal financial literacy, or personal finance, we can just put in there.

Chair Kulikowich: Personal finance. Again, I want to clarify, personal finance is added to the list. That has been seconded. Is there any discussion on that? Are we ready to vote?

Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. All those in favor of adding personal finance, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.
With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 14 in favor and 74 opposed. The motion fails. We are back to the original motion as amended.

**John Nousek, Science:** I want to ask a meta-question about what has been written, proposed. It is clear to me we are seeing the tip of the iceberg of various suggestions about this or that piece that is very critical to be included in General Ed, and I do not want to minimize that discussion.

At a deeper, larger level, what does it mean if we vote in favor or against this resolution at the end of the day? Are we voting that we will no longer have a Task Force if we say no? Is that the end of the Task Force? Or is it that they go back and revise things? I guess I am wanting to understand the Task Force view on what they are asking from the Senate when they submit this-- whatever it is, motion.

**Chair Kulikowich:** That is a very good question. Again, conferring with the Parliamentarian, this report belongs to the assembly on its own. It is independent of the report that will follow, which is the Advisory Consultative Report, which the General Education Task Force will still introduce. The outcome of the vote will determine their next steps as they move forward.

**Victor Brunsden, Altoona:** Thank you very much for all the hard work that you have done in producing this, and all the rest of the members of the Task Force; it is a mammoth undertaking. I know that this has got to be somewhat frustrating listening to me and others stand up and talk interminably.

I appreciate the thoroughness of the review, and I do welcome the focus on the skills and the objectives that you have identified. I think that is a welcome addition to Penn State's curriculum; it is a big hole that is currently in all our curriculum, not just the General Education curriculum.

In particular, right now, our General Education curriculum focuses on domains of knowledge and ways of knowing the world. It says very little about skills that we wish our students to have.

Having said that, I am concerned that this current proposal will be throwing the baby out with the bathwater, that this proposal focuses too much on just the skills and may be neglecting the domains of knowledge. As I understand it, the key literacies-- B, that is essentially where we are putting, should we adopt this, the domains of knowledge.

Now, I understand why you have done that and that there is a following report to come in March containing curricula prototypes for the General Education curriculum. That being said, I move that we table this report until the March meeting, when the Senate can vote on both reports, seeing them together.

**Larry Backer:** This is not a report. It is legislation. He has moved to table the thing before you. There has been a second. No debate. Now you get to vote.

**Unidentified Senator:** Point of order.

**Larry Backer:** Sir?

**Unidentified Senator:** What does it take in March to take it off the table? I want to know before I vote.

**Mohamad Ansari, Chair-Elect:** You need a motion to take it off the table. That is another motion, same as this you can do that in March.
Unidentified Senator: Majority?

Larry Backer: Right.

Unidentified Senator: Thank you.

Larry Backer: You are welcome. Ready to vote? We are voting to table. We are voting to table, which means we are done. We are not taking any action on this item until you move the item back for further discussion and action.

Chair Kulikowich: Again, because I want everyone to be able to be aware here, we are now to voting, if we press A, we are tabling the motion. If we press B, we are not tabling the motion.

Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To table the report, press A. To not table the report, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 124 in favor and 22 opposed. This report has been tabled.

Thank you, Janet, Norah, and Peggy

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

GENERAL EDUCATION PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT TASK FORCE
Institutional Support and Resources for General Education
Committee Members Robin Bower, Patricia Koch and Nichola Gutgold

Chair Kulikowich: We now move on to the next report. This is item J, an advisory consultative report. We have one Advisory Consultative Report today. It appears as Appendix F in the agenda. Task force members Robin Bower, Patricia Koch, and Nichola Gutgold will respond to any questions. This report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Is there any discussion?

Patricia Koch, Health and Human Development: Before discussion, there are a few points that we would like to make. Good afternoon, everyone. I hope we are all feeling good and energetic.

The few points that we want to start off with are somewhat reiterating what other people have said-- that this is based upon collection of a lot of information and data from students, faculty, administrators, advisors, et cetera. What came to attention was that people repeatedly said, no matter what else, we need to have support and resources for General Education. It was noted many times that in 1997, when General Education was last revised, there did not seem to be resources that were forthcoming after that--people emphasized that a great deal.

The second thing is that this report is relevant for General Education support and resources no matter what our General Education program is. Please think of this not in relationship to learning objectives or anything coming forward with possible prototypes, that even with the General Education program that we have, we are saying that we are asking for support and resources, no matter what that program might be.

Then finally, to emphasize that this report calls for an intra-university faculty-led structure for General
Education collaboration, support, assessment, and research, but is not calling for a specific structure or location in which this will happen, because also, it is an Advisory and Consultative Report, unlike other reports that are in the purview of Faculty Senate alone that have to do with our determination of curriculum.

That is why we are seeking from our body of colleagues that we can go forward and present to administration that we need, deserve, for General Education certain levels of resources and support. With that being said, please—questions, comments.

**Thomas Beebee, Liberal Arts:** First of all, I am sure someone is going to move to table this one too. It will not be me, because my March is very busy.

I think the idea here is, of course-- I support totally the idea that-- again, we do not want an unfunded mandate where we come up with all kinds of fancy things we could do with Gen Ed, but then finances force us to abandon many of those, which I think is actually happening in some situations currently.

It is hard for me to vote for something that has a budget item-- I mean, not an item, but where money is involved, we are going to ask for money, and yet the scale of this is extremely vague. Particularly in item number two, creation of this structure with a standing budget, meet the needs of the instructors, support, maintain, promote excellence.

This could be anything from a one to 10 scale--a one scale would be travel support so people could go to Gen Ed symposia around the country and maybe get a semester off to revise a Gen Ed course. All the way up to a 10, where it would be like actually hiring people. People would be specifically hired through this unit outside of the colleges to teach Gen Ed. That is just to give an idea of the scope.

What I am asking basically is what are we talking about? Where are we? What did the committee discuss-- I am sure you have discussions about how big this might be.

**Patricia Koch:** First of all, the Task Force would not like to see this particular report tabled because I think that does not send a very good message to administration about our collective wants and needs and asking for support, et cetera.

Regarding the second point, Tom, that you made about the scope of this. First of all, we discussed in the Task Force, in the Faculty Support Subcommittee, in the different town hall meetings, et cetera. It was clear that nobody wanted some type of entity called a General Education faculty, and that anyone who, no matter what their appointment, status, et cetera, who taught general education could be part of support, resources, et cetera. Regarding the idea of hiring people specifically to be General Education faculty, we had always talked about that that is the purview of units, of academic units. This would be outside of that purview.

The other thing is, part of that recommendation too was important that it says, work with General Education Task Force and the appropriate Faculty Senate Committees so that things that you have just raised, for example-- which are things that, of course, are of great sensitivity and importance to faculty and Faculty Senate, would be part of this continuing discussion of the development of this faculty-led structure. Anybody else would like to add?
Nichola Gutgold, General Education Task Force Member: I would add also that when the Provost charged the Gen Ed Task Force, he underscored that he wanted to have us do what we think needs to be done in order to create the best Gen Ed, and that included funding it. While we cannot be specific, we want your support, and we would prefer this not to be tabled so that we can stay in keeping with the Provost's wish, that we have the budget in mind, that we need resources in order to make this happen.

If I may as well add-- and I am going to speak metaphorically-- you did mention the problem of unfunded mandates. There are a lot of buzz words that I had heard bandied about during luncheon this afternoon-- you know, advocacy, championship, we are advocating excellency in General Education, we are championing a new vision for General Education. We can advocate and we can champion, and we can have nothing to back up those words. What we are proposing is an expression of the Senate's will to begin to lay the paving stones for walking our talk.

Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts: I am not going to move to table this. I think it should be defeated, because the question of commitment to support unspecified in magnitude or for particular purposes is to invite the administration to cover the waterfront in terms of what, when all is said and done, it is willing to put up in the way of support.

From my point of view, it is premature to be talking about the amount of support that is going to be necessary for implementation of General Education reform when this body has not demonstrated at this point, at least to my satisfaction, that it has something that is going to be worthy of support. If I were an administrator, and you had this motion passed and came to me with a lousy program of General Education, I would say, yeah, we are committed to supporting this, but at the absolute minimum possible.

Patricia Koch: I hear what you are saying and very much respect those thoughts. I want to reiterate that this is for support and resources for General Education as we now have it or as it may be reformed. It is not just about what is going to be proposed and paying for those reforms. I wish that we could have come forward at first in discussing this just as General Education overall and not necessarily in the context of what may or may not be reformed.

Nichola Gutgold: I would also like to add that when we were visiting with faculty across the University, we kept hearing time and time again that there was not enough support for General Education, and that is one of the reasons we felt this was so important. I would say, we just heard President Barron say he would like money to do the things that he wants to do--this is also supporting our administration.

Robin Bower, Beaver: I would like to further add that should it be the consensus of this Senate as the General Education Task Force proposals come across that in fact this Senate endorses and stands behind the General Education curriculum that now stands, then that Senate is declaring that curriculum to be worthy of the kind of support that this Advisory/Consultative Report is asking for. Thank you.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: I support this report. I think it is important that the Senate make a statement that General Education is important and deserves support. Whether or not you support this change or that change or any change to General Education, I think we all agree that General Education is important. No matter if you plan on in the end supporting or rejecting the previous piece of legislation or supporting or rejecting whatever change comes next month, please support the concept of better training for those who teach General Education.
John Nousek, Science: I support the motion. I believe it is independent of the other two as Senator Koch said. Whether you do not change Gen Ed or if you change it completely, this is putting together a structure.

In response to Dennis' comments, I would just like to say that I do not think we are ever more than a deliberative body. The implementation always rests upon the administration, and no matter how specific our wording or how vague our wording, I am afraid, they will do what they want. Hopefully they will be guided and inspired by our thoughts. I do not think the fact that something is not specific enough in this case rules out voting for it at this point.

Esther Prins, Education: The report states that one of the goals of the new support structure would be to offer resources for instructors that will facilitate excellence in Gen Ed instruction, such as providing funding, for conference attendance, or other exploratory or research efforts, et cetera.

Two points I wanted to make. One is, I think one of the most important forms of support that could be offered is to guarantee TAs for classes that reach a certain size. I do not see that anywhere in here. I would very much like to see that made explicit. Another would be to hire more instructors and tenure-line faculty to teach classes so that the class sizes are not so huge.

Second, I wanted to know whether this new structure would involve hiring of new administrators and support staff. If so, to me, that money would be much better spent hiring instructors and TAs.

Patricia Koch: Yes, thank you for those comments. One thing that I would note is that, as has been said before, that our discussions here are on the record. What you have said and as a faculty member you are suggesting recommending are the needs of faculty noted on the record already, but that can be reiterated.

Secondly, yes, we purposefully are using the terms of "faculty-led structure or entity" that we definitely heard from town hall meetings, et cetera, that people were not in favor of maybe having more administration or using funds in that way. That is definitely where you see that term, faculty-led. That was specifically chosen for that reason, that this is not to be something with more administrators at the helm. It would be something for faculty so that the monies would be more well spent in supporting faculty.

The other point that I would make is that there are other committees-- I do not know if they are task forces-- that are looking at, for example, some of these broader issues of different appointments of faculty-- for instance, fixed-term, et cetera-- who are teaching at various courses, various levels at our University. In a sense, that is something that is related to this report. Those issues are being dealt with elsewhere and were not in our charge to deal with.

Steinn Sigurdsson, Science: I have two questions. One is, if this structure is set up, where do you envision it coming within the University Administrative structure? Is it Vice President's level office, or is it a college level office, because it will be dealing with academic units across the entire University. It either has to have the level of hierarchy to be able to make an effect across the University, in which case it has to be fairly high up or it will likely be ineffectual.

Secondly, this will mean some diversion of resources. General Education funds, which come with accredited hours that are associated with students taking the classes, are currently a major source of funding for academic units. What sort of fraction of the current funding coming through General Education do you see being diverted from the academic units to the structure?
Nichola Gutgold: I do agree with you that it would have to be at the highest level so it can go across this very comprehensive complex University, but we do not suggest any specific way that it is diverted from the colleges at this point; although I think you make a good point about that.

Rosemary Jolly, Liberal Arts: I just want to point out that this question is exactly what I worry about. That is to say, we all agree that there should be support for General Education. I completely understand that there are two approaches to this. One is the one that you have taken. Yes, it is easier for us because we do not all have to agree on stuff because there are hardly any specifics in here.

The trouble with that is that I do not think it is particularly useful as a consultative report because all it is, is a statement of principle that General Education needs more financial support. It is not enough or sufficient enough, or it does not carry enough authority that way, that I can sit there as an administrator and just say, OK, well, let us just budget from here to here.

In other words, I think we lay ourselves open to a vulnerability precisely because of its vagueness. The vulnerability is twofold. The funds have to be drawn from somewhere. We want some say in where they are drawn from. The second one is a reputational issue, where we want the Senate to be robust leadership. This is not a document as it is that evidences robust leadership and strength.

While I understand that we are not an administrative body, we certainly are cutting off our legs to say that we cannot suggest how this could be administered. I am feeling right now that the benefits of not stepping on people's turf, not getting us to agree to a complicated document, all of the rest of that, are completely outweighed by the fact that we have ended up with a document that is so vague that it makes us look spineless as a consultative document, because I think that the minimum we can all agree with is that Gen Ed needs financial support.

Patricia Koch: I understand what you are saying, Rose, and that is the fine line that we have been working with the whole time. I do not think that this is spineless because we added-- the second point in the recommendation is to work with the Gen Ed Task Force and the appropriate Faculty Senate committees so that we could continue to discuss among ourselves and maybe come up with the most specific idea of a structure and put that forward to University administration not to be agreed upon.

The idea here was that by supporting this that we would go forward at this point with the people from the General Education Task Force, people from Faculty Senate in collaborative discussion, communication, negotiations with the administration, because at this point, we do not have a platform to do that.

All we have a platform to do is to talk among ourselves and then bring something forward. As we are all aware of how many times we have spent time on tasks, spending a lot of time analyzing, putting forward a proposal, and then to have administration just say, well, it will not work because of these reasons.

We wanted to engage at this point in time so we could have productive, fruitful discussions as to, well, if this will not work, then let us look at this and see what will work so that we do not go through everything and then at the last minute be told, sorry, that is not going to work.

Nichola Gutgold: I would also add that we want to serve all the Penn State locations. That is right in our language here, and that we can do that once we have that platform established.
Robin Bower: I would like another tripartite response here-- which as a medievalist is a wonderful thing to me-- that this Advisory Consultative Report and what we propose is not an ending point. What we are proposing is a starting point. What we are proposing is a mandate from this body to bring all of the appropriate stakeholders together to engage in productive dialogue and hard work to bring about a hard-fought vision that has not previously existed to create a cohesive University-wide general education experience that unites faculty, administration, and students in a common mission.

That is what General Education was meant to be in 1997, but it did not have the backup. Again, I reiterate, this is not an ending point--it is a starting point.

Patricia Koch: I will just add that it has been my experience in knowing all of my colleagues-- anybody from Faculty Senate or the General Education Task Force that will be put together to work, to continue to work with administration on this, I do not know a spineless person among us. Everyone will have spine and work hard.

Christopher Long, Liberal Arts: I am on the Gen Ed Task Force, and I rise to support this motion. One of the things I think we have learned on the Task Force is the tremendous amount of interest in and goodwill associated with the General Education endeavor. It touches everybody, and everybody is concerned to ensure that it is as good as it possibly can be for our students.

What we also learned, I think, on the Task Force is that we as a University have not cultivated the habit of open transparent dialogue about issues, why, a number of issues. One important issue, in our case, is General Education. We have tried to embody that in the way that we have proceeded through the last year and a half with an open conversation with many, many visits to all the campuses, all the colleges.

What this motion does is allow us some structure to begin to cultivate those habits as an institution in an ongoing way about the issue of General Education. The reason I support it is in part because it is a mature proposal. It assumes the goodwill of the administration, it assumes the goodwill of the Faculty Senate, and it assumes the goodwill of the General Education Task Force. It provides a structure for us as a faculty to take ownership of General Education.

Not only that, it also provides an opportunity for us to raise some revenue in terms of external funding to study innovative work in General Education that is going on in a campus somewhere or in a college somewhere or in a classroom somewhere that we have seeded because we have some resources and that we have been able to attract more money to the University for this.

The vision of this thing is not just one more administrative structure that is going to lay over everything else. The vision of this is about culture and cultivating a culture of excellence about General Education and rooting that culture in the expertise of the faculty--that is why I support it.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: Do not worry. I am not going to move to table this, I promise you. I have shared this with some of you before, but I am going to share-- I do want this to be on the record. Should we vote or establish such an institute, this University already possesses a body which represents the faculty and actually has control of the curriculum--it is the Senate. Any such institute should be established within and under and as part of the Senate. It should not be a separate administrative entity.

As soon as you establish a separate administrative entity, it creates its own impedance mismatch. It then becomes exceedingly difficult for that to reach across all the different locations. It does not become
representative of all of the faculty. We have an entity right here, right now, that is where this thing should be located.

If we are going to do this, I am not going to make any motions, but it would be my very strong recommendation that this become part of the Senate. Yes, it is an expansion of the role of the Senate. However, I do think that that is something that if we are sincerely interested in General Education, however we construct it, that we should do.

Patricia Koch: Victor, I would say that what you just said is not precluded in this-- yes, and because it says to establish a signature intra-university faculty-led structure for General Education collaboration, support, assessment, and research. We would more than welcome your participation in an ongoing collaborative committee to decide how that may actually be envisioned. It does specifically mention here that it should work in collaboration with the Faculty Senate.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: I support this. General Education produces a lot of resources, revenue, for many of our units. I think that something like this would create a kind of critical mass of advocacy to maybe put some of that revenue back into General Education rather than using it for other things, which it is doing now.

Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts: Responding to a couple of the recent comments-- and I hope in support of the report but trying to find our way through some of the anxieties that have been expressed. Would you foresee if this report were passed that at a later point when the planning is further along and somebody has an idea of where this institute or other entity, network, organization, where it would report?

You might remember that earlier I had suggested that we try to specify where we think it might report. If things are a little further along, would you foresee that there would then be, for example, a forensic report back to the Senate so that before anything is finalized, the Senate could weigh in? If the planned location of it, or design of it, or whatever, were then not what the Senate wished to support-- because I completely agree, General Education is the province of the Senate-- that then there would be an opportunity of that sort to have input again at a later point. It is vague now. I think maybe some anxieties could be resolved if we knew it would come back to the Senate later.

Patricia Koch: Yes, thank you for bringing that up, Carrie. I recall-- I think it was last year-- that Senate dealt with engaged scholarship. At the beginning, it seemed to be vague. People were expressing that. A process was put into place. I think it was at our last Senate meeting that we got-- and I think we had forensic about that, et cetera. Last Senate meeting, we had an update about how engaged scholarship has begun to crystallize, et cetera.

I agree. I do not think that this should be the last report. I think that we have seen some good examples of engagement, of transparency that have happened with Faculty Senate, along collaborating within administration. I would just point to engaged scholarship as one where we have had a continuing dialogue.

Robin Bower: I would like to, if I may, speak to that as well, responding to Carrie to some extent, also including Victor's comments in my response. It is clearly stated that this will be collaborative work among the administration, the Gen Ed Task Force, and Faculty Senate Committees. Faculty Senate will have direct, ongoing ownership of this process moving forward. It is right and natural that it should come back to Faculty Senate as a vision emerges, as there are more specific things for Faculty Senate to respond to.
Referring back to what Chris Long had said about the deliberative process and the assumption of goodwill on all parts. Victor, you had mentioned an institute. An institute is not what we want.

In fact, there is no mention of an institute in this report for a specific reason-- because there was clear sentiment among a preponderance of stakeholders that an institute was not something that the faculty wanted to see put forward-- we jettisoned that idea.

That is the kind of way in which vision emerges from a deliberative process that takes into account the objections of stakeholders as well as the desires. That is what we envision continuing with the ownership and with the direction of Faculty Senate committees as well, thanks.

Keith Shapiro: Yes. I would like to second the ideas of Senator Brunsden and Senator Eckhardt. I think that I agree that there is goodwill. I think almost everybody would agree that the direction of getting more resources makes sense.

There are so many vagueness’s that I really like the idea of you are going forward in a new manner in which you add additional, really interested parties who are now outside the task force to try to bring into sync with March or April, whenever we consider the true prototypes or curricular models, so that is all considered. I think you have heard enough people say, well, it might be good strategy to go ahead and spell out specifics about what would be assessed, about what would be institute-like.

I absolutely agree with Senator Brunsden. I think it would be a true innovation that would empower the Senate. It would set aside a significant amount of money.

If you came back with a new subcommittee or something that said, we have spelled out the level of resources, we have spelled out what will be assessed by whom, when, as a first round-- which is nowhere in there. We do not know how any of these objectives are going to be assessed. I am inclined to vote in favor of this document today with the implicit understanding that some significant progress like that is something that you are committed to and that the Senate will expect in March or April.

Patricia Koch: Thank you, because that was the intention of all of this.

Anne Rose, Liberal Arts: It seems the way the conversation is going, which makes a lot of sense, is sort of away from the document that we have, that we have all read, and sort of towards a-- I am going to call it a generic sort of affirmation of the idea of having something concrete to advocate for General Education.

Of course, I guess maybe of course I believe in that. We are going to be asked to vote on a document that includes a lot of other stuff. That is where I run into a problem. In other words, I think that the conversation has pared this down to something that is actually extremely sort of small. If we vote to accept, then we are accepting a lot of other things that may be problematic. For those reasons, I am going to vote against it.

Patricia Koch: Can I just say that, yes, the report does talk about possibilities which are probably a lot of the other stuff. Those specifics were not put in here for a vote. Accepting the ongoing process does not mean that we are accepting or not accepting something that was maybe mentioned as a possibility of funding research around General Education or funding having people being able to go to conferences.

Those were mentioned as possibilities, definitely, which some people may or may not agree to. Those
specific things are not what is being voted for.

Anna Butler, Senate Staff: There is a Mediasite comment from Asad Azemi, Brandywine. I support the need for financial support for Gen Ed, but asking for a standing budget that would require several layers of hierarchy that is not clear how it is going to be structured and work is difficult to support. At the time, we do not have a set structure for the new program.

Anna Butler, Senate Staff: There is a Mediasite comment from Michael Krajsa, Lehigh Valley. We are more than moving in the right direction with the hard work and goodwill of our colleagues working on this issue and the suggestions offered from the floor and their receptiveness to consider them. I would like to call the question.

Patricia Koch: He asked a first question, so I just wanted to respond to that. The idea of putting in the wording about the standing budget is because we have heard over and over again that unfortunately we have initiatives in General Education--last time was 1997--at the time, there may be some revisions or some money put forward, but then that disappears. In a year or two, then there are no more resources or money to be had. That was the thinking behind that.

Robin Bower: Furthermore, this is not in any way attached to any particular curriculum. It is a separate matter from the revision of General Education. The standing budget that this body will vote for or against, or this recommendation, pertains to General Education as it exists now as well as any revision that may or may not, in fact, take place.

Nichola Gutgold: We are asking for the University administration to work with the Gen Ed Task Force and the appropriate Faculty Senate committees in the creation.

Larry Backer, Parliamentarian: The question has been called. If you vote yes, no more talking. If you vote no, we can continue discussing.

Chair Kulikowich: A is yes.

Larry Backer: If you do not want to talk anymore, vote A. If you want to keep talking, vote B. A 2/3 vote is required.

Chair Kulikowich: Are we ready to vote? Anna, let us know when you have the votes from polleverywhere.com.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 74 accept, and 14 object. The motion carries. Now we are voting on the report.

To accept the report, press A. To reject the motion, press B. Anna, let us know when you have the Poll Everywhere votes. You can vote right now.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 103 accept, and 31 object. The motion carries.
INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

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

Annual Report on the Reserved Spaces Program, Appendix G.
http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/january-27-2015-agenda/appendix-g/

ELECTIONS COMMISSION

University Faculty Census Report for 2015-2016, Appendix H.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH

Update on Penn State World Campus, Appendix I. Craig Weidemann, Vice President of Outreach and Vice Provost for Online Education and Renata Engel, Associate Vice President for Online Education, presented this report.  http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/january-27-2015-agenda/appendix-i/

SENATE COMMITTEE ON OUTREACH

Update on Penn State Cooperative Extension, Appendix J. Dennis Calvin, Director of Cooperative Extension and Associate Dean of Cooperative Extension in the College of Agricultural Sciences, presented this report.  http://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/january-27-2015-agenda/appendix-j/

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS -NONE

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Kulikowich:  Are there any additional comments for the good of the University?

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kulikowich:  Is there a motion to adjourn?  All in favor, please say aye.  The motion carries.  The Senate is adjourned until March 17, 2015.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m.