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L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, April 28, 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 March 17, 2015, 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 these minutes?

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 March 17 meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Kulikowich: The Senate Curriculum Report of April 14, 2015, is posted on the University Faculty Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL – MEETING OF APRIL 14, 2015

Chair Kulikowich: Minutes from the April 14, 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 April 14 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/facultysenate. 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.

At the April 14 Senate Council meeting, Council members voted to place the following reports on the Senate Agenda and website only: the Committee on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid’s Annual Report on the High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses, the Committee on Faculty Affairs’ Faculty Tenure Rates: 2014-15 Annual Report, the Committee on Research and the Committee on University Planning’s Overview of the Facilities and Administrative Rate Distribution by Colleges, Administrative Units and Commonwealth Campuses. 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 discussed today.

I am delighted to invite Senate Committee on Student Life Chair Mary Miles to introduce the John White Fellowship recipients.

Mary Miles, Liberal Arts: Thank you, Chair Kulikowich. Each year, the Senate Committee on Student Life recognizes outstanding undergraduate students who are graduating with highest distinction and who plan to enroll in graduate study. The John White Fellowship is one of the oldest continuing fellowships at Penn State. The award was established in 1902 by James Gilbert White to honor his father, Reverend John W. White of Milroy, Pennsylvania.

Joining me on this year’s review committee was Enica Castaneda, Committee Vice Chair and Graduate Student in Mass Communications at University Park.

I am pleased to introduce the four recipients of the 2015 John White Graduate Fellowship awards. Each student will receive a $1,000 award. As I say your name, please join me at the podium. Senators, please hold your applause until all four recipients have been introduced.

Marina Burka will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with a B.S. in Human Geography and minors in Spanish and International Studies. Marina has been awarded a Fulbright Fellowship, and will attend the University of Glasgow in Scotland, where she will pursue a Master of Research degree in Human Geography. Her ultimate goal is to pursue a Ph.D. and become a tenured professor in Human Geography, where she can conduct research that will have direct impacts on U.S. refugee policy and initiatives while also mentoring the next generation of humanitarians. Marina studied as a Parks and People Field Intern in South Africa, completed a Fundraising and Education Internship in Argentina, and also interned with The Rock Ethics Institute and Penn State’s Institutes of Energy and the Environment. Marina has received many awards, including The Evan Pugh Scholar, the Quentin and Louise Wood Honors Scholar, and the Balmat Family Scholar in Geography awards.

Timothy Hackett will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with a B.S. in Electrical Engineering. Timothy will pursue an M.S. degree in Electrical Engineering at Penn State. He plans to conduct research in the area of software-defined radio. Timothy’s ultimate goal is to work in the aerospace industry, focusing on space communications and related signal/image processing to create new solutions to further enhance communications for commercial, civil, and national defense markets. Timothy studied as a Systems Engineering Intern for the Proprietary Satellite Program with The Boeing Company in California, and as a Simulation Engineering Intern at the Locomotive Simulation Laboratory with General Electric Transportation in Erie, PA. He has also conducted research at the Student Space Programs Laboratory and
the System Design Laboratory at Penn State. Timothy has received the William and Wyllis Leonhard Engineering Honors Scholar award, and is a member of the Eta Kappa Nu Honor Society.

Kira Hydock will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with a B.S. in Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, a B.A. in African Studies, and a Minor in International Agriculture. Kira will attend the University of Pennsylvania’s School of Veterinary Medicine, where she will focus on companion animal and wildlife medicine. Kira is interested in the importance of wildlife and environmental health in the health of humans and domestic animals. After veterinary school, Kira plans to attend the University of California, Davis, to pursue a Master’s degree in Preventive Veterinary Medicine, which will provide the skills needed to address emerging diseases in both humans and animals. Kira’s ultimate goal is to work in Africa, in an emerging disease hotspot, in order to prevent these diseases from spreading throughout animal populations and from entering the human population. Kira has completed many internships, including those with the Pre-Veterinary Wildlife Rehabilitation in South Africa, Conservation Through Public Health in Uganda, the National Aviary Veterinary Hospital, and the Pittsburgh Veterinary Specialty and Emergency Clinic. Kira has received the Evan Pugh Scholar and the President Sparks’ awards.

Molly Lichtenwalner will graduate as a Schreyer Honors Scholar with a B.S. in Communication Sciences and Disorders, with a Specialization in Speech-Language Pathology. Molly will pursue a Master’s degree in Speech-Language Pathology at Towson University. She has worked with children in each of the past five summers. Molly’s ultimate goal is to become a speech therapist, working with children of all ages, encouraging them to realize that despite their differences and their speech disorders, they are still beautiful. She intends to help her students gain the confidence to be proud of their speech and who they are. Molly has completed research at Penn State and in Germany. She has received many awards, including the Penn State Alumni Recognition for Student Excellence, the Evan Pugh Scholar, and the Frank A. Macellaro Memorial awards. Molly has also volunteered with Penn State’s THON, Relay for Life, and Camelot for Children. Please join me in congratulating these outstanding students.

Chair Kulikowich: Thank you, Mary.

Rob Loeb, Senator from Penn State Dubois, received The Milton S. Eisenhower Award for Distinguished Teaching. Rob also received The John Romano Faculty/Staff Diversity Recognition Award at the 24th Annual Senior Awards and Faculty/Staff Diversity Recognition Reception on April 8. Congratulations, Rob!

Michael Krajsa, Senator from Penn State Leigh Valley, received The George W. Atherton Award for Excellence in Teaching. Congratulations, Michael!

Elizabeth Seymour, Senator from Penn State Altoona, received The Penn State Excellence in Advising Award. Congratulations, Beth!

At the end of each academic year, a number of senators complete their terms of office. Please stand if you will not be returning to the Senate next year. We appreciate all that you have contributed to the Senate and we will miss each one of you. These senators’ names will be posted on the Senate website. Thank you for your good work.
Now I would like to offer special recognition to two senators who are leaving us with distinguished records of service. As they come forward, I will present them with a certificate signed by President Barron and myself acknowledging their dedicated service to the Senate. Please come forward when I read your name.

Kim Steiner served as an Agricultural Sciences senator for 16 years. Kim served as Chair of the Senate in 2004-2005, and chaired Committees and Rules, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, and Faculty Affairs. He also vice chaired Committees and Rules and University Planning.

Ronald Wilson served as a College of Medicine senator for 8 years. He has also served as Vice Chair of Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology.

Thank you both for your service and dedication to the Senate.

I want to acknowledge the Senate officers for their contributions over the past year: Chair-Elect Mohamad Ansari; Secretary Jim Strauss; and Immediate Past Chair Brent Yarnal.

My special thanks to Parliamentarian Larry Backer. Thanks also to Carey Eckhardt, Senate liaison to the Graduate Council.

Now I want to recognize this year’s Senate committee chairs and vice chairs. Will you please stand? This group of individuals has provided leadership to the Senate this year. Without these dedicated men and women, the work of the Senate could not be accomplished. Please join me in thanking them.

I want to acknowledge Jon Leslie of Media and Technology Services for his work on Mediasite and for providing technology support at the Senate meetings. I also want to recognize the staff from Teaching and Learning with Technology who have provided training and support with the clickers.

I want to acknowledge the five Senate staff members, without whose dedicated efforts the Faculty Senate would not function.

Finally, I want to thank faculty, student, and administrative senators and committee resource members for your willingness to serve our University and for your committee service. Your time, dedication, and expertise to help our University Faculty Senate to successfully complete its work is most appreciated.

Thank you.

Committee preference forms have been submitted and the Committee on Committees and Rules will meet in May to make the assignments for 2015-2016.

At this time, I would like to call on Chair-Elect Mohamad Ansari to come forward to pay a special tribute.

Mohamad Ansari, Chair Elect: Thank you Chair Kulikowich and Good Afternoon Everyone.
I stand before you to pay a special tribute to a former colleague and past chair of the University Faculty Senate. Professor Christopher J. Bise, passed on unexpectedly in February while attending the Society of Manufacturing Engineers Conference in Denver, Colorado. Chris received his PhD degree from Penn State and joined the Mining faculty in 1976. He was the Program Chair and the endowed George H. Jr and Ann B. Deike Chair in Mining Engineering. For his contributions to engineering education, new and innovative
technology and enhancing the health and safety of miners through extensive, diversified, and practical research, Professor Bise received the Howard N. Eavenson Award in 2004. On September 1, 2006, Professor Bise was appointed C.T. Holland Distinguished Professor and Chair of the Department of Mining Engineering at West Virginia University, a position he held until his passing.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Barron thanked the Senate officers for their service and their input on issues. He mentioned that the university’s Moody rating is Aa2 with a positive outlook. The positive outlook is remarkable considering the pressures on higher education in general. He spoke about the merger with Pinnacle Health and the accreditation review by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. He responded to several questions on issues ranging from clarification on the university’s health plan, the administration’s utilizing faculty expertise when studying issues, the advisory/consultative report on the tuition discount for adult children of university employees, and the University’s strategic plan.

Chair Kulikowich: Now, Provost Jones would like to share a few remarks.

Provost Jones: Over the course of this academic year, the Senate has had an opportunity to review several important employee benefit issues, all of which are critically important to faculty and staff of the University. These issues reflect the need to modernize the University's benefit programs to help us sustain a fiscally responsible and balanced approach to total compensation for all faculty and staff. You have reviewed and approved the following advisory and consultative reports:

First, revisions to policy HR-37, grant-in-aid for dependents of faculty, staff, and retirees, better known as the tuition discount. Second, employee contributions to Penn State self-insured health care costs. Today you will be discussing a report that would provide a significant increase in University paid life insurance, a recommendation that was made by the Office of Human Resources last summer. I appreciate the Senate's deliberations on these issues and assure you that we take your consultation under advisement as policy changes are considered, and finalized.

I would like to take a few minutes to address the first two of these issues. I believe that on this topic, the University Faculty Senate deserves more than just a letter, but an in-person explanation and, as appropriate, clarification of our position. We talk first about the tuition discount program. The original recommendations to revise the tuition discount policy for dependents of our faculty and staff was a comprehensive recommendation. In other words, the changes were recommended as a package. The ultimate goal was to modernize a policy that is over 70 years old.

The comprehensive revision to HR-37 included the following. One, include married children in the grant-in-aid benefit eligibility. Two, eliminate the two-year waiting period for spouses to receive grant-in-aid. Three, allow children to receive the grant-in-aid for all undergraduate credits. In other words, remove the exclusion to limit to the first bachelor's degree. Four, allow children and spouses to receive the grant-in-aid for the entire semester in the event that the employee becomes ineligible at any time after the start of the semester.

Five, limit the benefit to employees’ children up to the age of 26. Six, limit the ongoing benefit for surviving children and/or spouses of employees who died during active service with the University. As just cited, the first four recommendations wholly benefit faculty and staff and their children, spouse, or partner.
Limiting the grant-in-aid benefit to employed children up to age 26 is equitable with what our Big 10 counterparts are offering based on the benchmarking that was presented in the report and aligns with all of our other benefits eligibility. To maintain a policy with no age limitation cannot be considered fiscally responsible in this day and age.

As part of our obligation to state legislators, taxpayers, and to be responsible in our expenditure of tuition dollars, we must be good stewards, stewards of our fiscal resources. We have been criticized in the past for our generous tuition discounts for employees and their family members. Allowing the benefit to become even more generous through the suggested revisions without counterbalance will potentially expose Penn State to additional criticism.

The committee will not like to be reminded that our employees’ children can take advantage of a 75% discount long after they cease to be deemed dependents per the IRS definition. The table of ages and number of participants in the grant-in-aid benefit that was provided in the report indicated that the majority of employees’ children seeking grant-in-aid at Penn State are within the age 26 limit. The administration will support all the recommendations but the unlimited age limit for dependent children. The recommendation of age 26 we consider reasonable, and that will be the recommendation that the administration will endorse at this time.

Second, employee contributions to Penn State self-insured health care costs. As you are aware, Penn State is, with respect to employee health care benefits, self-insured. This means that Penn State pays, from its operating budget, approximately $0.75 of every dollar spent by our employees on health care services. In total, the cost of health care services utilized by the covered participants of our plans is nearly $200 million annually. Of this amount, Penn State pays approximately $150 million, and employees pay $50 million through payroll deductions to participate, and deductibles, copays, and coinsurance at the point of care.

At the rates of increase we have experienced recently, the total cost will potentially increase annually at 8%, or about $16 million, per year. An increase of this magnitude is simply not sustainable from an operating budget perspective. It significantly impairs our ability as an institution to direct investments in other areas of our employment package-- for example, compensation.

The University is working to reduce the total cost of $200 million, not just the $150 million, it faces from an operating cost perspective. If the total cost can be contained, both the University and all covered participants will be better off. It is not the University's intent to simply shift more cost onto its employees to contain the operating cost it faces. We are working to impact the supply side of the equation by undergoing an audit of the Highmark claim payment system, implementing a data warehouse to study our population's risks and health care outcomes, exploring lower cost, preferred providers for lab services, and implementing an on-site clinic at University Park in conjunction with the College of Nursing.

The University is establishing a contemporary set of principles to guide the design and management of Penn State's health care benefits in the long term. These principles will include delivering benefits through a sustainable structure that promotes participant engagement in health care, providing education, tools, and resources for participants to become better consumers of health care, and increasing the use of high-value health care services to improve delivery and mitigate charges. These guiding principles will support a comprehensive long-term strategic plan that is currently being developed.

The administration has reviewed and is considering carefully the recommendations presented by the Faculty Benefits Committee in its report to the Senate last month. We recognize the concerns of some of
our faculty members, and a number of good points that require further study have indeed been raised. It is important to clarify that the two health plans we currently offer are independent of each other.

The consultative report that was presented at the last meeting suggested that investment in one plan was a burden to the other because we are self-insured, the investment of institutional resources in a new plan modeled off what many of our peers are doing is provided to give faculty and staff flexible options and alternatives. The notion that we are robbing Peter to pay Paul is simply not accurate.

We are focused on managing the total cost of health care. That may indeed require additional institutional investment to launch more sustainable and cost-effective approaches that also work well for a good proportion of our employees. The President's Health Care Advisory Committee will help us incorporate the recommendations of the Health Care Task Force and the recommendations from the Senate advisory and consultative report into a comprehensive strategy for sustainable health care benefits for the University.

In the spirit of transparency, at this time, we plan to stay the course on the current plan designs and not implement any major changes in the next calendar year in premiums, cost-sharing, or health savings account seed funding, as we take time to better understand the initial effects and impacts of the high-deductible health plan. We appreciate the Senate's patience as we review your recommendations more fully and work toward the development of a comprehensive long-term health care strategy for all faculty and staff at the University.

In closing, the decisions the administration faces to modernize benefits and compensation programs and policies for all employees are difficult ones and always must be balanced in the context of competing resource demands at this large and complex institution. We welcome and appreciate the faculty's input and advice on these important issues. Your advice influences the decisions that need to be made by the administration to balance fiscal responsibility and the sustainability of employee benefits for all faculty and staff. Thank you.

**Willie Ofosu, Wilkes Barre:** Thank you very much, Provost Jones. I think that is a useful report on the reports that we have sent to you. I do appreciate this. You mentioned right from the beginning that you preferred coming in person rather than sending a letter. If I understand correctly, in the way that things have been working, sending a letter does not preclude coming to present it in person, and what that would have done is sort of help us to actually understand the direction that you intend to go in. My suggestion for this case, is in the future, hopefully, that the letter will hopefully precede the in-person presentation.

**Provost Jones:** Let me reread that sentence. I believe that on this topic, the University Faculty Senate deserves more than just a letter, but an in-person explanation and, as appropriate, clarification of our position. Letters on both of those advisory and consultative reports will be forthcoming.

**Willie Ofosu:** Normally, the letters actually would precede the in-person, in that the letters would be posted, so that people who get to read it can have, again, a direction as to exactly how the conversation is going to go. My point here is that maybe in the future, that the letter will hopefully precede the in-person presentation.

**Provost Jones:** That is fine. Given how hard I had to argue to speak, I think it is actually unusual that there is a verbal presentation, so we can certainly address that order in the future.
Willie Ofosu: I have one more point, and then I will-- on the question of PPO Blue and PPO savings in terms of assisted-- robbing Peter to pay Paul, what the committee has done is through-- in fact, we have worked all along through the year in cooperation with HR and also with Towers Watson. What we have done constantly right through the process-- for instance, in December, we had a good meeting, and as a result of that we delayed making the presentation in the general meeting, because we wanted to make sure that every point is covered.

With a lot of the reviews that we have done and, again, the consultations, definitely, that point has come up that there has been some shifting in terms of what steep the index has done. Of course, it creates some money, but then in terms of the distribution, some of it has been shifted to support the development of the PPO savings. We were not making a statement that, off the top of our head, we had come to. We were making a statement relating to something that had actually happened and had been expressed to us. I just wanted to point that one out.

Provost Jones: I respectfully disagree with that characterization, and I am sorry if that was the impression that you were given.

Willie Ofosu: That tell us what is wrong, meaning?

Provost Jones: I do not know. I was not present. I disagree with the characterization that there is a connectedness between these two plans that are independent plans.

Matthew Woessner, Harrisburg: Forgive me for a moment. I am going to quote from John Adams in his defense of the soldiers of the Boston Massacre. "Facts are stubborn things. And whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, our dictates, our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence." The truth is it is an undeniable fact that the administration imposed a substantial rate increase on especially the higher income employees in the PPO Blue plan.

It is an indisputable fact that at the exact same time, it rolled out a new high-deductible plan, a plan which Towers Watson confirmed to us, our benefits consultant, was brought in with extra low rates to encourage people to come into the plan. They described that it is standard practice in the business world to bring in a high-deductible plan at extra low rates and raise them later. This is the very definition of a subsidy. Now, we can quibble, potentially, over the wording, but when you raise one plan, with the express policy of driving people out, and then introduce a plan at low prices. That is arguably a subsidy, and that is precisely the conclusion the committee reached.

Secondly, it is the express policy of HR to raise the prices in PPO Blue plan to drive faculty into high-deductible insurance. They said it in committee. We have documents to this effect, and we have strong concerns that a policy which targets high-income employees to drive them out of the plan is ethical or transparent. It was important for us to give the administration another model, that everyone would receive equitable compensation and that would pay the difference if a plan was more expensive.

Finally, it was not the position of the committee in the report to take any position on high-deductible insurance. In fact, I stood at that very podium and defended high-deductible insurance as one method, one potential method controlling cost. We are agnostic on this question. All we ask for in the report, and all we ask that you consider, as you look at this policy moving forward, is fairness, equity, and transparency. Whatever we decide to do, we want to make sure that no one is putting their thumb on the scale, pushing us
from one plan into another, or attempting to change the behavior of employees to artificially high rates. I hope the administration considers that moving forward. Thank you.

**Provost Jones:** I wanted to respond to the first part, because I think it was a re-statement of what you had said last time. I can assure you that the administration is not up to anything, with any kind of malicious intent or active intent to drive people into more costly or other plans.

**Matthew Woessner:** As to the question of intent, I have an email from HR in which they seemingly indicate that it is the express policy of HR to do this. If you like, I would be happy to share with you and the Senate, which I think will confirm our claim that it was a deliberate policy to change the rates, in part, to drive people out of the PPO Blue plan. I am not going to release that without your permission, but I think we have a pretty ironclad case that this was not accidental but in fact was policy by HR to move people out of PPO Blue. I would await your consideration before releasing that email to the Senate or to you.

**Jamie Myers, Education:** I am a teacher. Honestly, I do not think it was an intent to push people from one plan to another. I do think the industry, as you mentioned, as you very well said just a few minutes ago, that it is common practice in the industry to introduce a high-deductible plan with some incentive to get people to consider it.

That is not the underlying issue that that report pointed out. I am a little disappointed in you maintaining the current contribution levels for another year, because basically, what you pointed out in the beginning was that the University, we are self-insured-- 100% of the cost we pay. The University is paying 75%, $150 million; we are paying 25% of the $200 million to reach the $200 million, the $50 million.

Now, if you break that down in terms of equity, a participant in each plan, Blue and Savings, should be contributing at the same rate-- University-- 75%. The individual contributions would make up the difference of 25%. That report clearly shows that for the PPO Savings plan, people in that plan are not carrying their weight. It is inequitable at the University. People in the PPO Savings plan are not contributing 25% towards their insurance, and people in the PPO Blue plan are.

The inequity between the contributions in those two plans is what is at stake, in my opinion, as we move forward. I think you should look again carefully at revising the contribution. This Faculty Senate endorsed lowering contributions on employees at the lower income and raising contributions on employees at the higher income.

We endorse that. We did not endorse lowering the contributions for the PPO Savings plan for all employees and increasing dramatically the contributions for those in the PPO Blue plan. It is not Peter robbing Paul, it is equity in our benefit as an employee at the University, and carrying our weight, and contributing our 25% towards our insurance.

**Esther Prins, Education:** I am going to sit, because I have my laptop that I am going to read some comments from. When the tuition benefit for older adult children of employees was brought up, I had a colleague read my comments. I am dismayed to hear that the tuition benefit will be rolled back for older dependents. First of all, this directly contradicts the strategic plan. Goal 4 is to maintain access, affordability, and enhance diversity.
I quote, "student success must be envisioned, evaluated, and supported for all of our students. That is not only for the traditional student base, but, and in some ways particularly, for segments that have been historically underrepresented and underserved in higher education, but are now increasing.” Adult learners are explicitly mentioned here. I realize this is probably directed toward thinking about people who are not children of employees, but this is also covered by this tuition benefit.

Some of the comments that my colleague had made on my behalf earlier concerned the fact that there are only, from my understanding of the report, about 30 to 40 undergraduate students who are in this small group. My question is, why is fiscal responsibility being put on the backs of this tiny group of adult learners? My own research suggests that adult learners in Pennsylvania, about 60% of them are in poverty compared to only 30% of students age 24 or younger. We are talking about an annual gross income of only $30,000 per year on average.

If these learners are only now pursuing their undergraduate education at Penn State, it means that they have already faced multiple obstacles in their lives. Many of these are probably women who postponed their education because of having children. It was not broken down by gender, but that would be my guess, based on my knowledge of the research. Instead of suggesting that we would be out of step with our peers, if we were to provide this generous benefit, I would suggest that we can become a national role model by providing this for adult learners.

My second point is about fiscal responsibility. Again, I question why fiscal responsibility always has to be on the backs of the most vulnerable populations. Let me point out that an AAUP analysis of Penn State showed that the number of administrators increased by 54% between 2002 and 2012. Executive administrators grew by 65%, and those salaries were 23% above inflation, compared to a rate below inflation for faculty salaries. No offense to anyone in the room, but I would suggest that might be a place to start looking for fiscal responsibility.

Provost Jones: Let me respond to the support of adult learners. Penn State is extraordinarily committed to adult learners. We have many mechanisms in place to provide financial aid for students who return to Penn State or start at Penn State when they are older. In fact, I visited the Shenango campus yesterday; met with a classroom full of students. Two thirds of the students in the room were above age 24. This is a group that we are particularly sensitive to, and we are committed to, and committed to making sure that financial resources are available.

On the administrative bloat issue-- not your word, my word-- I would refer you to my presentation at the last Board of Trustee meeting. There will be also a more detailed presentation at the upcoming Board of Trustee meeting, where we do a detailed analysis of Penn State in this space. I hope that you will be pleased with what you see relative to your institution in that regard.

Chair Kulikowich: I am going to move on to the next items of our agenda. I would just like to say, Provost Jones, I hope you know that as the Chair of the Faculty Senate this year, and I am confident in your chair next year, that if you should ever request to share remarks, you are welcome to do so.

NEW BUSINESS – NONE

FORENSIC BUSINESS - NONE

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.

GENERAL EDUCATION PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT TASK FORCE
Revision to General Education Curriculum
Committee Co-Chairs Mary Beth Williams, Janet Schulenberg, and Maggie Slattery

Chair Kulikowich: We have one Legislative report today from the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force, which appears as Appendix B and is projected on the screen before you.

Task Force Co-Chairs Mary Beth Williams, Janet Schulenberg, and Maggie Slattery will respond to questions.

Mary Beth Williams, Committee Co-Chair: Thank you, Chair Kulikowich, and thank you, Provost Jones, for the warm-up.

Good afternoon, everyone. We are honored and humbled to represent the work of our very respected colleagues, who are dedicated to Penn State students, and to join you here today. On behalf of the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force, we wish to express our gratitude for the council, the support, and substantive contributions of thousands, literally thousands, of colleagues, students, and stakeholders who were instrumental in shaping these recommendations. We wish to acknowledge, with gratitude, the logistical support provided by Senate staff members, especially Cindy Zook.

We are pleased to submit to you, for your consideration and approval, recommendations and revision to our general education curriculum. These recommendations are the result of a high level of engagement and constructive input from the University community at all levels, including current and past senators and Senate chairs, student leaders, faculty governance leaders, and our administrative colleagues.

In this legislative report, we present two sets of recommendations, which we will address through six separate votes. The first set of recommendations frames general education around a set of contemporary learning objectives that reflect Penn State's mission and values, and that align with recognized principles of excellence in general education. The curriculum should be evaluated around these learning objectives to enable continuous improvement and innovation in the years to come. We just heard that our recent Middle States accreditation visit occurred. This has also reinforced the importance of assessment in general education.

The second set of recommendations for your consideration today proposes changes to the general education curricular structure itself. This set of recommendations is designed to strengthen student learning through the general education curriculum. As with any Senate legislation, implementation is the responsibility of the appropriate Senate committees and will occur under the direction of incoming Senate leadership. Although implementation is not the charge of this task force, our colleagues on the logistics subcommittee have been continuously evaluating feasibility and possible impacts of these recommendations that we are bringing forward to you today.
The task force strongly values Senate committee leadership and implementation in the years to come. So each of these recommendations is written to stand alone and to offer an improvement to general education. We will take each recommendation in sequence as a separate vote and with discussion before each vote.

We wish to begin discussion now of the first recommendation. Recommendation 1 should look very familiar to you. This is exactly the same as you amended in your January 27, 2015 meeting, with one exception, one change. We change the word "including" in the Key Literacies objective to "such as" in order to make clear that those are examples, not meant to be an exhaustive list.

I also want to clarify some of the questions that we had last time-- about how these would play out in the curriculum. Hopefully, that becomes much more clear with this whole report. The bottom line is in order for a course to meet a general education criterion, it must meet at least one of these learning objectives as well as the domain criteria for that course. The floor is now open for discussion on Recommendation 1.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Are there any questions? Are we ready to vote on Recommendation 1? Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 145 accept, and 18 reject. The motion carries. The co-chairs will now provide introductory remarks for Recommendation 2.

**Maggie Slattery, Committee Co-Chair:** Recommendation 2 asks for a regular and ongoing assessment of the general education curriculum as a whole. We have addressed in previous Senate reports assessment of general education as an area up for improvement. We also just heard from President Barron that assessment is a growing priority for the University. This recommendation includes language about Senate approval, because there are bodies external to the Senate who are responsible for assessment. We want to make sure that the Senate is included in collaboration, as the plan is developed. We also include this because the Senate is ultimately responsible for the curriculum.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Are there any questions or comments?

**Keith Nelson, Liberal Arts:** I have had a lot of comments from many people around the University. I represent Liberal Arts. I have had extensive discussion with all the key people in Psychology, and I have to say that even though there is a reasonable amount of coherence in the way that the plan is presented, we are disappointed at the degree of reform that is represented. We also believe that there should be explicit, not just leaving it to implementation, that there should be an explicit plan at the point we are voting on now for assessing learning objectives, right? We know that the criteria for gen ed courses have not been revised since 1985. There is no effective assessment now, independent of courses, of whether the learning objectives are achieved. We think that that is a major gap in what could be a major reform. We recommend that a revision in this report be achieved before we go ahead.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Senator Nelson, is that a motion?

**Keith Nelson:** Yes, I would like to make it a motion.
Chair Kulikowich: A motion for what? It would be a restatement--

Keith Nelson: A motion that we do not vote on this report, but wait for a revised report that reflects the kinds of issues that I have raised. Again, I think they are common among many, different people in the University.

Chair Kulikowich: The motion under consideration is Recommendation 2.

Keith Nelson: Yes, for Recommendation 2. In effect, regardless of the right parliamentary procedure, I am suggesting that the many good things that have come forward in this task force report-- about integrating studies and their importance, about creativity and their importance-- there are many things that we agree on. In terms of the degree of change in the actual curriculum that will support the objectives and the complete lack of any assessment procedures outside of courses, I think it requires deferring and working on those before we try to move forward and pass it on to implementation.

Maggie Slattery: This motion is about developing assessment procedures and developing an assessment plan, specifically requesting that the details come back, but putting in motion the pieces to develop that assessment plan. To address concerns about the amount of change or whatever in the curriculum that would be in reference to some of the subsequent or future recommendations that we are going to address after this vote.

Keith Nelson: Let me paraphrase in a nutshell what we see. We see that there are many things in future directions that are like a promissory note, that these will be attended to. I am suggesting that before we pass on an important report like this, for implementation and further consideration, that it become more explicit about assessment, and become more explicit about integrating studies of all kinds.

Chair Kulikowich: Senator Nelson, right now the motion is still with Recommendation 2 and not the report. I am going to have Parliamentarian Backer make a statement accordingly.

Parliamentarian Backer: It is not quite clear what you are attempting to do in the form of an acceptable motion. Are you seeking to postpone consideration of this indefinitely, which is an appropriate motion?

Keith Nelson: Yes.

Parliamentarian Backer: Or are you seeking to table this, which is also an appropriate motion?

Keith Nelson: Oh, excuse me. I spoke too fast. I would recommend, on Recommendation 2 specifically, table it and asking--

Parliamentarian Backer: OK. You move to table Recommendation 2?

Keith Nelson: Yes.

Keith Shapiro, Arts and Architecture: As I understand Robert's Rules of Order, the purpose of the motion to lay on the table is to enable an assembly or majority to vote without debate and to lay a pending question aside temporally to take up something else of immediate urgency. Since there is nothing on the table or nothing that we are going to take up of more immediate urgency than this, I would suggest that it is
improper to use this particular rule in this case, because all it is going to do is suppress debate, and that is not correct.

**Parliamentarian Backer:** There is no second on the motion, so we do not have to vote on anything yet.

**Keith Shapiro:** We need a second. There is no discussion of this. There is no point--

**Chair Kulikowich:** Is there a second to the Nelson motion? Then the question is moot, says the parliamentarian. Are there any other questions or comments regarding the motion on Recommendation 2 as on the screen?

I would like to recognize someone has called the question. Is there a second?

**Senators:** Second.

**Chair Kulikowich:** All in favor of calling the question?

**Senators:** Aye.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting via Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 146 accept, and 14 reject. The motion carries. The co-chairs will now provide introductory remarks for Recommendation 3.

**Janet Schulenberg, Committee Co-Chair:** The second set of recommendations that we are bringing forward relate to the curricular structure of general education. These recommendations present modifications to our current program and are intended to improve student learning through general education. They are designed to make the purposes of general education more transparent to students and to stakeholders to strengthen the role of communication and quantification as building blocks to later coursework, to increase student flexibility, and to create an integrative component among the knowledge domains.

Like the first set of recommendations, each of these four recommendations stands alone for Senate's consideration, but these are a little bit challenging to wrap your head around. Unless you are sitting pretty close, we would like to take a few minutes to show you how they would work for students. We will do this here, and we will also do this before Recommendation number 6, which is the point that presents the most change. We want to make sure that you are understanding what we are asking you to vote on.

Because this is a modification of our current program, we need to start there with our current program. Shown here is one way of representing our current program. In this, students complete 45 credits distributed like you see here. This distribution goes back into the '80s and even before that, where students take nine credits each of writing, and speaking, and natural sciences; six credits each of quantification, arts, humanities, and social behavioral sciences; and three credits of health and physical activity. There is a firewall within here between a major and general education. That is, for example, a chemistry major cannot take chemistry courses to count within general education.
There are also three substitution rules available to students. There is a world language substitution, where a student can substitute a particular level of world language studies for one of these courses. An upper level substitution, where courses within a domain can substitute-- like a higher level econ course that does not carry a GS could be substituted for a social science-- a 9-6-3 substitution, which is only among the arts, humanities, and social sciences. In that substitution, students could borrow three credits from one of those categories, among arts, humanities, and social sciences, and apply it to another one within there. Hence, the 9-6-3.

In the proposed curriculum, we retain much of the structure. The base distribution of credits remains. The firewall between the general education and the major remains. The world language and upper level course substitutions also remain. In the revised curriculum several categories are renamed-- Recommendation number 3 and Recommendation number 4. The C or better in foundations courses, in writing, and speaking, and quantification is recommended-- that is Recommendation number 5.

Number 6 has the most change in it. An additional opportunity for students to choose courses they find intellectually engaging is created through an expansion of that 9-6-3 flexibility to include all of the knowledge domains. We are calling it ‘move 3.’ The structured opportunity for students to explicitly practice integrative thinking that is a hallmark of contemporary general education is created within this.

This may be accomplished through two initial pathways that we are proposing. This is explicitly because we know that there are differences among departments, campuses, and colleges, and we want to make sure that these units have the ability to participate in ways that honor their strengths and their current structures. In response to some suggestions from colleagues, we have also put together a handout for you that is an example of a curriculum check sheet, a way that this could be tallied up to aid in advising. We shared that as a handout with you. It is also available on the Gen Ed website in an interactive format. This is an Excel spreadsheet-- those of you who think in spreadsheets might see this very intuitively. Those of you who do not, it might be a little bit more of a challenge.

If you play around with this, it tallies up what still needs to be done. That check sheet facilitates keeping track of the total number of credits, which must be 45. The total number of courses within each domain, is the same as we currently have with the substitutions and the integrative studies. In particular, it helps make sure that no domain is eliminated or completed only through integrative studies. We want to focus—that is the overview.

Now we would like to focus in on the first two of these recommendations, Recommendations 3 and 4, which seek to make the purposes of general education more transparent.

**Maggie Slattery:** All right. Let us talk about Recommendation number 3 first, so we can keep the momentum going. Recommendation 3 seeks to rename Health and Physical Activity to Health and Wellness to better reflect the knowledge domain's focus on theory and the practice of lifespan-long health and wellness. The floor is now open to discussion on Recommendation 3.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Are there any questions on Recommendation 3? Seeing none, are we ready to vote on Recommendation 3? Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 157 accept, and 14 reject. The motion carries. The co-chairs will now provide introductory remarks for Recommendation 4.
Maggie Slattery: Recommendation 4 seeks to rename the components of general education. The current programs’ components are named Skills and Knowledge domains. We recommend changing these to Foundations and Breadth Across Knowledge domains as a better way to convey their roles in general education and the relationship to the rest of the undergraduate degree. The floor is now open for discussion on Recommendation 4.

Chair Kulikowich: Are there any questions about Recommendation 4? Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 156 accept, and 11 reject. The motion carries.

Janet Schulenberg: Recommendations 5 and 6 focus in on student learning in general education. Recommendation 5 seeks to require a C or better in writing and speaking and quantification courses. Writing and speaking, that is, GWS courses, and quantification, GQ courses, are both key areas of literacy, and they are meant to be taken relatively early in a student’s undergraduate career. Subsequent courses are meant to draw on those skills and refine them. This is a recommendation that we heard strong support for from multiple stakeholders, particularly during our retreats, and including faculty from the relevant departments.

I would like to give you a little bit of context, as my campus colleagues who deal with lots of transfer students know, when students transfer courses into Penn State, they must have earned a C or better in those courses at another institution in order for them to apply for Penn State credit. We would like to bring these foundation courses into alignment with what we would accept from other institutions. Additionally, each major requires 15 credits of C or better coursework. This requirement would place general education in comparable standing with those major degrees, and emphasize the role of these foundation courses.

We suggest that with this recommendation, students should demonstrate sufficient mastery of these basic literacies to indicate that they are well positioned to succeed in their educational endeavors. We do not anticipate that this requirement would lead to grade inflation, although that is a concern that we have heard, because we have confidence in the ability of our colleagues to promote a culture of academic excellence. We also believe that students are willing and able to meet this requirement.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: I oppose this, because I do believe this will lead to grade inflation. It will also lead to compression of grade point averages. You are essentially changing D’s into failing grades. Therefore, a faculty member who does not feel a student has accomplished the minimum necessary requirements to move forward can give a D instead of an F. So basically, there is going to be two levels of failing-- a D fail and an F fail.

I personally never liked the idea of all the C or better grades in majors. Also, I do feel that a faculty member should decide if a student has met minimal requirements in order to pass the course. It used to be that a D was a low pass, and a C was an average grade. We have now changed an average grade to a B, and a C is turning into a low pass. I do believe that is contributing to grade inflation.

Ira Saltz, Shenango: There was some discussion of this at the caucus meeting, and I have been thinking about this deeply. I was leaning towards the side that Roger just expressed, but another part of me says that I think by saying we require a C or better, we are making a statement. Just this morning I was talking to a student on the van ride on over, and her comment to me was that, “well, you know, a lot of students do not
take Gen Ed seriously. They do not put a lot of effort into their courses, and maybe this will result in students having to put a little bit more effort into their writing and understanding some very basic quantitative techniques.” I would like to recommend that we approve this. Thank you.

Victor Brunsden, Altoona: I have been going back and forth on this requirement myself. I am a mathematician, so I would be directly affected in my teaching with this requirement. I would recommend strongly that should this pass, that this be one of the first items of assessment of the general education curriculum to see that this really does have the intended effect and is something that I think that we should be able to assess in a relatively straightforward manner.

Janet Schulenberg: Thank you. I think that is an important point that you just made, and this is a statement about raising the bar. That is why we are bringing it forward to you. We also, as we have done throughout this process, want to base our recommendations on evidence and to then see them play out and be analyzed. Thank you, I think that is exactly the right thing to say.

Kimberly Blockett, Brandywine: I just want to say, as an English professor, I have always been uncomfortable with the idea that a student who earned a D in writing, particularly a basic writing course, would then move on with the message that, I have mastered this material. It is unethical. A faculty member still has the flexibility to assign an earned D. That does not change. The difference is, a student cannot graduate, cannot move on with that D. I think that is sending the correct message and is an ethically responsible thing to do for us as faculty.

Frantisek Marko, Hazleton: I would like to speak in favor of his recommendation. I would like to assure Roger that I am not going to inflate my grades, and I believe that raising from 60% to 70% is raising the bar. I do not want to see students not be able to write and not be able to comprehend complicated charts. I want them to read the newspaper, understand the data analysis from Wall Street, for example, and I believe that we will accomplish this this way.

Jane Wilburne, Harrisburg: I just wanted to add to the conversation that I think we as a University need to be accountable to our stakeholders for hiring our graduates. When you look at many of the businesses in STEM fields especially, and they are trying to hire people who are able to write well and do math and critical thinking. I think that is a sign of our University that we want to make sure that we have graduates who meet the needs of our future employers.

Janet Schulenberg: Thank you for making that point. Again, part of this whole revision is to address some of these key skills that our graduates need in order to be successful.

James Ruiz, Harrisburg: I rise to support this issue. I suggest that there be a consequence for this. You will receive a reaction from students and parents when students start to fail with a D, and they will want to know why. This will also impact SRTEs. Please be aware that for this action, there will be reaction.

Patricia Hinchey, Worthington Scranton: Jim just made the point I wanted to make. SRTEs will indeed go down. Roger, grades will not be inflated unless faculty are punished for lower SRTEs. This body has already requested support from the administration. I assume that can include us not being beat up for lower SRTEs when we put this in place. I also support the motion.
**Thomas Beebee, Liberal Arts:** I am curious about the technical aspect of this. A couple of technical aspects. A student gets a D-- that means that if they want to go on, they have to retake the course. Is that right?

**Janet Schulenberg:** That is correct. You need to complete general education in order to graduate. A student does not need to repeat a course unless that specific course is required by the major. A student could take another course if they wanted to. A student who earns a D in the Mathematics of Money could take Mathematics and Sustainability, earn a C or better, and not--

**Thomas Beebee:** OK, but Writing and Speaking, is that not always English 15?

**Janet Schulenberg:** Sometimes, but not always. There are other GWS courses. That is the typical one that students take, yes.

**Thomas Beebee:** What I am getting at is first of all, just to make sure that when we say-- what happens normally when a student retakes the course? Are not the two grades averaged or something like that?

**Janet Schulenberg:** It is averaged into the overall GPA, yes, but there is no averaging of those two courses together to get--

**Thomas Beebee:** It is in a single course that they have to get the C, and then are these courses set up in such a way-- oh, OK. Then what happens to the three credits of D? Can that be used for, like, an elective?

**Janet Schulenberg:** It is up to the major. I am trying to think about when we have cases where students bring in AP credit for Math 140 but then take Math 140, it would work in a similar way to that.

**Timothy Lawlor, Brandywine:** This might just be a rhetorical question, but maybe this would be a good area where you could place targeted resources. For example, if we are going to have the requirement increase to a C for these courses, maybe more resources to help students achieve that, STEM labs, writing centers, and things like that. It is just a thought.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Any more questions? Are we ready to vote? Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. to reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 137 accept, and 23 reject. The motion carries.

**Maggie Slattery:** Recommendation 6 is presented as a package, because its individual parts do not stand alone, unlike the five prior recommendations. This recommendation, Recommendation 6, is the most significant curricular change being presented for your consideration today. The part that looks the most complicated-- we know that you may have questions and concerns about this recommendation. We would like to take a bit of time to fully present it before we open the floor to discussion.

One of our learning objectives, you just approved, is integrative thinking, the ability for students developing the ability to synthesize knowledge across multiple domains. This is a critically important skill for our graduates and a hallmark of contemporary general education curricula. It is not explicitly required in our current general education program. Because it is so critical for our students, the task force is recommending that it be included as a required component in the general education curriculum.
While there are institutional barriers to large changes, particularly in an institution of this size, this is the most significant revision that we are presenting. It is intended to improve student learning. There are multiple ways to encourage integrative thinking. Over the last 18 months, the task force has considered, deliberated, sought your feedback, and iterated on several models on how we might accomplish this at Penn State. Based on your input and based on the input of the University community, we narrowed the curricular structures to ones that would have the likely educational effect and that would be deliverable and sustainable at Penn State.

We are proposing an integrative studies component that can be accomplished by one or both of two possible pathways—through inter-domain courses or/and linked courses. This flexibility presents campuses, colleges, and departments with options for how they can participate in this new general education component.

As someone who talks with students every day about general education, it is important to me, as a stakeholder, that this requirement be straightforward to describe and to track. Although at first glance it might look like this is complicated, I truly believe that what we presented to you is something that is readily understood after a little bit of study and is fully implementable. It is important to be clear here, too—this is a conversation that came up in our Curricular Affairs meeting this morning— but the intent is to promote integrative thinking.

These are the ways that— the ones that we are proposing right now are the ways that we think we can do this within our current structures and with our domains. The intent is not to exclude any discipline from participating in integrative studies. That is a topic that will need to be worked out through implementation, but we see the possibility for every single discipline to participate in this initiative.

What I would like to do is to show you a couple of ways that this would play out for students. These are also in your appendix. Inter-domain courses are an innovative way, we think, to provide students the opportunity to develop integrative thinking across knowledge domains through a single course. In the proposed curriculum, students would take two of these inter-domain courses, where each of the courses counts within two knowledge domains, right? It is double counting for students.

There are a number of combinations for this. We have not provided examples of this, because this is where the faculty comes in. We expect faculty and departments would develop courses that align with their disciplinary and research expertise. There are a couple of courses on the books right now that carry two domain designations. For example, Chemistry 233 cross-listed with English 233 as Chemistry and Literature. It covers key concepts in chemistry, the influence of chemistry on literature, and back and forth—the relationship between science, society, culture, and values. This is the idea behind that. That course was not developed to be an inter-domain course to meet these requirements, but that is the idea behind this.

It is also important to make a couple of points clear. The idea here is that students must take at least one course from each knowledge domain. That is, no domain could be completed through inter-domain courses alone. Inter-domain courses are suggested to be at the 200 level or higher for two reasons. One, it allows students to build upon prior college-level learning. It moves general education into the higher levels of the University curriculum.

Two, it allows students to build on experiences in a knowledge domain while practicing integration across the domains. A single inter-domain course meets multiple knowledge domain requirements. This frees up an additional three credits for students to take among any of the knowledge domains. The total number of
credits that a student takes among the knowledge domains remains unchanged, but this does increase student flexibility in choosing how they allocate those credits among the domains.

Appendix C of the legislative report shows additional examples of how students pursuing particular majors--for example, like those subject to ABET-like accreditation or students pursuing minors--might accomplish this curriculum. In each case, students in highly prescribed majors are presented with greater opportunities to make choices in general education that are intellectually relevant to that student while still exposing students to the breadth intended by this curricular element.

Also, on the check-sheet that we handed out, it shows the same student as in Appendix C who is pursuing a business major and an Asian studies minor. This shows how students can use that flexibility as one example.

The ‘Move Three’ substitution is included in this recommendation, because it is what allows the GHW--newly-renamed category, Health and Physical Activity now Health and Wellness--to participate in those inter-domain courses with parity. It further increases student flexibility. The ‘Move Three’ would function just like the 9-6-3 substitution does in our current program, but it would expand out to include the natural sciences and health and wellness domains. Just as with our current 9-6-3 substitution, no domain could be eliminated through use of this substitution.

Together, these two curricular components, the inter-domain courses and the ‘Move Three’ substitution, open additional opportunities for students to take world language, upper level courses, and to pursue a minor. The example you see here is what you see in your appendix as well, as one example of a way a student might accomplish this.

Linked courses are presented as an alternative way for campuses, colleges, and departments to offer integrative studies. Faculty teaching courses, among two different knowledge domains, either concurrently or in sequence, could collaborate to develop ways to help students make explicit connections across those courses through sharing, for example, a culminating project, or sharing reading assignments, or the like. This would allow existing learning communities, for example, or some of the campus theme models that we became aware of through this, to participate in integrative studies as a part of general education, and would include those exemplary programs with elevated student appeal, we think.

Additionally, in principle, faculty could build several linked courses into the requirement of a broadly integrative minor, making completion of a minor a bit more feasible to a wider group of students. Fundamentally, behind links courses, is faculty collaboration to build those connections. It does not necessitate unique courses, it necessitates unique teaching of those courses.

This is also where components that you have already approved, like with assessment, will add to this and help this become greater than its parts. For example, that assessment plan could inform assessment of these integrative studies components delivered this way, could assess piloted new ways of accomplishing this, and allow us to continually improve how we are accomplishing this in general education.

We know that there will remain questions about how the integrative studies component would be implemented, and that resources will be needed to deliver these courses. The President and Provost have provided strong assurances to us, and perhaps they will again today for you all, that they will support student learning and excellence in general education.
Again, following the processes of all Senate legislation, implementation is the responsibility of the appropriate Senate committees under the direction of Senate leadership. Senators who are tasked with working on implementation will have to determine the appropriate timeline and collaborate with other University groups, such as Lone Path. With that, we would like to now open the floor for discussion of Recommendation 6.

Ira Saltz, Shenango: I favor this. I think the task force has done an incredible job, one that I am sure has not been easy. My only, I guess, concern-- and I guess this can be ironed out in implementation-- is the notion of super courses. One of the things that I do not want to see happen is that students will be able to reduce their breadth in general education.

I am concerned about students trying to seek, within their major, integrated courses as a way of checking off a course in their major, or being able to continue to take courses in the field that they like while avoiding the other fields. I guess I want to see this pass, but I also hope that in implementation, we avoid a super course—we are not going to see a proliferation of super courses.

Maggie Slattery: Yes, we share that concern and completely agree with you.

John Moore, Retired Senator: I had a hard time coping with this Recommendation 6, only just trying to understand it. There are a lot of phrases here I did not understand. I do not know what integrative studies are. I looked it up in the—I am unfamiliar with the phrase "inter-domain." I am unfamiliar with linked courses. I could not understand how we could be asking people to take six credits of an unknown quantity, such as integrative studies. Or how could we ask them to take another nonexistent thing called inter-domain? I was worried about it all last night, and then finally, this morning, in Undergraduate Education, Senator Taylor shed light on my troubled soul by saying that if we vote yes on this, what we are doing is creating an implementation committee.

Maggie Slattery: Yes.

John Moore: That is, there is, at the current moment, no actual substance to this except someone will come up with what the phrase "integrative studies" means, and someone will come up with the phrase "inter-domain," and someone will come up with "linked courses." In voting yes, we are voting for a futures committee, an implementation committee.

My good friend John Bagby, he and I were on the implementation committee back in 1995 for the great Pangborn committee. Suddenly, I realized, oh my, this is all familiar territory. Nothing to fear. It might all turn out very well. At the same time, it is all undefined and in the future. Is that right?

Maggie Slattery: There is no question, John, that there is an implementation part of this for Curricular Affairs and other committees to decide by what criteria does a course meet these requirements. No question, but the requirement for our students to develop integrative thinking skills is something that you are voting on today.

John Moore: I guess what I am saying is that there will be another document forthcoming at some point, and we will be voting on that. That then becomes something that we can send to Curricular Affairs. That then becomes a curricular fact, right?

Maggie Slattery: Yes.
**Shuang Shen, Liberal Arts:** While I support the idea of integrative learning, myself and many of my colleagues seem to have many questions about how the inter-domain courses and the linked courses will work. The comments on the website indicate key questions, important questions, such as who authorizes the definition of inter-domain courses or linked courses? Therefore, in this situation, I find the concept and the implementation integrated to each other.

I find it difficult to ask us to commit ourselves to these two specific forms of integrative studies, inter-domain and linked course, without a concrete idea of implementation. Therefore, I would like to make a motion to make an amendment to Recommendation 6. I sent the motion to the Senate staff, which is basically to say that I think an implementation plan should be brought to the Senate for approval before we vote on it.

**Chair Kulikowich:** There is a second. The motion that was sent. Recommendation 6 requires six credits of integrative studies as part of the general education baccalaureate requirements, and allows three credits of integrative studies as part of the associate degree general education curriculum. An implementation plan will be brought to the Senate for its approval. That is the amended motion. It has been seconded. Is there a discussion?

**Maggie Slattery:** I would like to comment on the question of who would approve courses. The standing Committee of Curricular Affairs is charged with the responsibility of approving all courses at the University and through the General Education Subcommittee of Curricular Affairs would, through the standing and the existing processes, of approving general education courses, would approve any components that we were to approve today for general education. That would include integrative studies courses, inter-domain courses, and/or linked courses. That would happen through the existing processes of the standing Committee of Curricular Affairs.

**Jamie Myers, Education:** I would urge you to vote against this amendment for a couple reasons. I, too, as Senator Moore said, had trouble with this report initially until it dawned on me that inter-domain courses were what we already have, and we call them cross-disciplinary or cross-listed. You did give us a nice example on the floor today that was not in the report, I do not think. I went back and looked for it and could not find it. We have cross-listed courses. We recognize them as a hallmark of our interdisciplinary scholarship.

What I see this recommendation doing is asking us to develop more of those at the undergraduate level. There is money going to be offered to do that. I think that is a good thing. The motion, you know, is saying that we do not know what those are. I think we do know what those are. It is just that we are using two different names. Linked courses, we know what those are. The motion is saying we do not.

We have had for many summers a wonderfully successful program called LEAP that is built on linked courses between disciplines or departments. We have an experiential base for linked courses. I think that faculty and their creativity will find many other opportunities to do that. I think that you were rather smart in choosing those two venues for integrative studies, because both of those exist at the University. Their models are already there. Curricular Affairs is already there in terms of approving cross-listed courses.

The last reason I would vote against this amendment is that it is asking for what is already in the recommendation. That is, an implementation plan. This is going to move to Curricular Affairs and maybe Undergraduate Education. There will be an implementation plan. We do not need to make an amendment to ask that, because it is already in the original motion.
Judith Ozment, Abington: I also stand for the Curricular Affairs Committee. Our Curricular Affairs Committee has been watching and talking about this ever since the task force was invented. Our committee has spent some time thinking about implementation, because that is what we do. There is a part of our core being that has been positioning ourselves to get started on this. I think we are ready to start with this. I suggest we turn down this amendment and go back to the original question.

Keith Nelson: I would like to agree with most of the previous speakers. I think that the integrative studies component is at the heart of how we can do education better. I think it is the cart before the horse, like the first speaker. It is a promissory note that is requiring credits that have not even been defined. So many of my colleagues are absolutely on board with what the task force has identified as a future direction.

What we need are multiple incentives to make it happen. Take down the firewall. If you develop a course between chemistry and psychology, let it count in the major, right? You want to have flexibility, you want to have multiple incentives. We need promissory notes, I believe, explicit ones from the administration, that course releases and other money would go into the development of these. If all that happened, I think we would have many, many people develop new, fundamentally exciting courses. That is where we should go.

Now, I would suggest we amend the amendment in a very simple way. Because if I said everybody in the next round of general education had to take Swedish sign language courses and we had no Swedish sign language courses, I would be laughed out of court, right? We do not have integrative studies and linked courses defined here. At this point-- and let us recognize where we are in history and make it an option to count six credits of integrative studies, as you define them, in inter-domain and linked courses in your report, make it an option that you could substitute six credits of integrative studies for any other six credits as long as you do not eliminate a domain. It is a friendly amendment, saying, this is where we want to go, but we should not vote for requiring students to do something we do not even offer.

Parliamentarian Backer: Was that a statement, or was that an effort to make a motion?

Keith Nelson: I am trying to make an amendment to this amendment to make the six credits possible.

Parliamentarian Backer: You are trying to move to amend this amendment. In what way specifically?

Keith Nelson: That is correct. In a very simple way that I view as absolutely favorable to the goals of the task force. To make six credits of integrative studies an option in the general education program, which can substitute for any other--

Parliamentarian Backer: That is a description. How would-- we need something-- we have this on the floor-- this is what is being considered now. How do you mean to amend this?

Keith Nelson: I thought the amendment is at the top.

Chair Kulikowich: The clean copy is the-- what Parliamentarian Backer is pointing to at the bottom of the screen is the amendment.

Keith Nelson: OK. Let me try to be explicit word by word. Allow six credits of integrative studies-- and these can substitute for any other six credits of general education as long as no single knowledge domain is eliminated.
Parliamentarian Backer: That is the language you want to substitute in here?

Keith Nelson: Yes.

Parliamentarian Backer: All right. Is there a second-- does everyone understand this?

Senators: No.

Parliamentarian Backer: Do you want to try it again?

Keith Nelson: Let me just very quickly-- again, I intended it as a fully friendly amendment. The goals are clear. We do not have integrative studies, we should not require them. Allow six credits of integrative studies, as they are developed, students can take them, and allow those to substitute for any other six general education requirements as long as no single domain is eliminated.

Parliamentarian Backer: There is no motion. There is just a discussion. Either we have a coherent motion with a second, or we rule this as no motion and move on. You can choose either one. Right. There is an easy way and a hard way. All right. Here is the easy way. If the maker of the motion-- if, by unanimous consent with the agreement of the maker of the motion and the second, there is an agreement to permit the change, whatever it is-- because we are not sure what it is-- we cannot vote on something without the language.

We are waiting on the language. If there is no language, there is nothing to vote on. I'm sorry. Then we have no motion. If you mean to amend a recommendation, we need the words that are going to be used to make that amendment. Without it, an expression of what you intend to want to change is not sufficient. If, in fact, you have those words, and the maker of the amendment agrees, and there is unanimous consent, we can move forward. Right. We are still in step one. We need the language.

Michael Krajsa, Lehigh Valley: My understanding of parliamentary procedure-- we have a motion on the floor, and we have an amendment. Until we dispose of that amendment, we cannot entertain another motion.

Parliamentarian Backer: Sorry, no. Sorry.

Michael Krajsa: But does the person who made the amendment, the motion for the amendment and the second, do they accept an amendment to theirs? That is the question.

Parliamentarian Backer: With unanimous consent, they can. We do not have the amendment to the amendment.

Michael Krajsa: I understand we do not have it, but if we did have one, would they be willing to accept it?

Parliamentarian Backer: With unanimous consent.

Michael Krajsa: Well, if their answer is no, then we just proceed on the amendment here.

Parliamentarian Backer: Right, assuming we have one.
Michael Krajsa: Who made the amendment? Would that person raise their hand? Would you be willing to accept this?

Parliamentarian Backer: If it is not coming, then at some point, we are going to have to rule this out of order, and we move on. The rules are the rules. You like them, fine. You don't like them--

Chair Kulikowich: I know. At this point in time, we are waiting for a written amendment to the amendment that was on the screen.

Maggie Slattery: We are losing people.

Parliamentarian Backer: Yeah, and then we move on. If there is no second, off we go. There is no second on it, because there is nothing to second on. It is purgatory. It is where we are.

Chair Kulikowich: I know there is a lot of conversation in the assembly, and we are waiting for this written or stated motion. Parliamentarian Backer, can I entertain questions while this is coming, or do we have to wait?

Parliamentarian Backer: We have to wait.

Chair Kulikowich: Senators, if you can-- I appreciate that we are approaching 4 o'clock, and I know that, again, that you have questions or comments that you would like to share after this, so if we can, again, just wait for--

Parliamentarian Backer: Looks like they are almost done.

Chair Kulikowich: Again, fellow Senators, we have an amendment to the amendment Recommendation 6. Allow six credits of integrative studies to count as part of the general education baccalaureate requirements, and allow substitution for any other six general education credits as long as no knowledge domain is eliminated. Allow three credits of integrative studies as part of the associate degree general education curriculum.

An implementation plan will be brought to the Senate for its approval. Is there a second to this amendment to the amendment? Hearing none, we are back to the amendment. I will recognize you in a second. I want to recognize some senators who have been waiting patiently. I do appreciate that. Co-chair Schulenberg would like to make a comment, and senators, then I will recognize you.

Janet Schulenberg: In acknowledging that there are still some unknowns, I would like to point out that this amendment removes the ‘Move Three’ as an option for students, therefore eliminating GHW from participating within the inter-domain, if that is a way of implementing it. It also removes both ways that we have presented as ways to initially start the integrative studies. Rather than providing more clarity, it actually takes away some of the methods that we currently have available to us to implement this.

Matthew Wilson, Harrisburg: I would like to stand to oppose this amendment on procedural grounds. The sentence that has been added, an implementation plan will be brought to the Senate for its approval, is simply reiterating what the Senate does. That a plan will be brought to the Senate for its approval and that it will be approved by the appropriate committees-- there is no necessity for that sentence.
James Ruiz, Harrisburg: I call the question.

Chair Kulikowich: All in favor of calling the question?

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. Now we are voting on the amendment. To accept the amendment as written, clean copy on the bottom part of the screen, press-- excuse me?

Senators: Can you enlarge it?

Chair Kulikowich: The recommendation now requires six credits of integrative studies as part of the general education baccalaureate requirements, and allow three credits of integrative studies as part of the associate degree general education curriculum. An implementation plan will be brought to the Senate for its approval. Was there a second?

We called the question. We are ready to vote again. If you are in favor, press A. Yes, after this vote, we will go back to-- depending on the outcome, we will go back to the main motion. To accept the amendment, press A. To reject the amendment, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 26 accept, and 99 reject. The motion fails. We are back to the original Recommendation 6.

Brent Yarnal, Earth and Mineral Sciences: I have given a lot of thought to this, and I have a statement to read so I do not go off the rails. One thing I want to make sure is I do not derail Recommendation 6. I believe passage of it is important, and I support it in general. I cannot support the provision to Recommendation 6B, that inter-domain courses should be at the 200 level and should carry the prerequisite of third-semester standing or course work in one of the two relevant knowledge domains.

Let me give you some background to my perspective. I am an interdisciplinarian whose work and training lies at the intersection of physical, social, and information sciences, and whose teaching and research addresses the wicked, complex, and inherently interdisciplinary problems of climate change and natural hazards. I hold degrees in social science and physical science. I therefore understand the tensions between disciplinary and interdisciplinary science.

I am well aware of the opinions held by some individuals that it is necessary to have a thorough grounding in a discipline before studying integrated interdisciplinary topics. Although I agree with those individuals, that interdisciplinarians must have thorough grounding in one or more disciplines, I strongly disagree that students should not be introduced to interdisciplinary or inter-domain thinking before taking a domain-centric general education course or before reaching their third semester.

I argue that if we want our students to think broadly and to become interested in society's most vexing, most complex problems, they should start thinking broadly from the beginning. Doing so would also give them a better understanding of the relevance and application of domain-specific inquiry. Thus, I think that if students choose to do so, they should be able to take inter-domain courses, one, at the 0 or 100 level; two, before taking domain-specific courses; and three, before their third semester.
In addition, I am also concerned that the proposed legislation effectively marginalizes the 50 already existing interdisciplinary courses at the 0 and 100 level identified by the General Education Task Force that could not be given consideration as inter-domain courses if the legislation were to pass as is. Given that a considerable proportion of the cost of the general education reforms will go to preparing staffing and delivering inter-domain courses, preventing these 50 courses from being eligible for inter-domain status seems an unwise waste of resources.

As an example of a pre-existing general education course that would be ineligible for inter-domain status if the legislation were to pass as is, I will use a course from my department but one that I do not teach--Geography 30, Geographic Perspectives on Sustainability in Human Environment Systems. Through the terms "human" and "environment," this course explicitly links social and physical science domains in the title. It currently introduces about 500 students per year to integrative thinking.

In the proposed legislation, the course would either need to be domain-specific, despite its explicit integrative nature, or need to be artificially bumped up to 200 level, thereby inevitably reducing the number of students being exposed to its inter-domain content. I believe that preventing this and similar inter-domain courses from being designated as inter-domain would be a waste of resources and a disservice to students looking for inter-domain integration.

For these reasons, and quite a few more that I am not going to talk about for reasons of time, I make the following motion. I hereby move that we eliminate the fourth bullet under recommendation 6B from the proposed legislation, and it is up on the screen in blue.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Is there a second to that motion?

**Brent Yarnal:** I need to mention that going along with that, if that recommendation were struck, the paragraph immediately above 4C would become superfluous and should also be struck.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Is that part of the motion?

**Brent Yarnal:** Yes, I am not done with my motion.

**Chair Kulikowich:** We have a point of order.

**Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts:** Sorry. I apologize for that, Brent. To my knowledge, we cannot amend anything except what we are voting on. This is one of my reservations with going ahead with things in exactly their current condition, because there have been a lot of questions raised about sections of the report that are not the bolded words in Recommendation 6. I am just asking our parliamentarian, do we, in fact, have the option procedurally of going back and making amendments to segments of the report that are not the bolded recommendations per se?

**Parliamentarian Backer:** It is not my call. I am only the parliamentarian, that is the chair’s call. The chair can consult, so give us a second. Unless you want an answer off the cuff.

**Chair Kulikowich:** I appreciate your patience, and I understand the complications of knowing what it is that is being moved and what we are considering before us. Right now we have a motion from Senator Yarnal. He is attempting to make a motion. There has been a point of order. With the point of order, Parliamentarian Backer has asked of me to consider some possibilities regarding the point of order made
by Senator Eckhardt. Senator Eckhardt says that we are voting and we are considering Recommendation 6. I am going to defer to the assembly as to whether or not you consider the motion in process being made by Senator Yarnal as pertinent to the interpretation of Recommendation 6.

Senators: Yes.

**Dennis Gouran, Liberal Arts:** Democracy is a wonderful thing. For a learned organization, we have not learned very much over the years that I have been associated with this body. When you try to craft legislation in the manner we have this afternoon, I think that you need to keep your attention focused on the motion or the Recommendation 6 in any amendment to that recommendation, not amendments to other parts of the report. That seems to me to be out of order and inappropriate.

I am not sure anyone in this room, if asked to restate precisely what it is that we are being asked to do, could come up with a clear, definitive answer that everyone else in the room would understand. I think we have spent a good deal of time playing around with amendments, and amendments to amendments, and rejecting amendments to amendments, and getting back to the original amendment, and then getting back to the original motion. This could go on indefinitely.

I would urge you to reject this amendment and get back to the business for why we are here assembled at this point, which is to vote on Recommendation 6. In the nearly maybe more than 25 years that I have been part of this body, I do not think there has been a piece of legislation that has received more attention and more opportunity for comment and reaction than this particular set of recommendations. Why we are here at this point in time messing around with modifications of something that people had ample opportunity to react to earlier is beyond me. I urge you to vote against the amendment and to proceed with a vote on Recommendation 6 and Recommendation 6 only.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Senator Yarnal, I know you are still waiting to proceed. All right. Again, we are still working with the point of order and the discussion related to Senator Gouran's comment.

**Kim Steiner, Agricultural Sciences:** If I could make a recommendation. I think Dennis is exactly right. I think Carrie's exactly right. We have to focus on the legislation at hand. We cannot be modifying all the report that is in the background of that thing. Now, what has— if you think about what is going to play out here, if we pass Recommendation 6, it then goes to the Curricular Affairs Committee for implementation.

They have a lot of work to do. They have got to invent the courses that are going to be used to satisfy this requirement, for one thing. All that is in the report in back of these recommendations that we are voting on amounts to advisory material for Curricular Affairs as it undergoes that process. Brent's comments are now part of the Senate record, or they will be, as soon as they are recorded. I do not know if they will be recorded, that he got a lot of expressions of support, affirmation when he made them, but I heard those myself. I think that the Curricular Affairs Committee will take that into account when they do the implementation. Let us stick to what we are voting on.

**Brent Yarnal:** I withdraw my motion.

**Caroline Eckhardt, Liberal Arts:** This is just, in fact, two aspects of clarification. One, to my good colleague Jamie Myers, cross-listed courses are not the same as inter-domain courses. There are apparently only four existing inter-domain courses. Most of our cross-listed courses cross disciplines, but within a
similar domain. More important, as a clarification, this is the question, is an implementation report coming back to the Senate as a whole rather than simply to the Senate committees?

I think at one point, I saw Mary Beth nod when that question was asked. If so, could I ask you to state verbally for the record your nod and to say, yes, it will, because in that case, I think that response to the current status of the legislation, which, to me, has a whole lot of unknowns in it, might be different if we know we are going to see it as a whole legislatively again.

**Mary Beth Williams:** What I was nodding at, Carrie, was that I am not a parliamentarian, and I have to defer to Senate procedures for that. Whatever the standard Senate procedures are for passing legislation and moving on to an implementation phase is what we are recommending here. If it is the standard procedure for Curricular Affairs to take this legislation and work on an implementation plan, then that is the standard procedure.

**James Ruiz:** If we are now back to this original report, I call the question.

**Chair Kulikowich:** All in favor of calling the question, please say aye.

**Senators:** Aye.

**Chair Kulikowich:** Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. We are now voting on Recommendation 6. Senators joining the meeting by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, press A. To reject the motion, press B.

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 98 accept, and 2 reject. The motion carries.

---

**ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID**

Revisions to Senate Policy 42-82 (Acquisition of Credits) Accredited U.S. Institutions

Committee Chair Richard Robinett

**Chair Kulikowich:** We have two legislative reports today from Admissions Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid. The first appears as Appendix C and is projected on the screen before you. It is called Revisions to Senate Policy 42-82, Acquisition of Credits, Accredited US Institutions. Committee co-chair Rick Robinett will respond to questions.

Seeing none. The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote?

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

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 98 accept, and 2 reject. The motion carries.
Chair Kulikowich: The second report from Admissions Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid appears as Appendix D and is projected on the screen before you. Rick will respond to questions. Are there any questions? The report is brought to the floor by committee and needs no second. Are we ready to vote?

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

With the Mediasite votes, the vote is 80 accept, and 9 reject. The motion carries. Thank you, Rick.

Chair Kulikowich: The next report from Undergraduate Education appears as Appendix E and is projected on the screen before you. Committee chair Betsy Moore and committee vice-chair Annie Taylor will respond to questions.

Elizabeth Seymour, Altoona: In the spirit of being expeditious, we're just going to stand for questions.

David Babb, Earth and Mineral Science: I apologize. I will be brief. Referencing the next to the last paragraph, the statement "if class absence constitutes a danger to the student's scholastic attainment, the instructor should make this fact known to the student at once." We had a discussion in our caucus, and several of our faculty members interpreted the "at once" to mean that it was the instructor's responsibility to notify the student at the point of where the absences cause a problem rather than putting that policy in the syllabus at the beginning of the semester. I do not know what extent that misunderstanding is, if anybody else feels that, but I would like to make a motion that "at once" be struck from that sentence.

Chair Kulikowich: Is there a second? Is there any discussion on the deletion of "at once" from the report? If there is no discussion, are we ready to vote? This is on the removal of "at once." Do you want to do this verbally?

Senators: Yes.

Chair Kulikowich: All in favor, please say aye.

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. Motion carries. "At once" has now been deleted. We are now to the motion for the amended report. Is there any further discussion? If there are no questions-- you call the question. Is there a vote to call the question? All in favor of calling the question?
Senator: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Back now to the amended report. Ready to vote verbally?

Senator: Yes.

Chair Kulikowich: All in favor of the amended report, please say aye.

Senator: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. Motion carries.

LIBRARIES, INFORMATION SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGY
Resolution on Open Access to Scholarly Publications
Committee Chair Galen Grimes

Chair Kulikowich: The next item is a resolution from the Committees on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technologies and appears on the agenda as Appendix F. Committee chair Galen Grimes will present the resolution and respond to questions.

Galen Grimes, Greater Allegheny: I appreciate all of you sticking around this late, especially at this late hour. I will try to be brief. Open access is an issue that we have been discussing in LIST for a number of years. I believe we have issued a couple of informational reports. We decided this year that we needed to try to do a little bit more to support this issue, so we came up with this resolution. I have asked Lisa German, one of the associate deans of the Library, to stand up here with me to answer questions. She is one of the chief architects of the resolution from the subcommittee that drafted it. Are there any questions?

Chair Kulikowich: The report is brought to the floor by committee, and needs no second. Are we ready to vote?

Senators: Yes.

Chair Kulikowich: Do you want to vote verbally?

Senators: Yes.

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. The motion carries. Thank you, Galen.
ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

FACULTY BENEFITS
Employee Life Insurance Policy
Committee Chair Willie Ofosu and Committee Vice Chair Matthew Wilson

Chair Kulikowich: We have one Advisory Consultative report from Faculty Benefits. The report appears as Appendix G and is projected on the screen. Committee chair Willie Ofosu and committee vice-chair Matthew Wilson will respond to questions. Are we ready to vote verbally?

Senators: Aye.

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

Senators: Aye.

Chair Kulikowich: Opposed, nay. The motion carries. Thank you, Willie and Matthew.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

ADMISSIONS, RECORDS, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT AID
Annual Report on the High School Students Enrolled Nondegree in Credit Courses, Appendix H.

FACULTY AFFAIRS

Report on Faculty Teaching Workloads, Appendix J. Committee Chair

JOINT DIVERSITY AWARENESS TASK FORCE
Progress to Date and Steps for Moving Forward, Appendix K.

RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY PLANNING
Overview of the Facilities and Administrative Rate Distribution by Colleges, Administrative Units and Commonwealth Campuses, Appendix L.

REPORT OF SENATE ELECTIONS

Chair Kulikowich: Our final report today is the Report of Senate Elections. You will find some of the election results listed in Appendix M of your agenda. Elected to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, Patricia Koch, professor of Biobehavioral Health, Health Education, and Women's Studies, College of Health and Human Development; Secretary of the Senate, Laura L. Pauley, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering; Chair-Elect of the Senate, James A. Strauss, Senior Lecturer to Eberly College of Science. Thank you and congratulations, Pat, Laura, and Jim.

Comments by Outgoing Chair Kulikowich: Well, now it is time for my outgoing comments. I will try to shorten them. A University Faculty Senate year goes by so quickly. It seems like yesterday that the Senate Council approved in August the agenda for our first plenary meeting last September. Easily we can recall but are likely happy to forget a winter that not only presented us temperatures in digits well below zero, but
also varieties of wintry mixes and snowfall throughout Pennsylvania that made some of our longest scheduled days of meeting all the longer. But January moved quickly to February, and then to March. And here we are at the end of April, ready to bring closure to one University Faculty Senate year and to start a new one.

In the past 365 days, we have accomplished a great deal-- 5 Forensic Reports, 26 Legislative Reports, 6 Advisory Consultative Reports, 34 Informational Reports. In total, the Senate Council approved 71 reports from our 15 standing committees, and 2 task forces, and if I counted correctly, six recommendations from the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force were just ratified, too. Many of our ratified Legislative Reports revised numerous policies, updated and introduced new sections of our Constitution Bylaws and Standing Rules while our Advisory Consultative Reports offered many recommendations for our President's consideration.

Informational Reports and presentations addressed topics ranging from task force progress to showcases of our library systems and research portfolios, while the forensic sessions led off our agendas with dialogues to consider current and future topics of interest to help our Senate and University move forward. Sincerely, these achievements could not have been realized without your dedication as members of our 15 standing committees and 2 task forces. Once again, I express my gratitude for the generous contributions of the chairs and vice-chairs of the standing committees and the co-chairs of our two task forces.

I would also like to say a special thank you to our student senators and the undergraduate and graduate students who they represent. In my opinion, and as a faculty member of the Pennsylvania State University, it is an absolute joy to learn with our students, work with our students, to serve with our students, and to be inspired by them. It has been a pleasure to serve as chair while welcoming Eric Barron as President of our University. Nick Jones, in his second year as Provost, has always been available by email or phone to address any and all questions that I had. I thank him for taking the time and making the time. Personally, many of you know that I call home northeastern Pennsylvania and that I feel blessed to have a loving family of mom, Pat; dad, Mike; and my two sisters, Jennifer and Natalie and their families.

Here is where it gets tough. One thing that I would never imagined in my career is that in less than two years, I would appreciate four gentleman as my brothers. What you should know is that prior to those two years, I had not shared a conversation of any significance with any one of them. I knew of them by name, as I would participate in our many scheduled Senate meetings with them. I watched them and I saw their names on reports, but I did not know who they were. Larry, Brent, Jim, and Mohamad, I see you not only for the most devoted senators who you are, but I am also the most grateful in recognizing you as my brothers.

From each of you, few would know of your combination of dutiful objectivity, sincere reflection, sense of humor, and wisdom.

I have come to know about these gifts that you-- thank you. Before I prepare to pass this gavel to Mohamad, I just wanted to share that this honor to serve with you and for you, our fellow 200 elected faculty senators, has been the greatest and most rewarding experience of my career. As we might be reminded by our professors of philosophy and those of humanities-- asked about what we have done and what we do, might lead to easier lists of response than asked about who we are and who we represent.

Yet the "who" is always realized as we say our names, the names of those who we represent as well as listen to the names of one another. If you have felt that you were recognized when you asked for the
microphone to say who you are and who you represent, and if you felt that someone was listening to you, whether you expressed an opinion, a divergent point of view, a question of clarification, or one of inquiry, no matter how different from your fellow senator who spoke before you or would speak after you, then I am most pleased.

If you walked into this assembly in 112 Kern or joined us by Mediasite, perhaps lounging at home in your favorite comfort wear, and felt this was your assembly to reveal who you are, then I believe we have done our job, made this assembly a home, realized who we are as "we" is much stronger than each of us can be as "I." Together we have served for the good of our University, the Pennsylvania State University. I thank you for this productive year. I am 100% behind my oldest brother, Mohamad, all the way, who believes he is the introvert of the family.

I look forward to serving with him as he leads us as our chair next year. Once again, I thank you so very much.

**Seating of New Officers**

Now we turn to the seating of the new officers. Jim, you have already-- well, you should take your seat where Mohamad was, and Mohamad will come and stand by me. Laura, will you please take Jim's seat?

If you will grant us just a couple more moments, Mohamad and I wanted to revisit an era of the past, where the outgoing chair and the incoming chair exchanged gifts. Before I get ready to pass him the gavel, I have a few gifts for him. Notice for the first time, I am script-less. I am going extemporaneously up here now.

Hang with me, folks. I thought about things that you need to start your first new day. We know you need your Juicy Fruit. We know you like hot water with honey. Do notice it's orange blossoms. Orange is your favorite color. We know that you don't like microwaved hot water, so I went to Macy's and I got you an electric boiling pot.

Notice the ribbon. That is your second favorite color, royal purple. You do not have to open this now, but you can open it at some time. With the lemon and with the hot water, I think you need a special cup.

Lead us well, and as you always do, look good doing it. I have one final thing left to do. Mohamad, I am pleased to present you with the gavel you will use during the year as chair of the University Faculty Senate.

**Comments by Incoming Chair Ansari:** Thank you, Jonna, very much. I am accepting this gavel with honor and also excitement. I told you not to cry, but you did cry. But also, you told me that I might cry, and I was almost crying when you were crying. We had a wonderful time this past year, and I cannot stand here and thank you. The words will not describe my emotions for what we have done together all the past 12 months. Hours of conversation started at 6 AM in the morning. You are truly the best. I thank you from the bottom of my heart. I do not think I deserve all this, but I appreciate the fact that you have thought of me. Also, everything is so appropriate.

Of course, I do not know what is in the other two boxes, but Larry wants me to open it. I am going to have to let him to wait, because all our friends have stayed here and I do not want to prolong this meeting any further. However, I have something for you. If you would please come here, I would like to present that to you as a token of my appreciation and deepest gratitude for your friendship and for your inclusiveness. I just humbly will present it to you.
As I said, I do not know how to thank all you fellow senators for staying. We had a great day. I want to congratulate the co-chairs and membership of the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force for the wonderful job that they did. They deserved this important report to be ratified. I thank you all, the senators, for staying here tonight, this afternoon, and listening to me. I have a few remarks to make, so please, I beg your indulgence.

I wish to express my deepest appreciation to Chair Kulikowich for her friendship and for her inclusive style of leadership. This year, I had the distinct privilege to work very closely with our chair on all aspects pertaining to our Senate. For that, Jonna, I am most grateful. Chair Kulikowich is a remarkable leader. Under her effective leadership, our Senate voted on a number of significant Legislative and Advisory Consultative Reports. Please join me in thanking again Jonna for her distinguished service on behalf of the University Faculty Senate.

I would also like to give special thanks to secretary James A. Strauss and parliamentarian Larry Backer for their time and energy to our Senate, and for their valuable counsel to me. Thank you very much.

I am delighted to announce that Senator Backer has graciously agreed to continue serving as the Senate Parliamentarian for the 2015-16 academic year. Thank you, Larry. Congratulations to chair-elect James A. Strauss and secretary Laura Pauley on your new positions. It will be my privilege to work with Jim, Laura, Jonna, and Larry. Thank you again.

This year, the leadership and members of the General Education Planning and Oversight Task Force, Joint Diversity Awareness Task Force, and other special Senate committees undertook important tasks and dedicated considerable time and effort to enhance our University's curriculum climate and governance. Thank you.

Moving forward, in consultation with our Senate colleagues and Provost Jones in the near future, I expect to be able to identify the needs of the University Faculty Senate in relationship to appointment of special committees and task forces. As your chair, I pledge to continue to exercise our role in shared governance while also endeavoring to collaborate with our administrative colleagues. Leadership of our Faculty Senate is a collaborative project that transparently reflects the sentiments and will of all faculty, staff, and students.

In this spirit, I am committed to lead with clear consensus in establishing priorities and objectives, and to engage our faculty and students in an effective and meaningful way. I will look forward to working with you, my Senate colleagues, and I greatly appreciate the contributions that you will make to the work that lies ahead. Thank you very much.

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS -NONE

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Ansari: I'm delighted to recognize Professor Maria Truglio, who has asked to be recognized for a few remarks that she will make. Professor Truglio.

Maria Truglio, Professor in Liberal Arts: Thank you, Chair Ansari, for the opportunity to speak. I will be brief. Many members of the Penn State AAUP chapter have expressed strong support for the Advisory and Consultative report recently put forward by the Faculty Benefits Committee. This report, which passed
at the March meeting by a wide margin, enumerates principles that would allow Penn State employees to choose the most appropriate health insurance plan for themselves and their families without hidden mechanisms swaying their decisions.

In fact, I was present at the meeting in which Towers Watson admitted under questioning that the current rates were set to incentivize migration to the high-deductible plan. AAUP members and I hope that the administration and the Office of Human Resources will implement the wise recommendations offered in that report. These procedures will allow the University to realize, in concrete and meaningful ways, the values of fairness and transparency that we claim to embrace. Thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ansari: Is there a motion to adjourn? All in favor, please say aye. The motion carries. The Senate is adjourned until September 15, 2015.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.