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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, September 17, 2019, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Nicholas Rowland, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Nicholas Rowland: Ladies and gentlemen, it is now 1:32-- we're close-- on Tuesday, September 17, 2019. And the Senate is now in session. Agenda item A minutes from the preceding meeting, April 27, 2019, [INAUDIBLE], which provides a full transcription of proceedings, was sent to the university archives and is posted on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions? May I hear a motion to accept?

Speaker 1: Accept.

Nicholas Rowland: Second.

Speaker 2: Second.

Nicholas Rowland: All in favor of the minutes please say aye.

All: Aye.

Nicholas Rowland: Opposed? The I's have it. Motion carries. The minutes of the meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Rowland: Moving on. Agenda Item B, communications to the Senate on June 25, 2019 and August 27, 2019. The Senate office published our curriculum reports on the Senate website. This summer then Chair Duffey convened a special meeting of the 2018, 2019 Curricular Affairs Committee. In total, the Committee reviewed-- and this is impressive-- 311 courses, 12 programs, 9 enforced prerequisites, and 135 general education recertifications. We thank members of the 2018, 2019 Curricular Affairs Committee for their extra effort this past summer. And we also thank Provost Jones for the financial support that made this productive gathering possible. We thank you both. Appendix A

Consistent with legislation last year, Senate Council approved five editorial changes to Senate rules which, are now posted on the Senate website. If there are no objections in the next five days, then the recommended changes will be implemented immediately. If there are objections, then the changes go back to committee on committee. And rules are reformatted as legislative reports and then will be brought back to the floor of the Senate for a vote. Appendix B
REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Rowland: Moving on, Agenda Item C, report of a Senate Council. Minutes from the August 2019 meeting of a Senate Council can be found at the end of your Agenda. Included in the Minutes are topics that were discussed at the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Rowland: Agenda Item D Announcements by the Chair. Staff appreciation is something that I've reflected on a lot, especially over the last few months. As faculty, we should seek out opportunities to express appreciation for the contributions that staff make. Because, as we all know, recognition confirms that our work has value and is valued. I've been thinking about staff appreciation in no small part, because the Senate office is undergoing a significant transformation. As many of you already know, our beloved Patti Hopes is retiring today. I wouldn't dream to ask Patti to stand. I know she wouldn't like that sort of thing. And also, of course, she's not here, because she's retired.

The Senate has many fond memories of working with Patti over the years. She'll be sorely missed and for many of us already is. So please join me in thanking Patti for supporting the Senate so well and for so long.

Where there is a retirement, there should be a new hire, at least there should be. Please allow me to introduce Reci Grabowski, who is conveniently already standing. Reci recently joined the Senate Office and will be taken over the role that Patti previously played, answering the phones and acting as the first voice you hear when calling the Senate Office and, well, helping us with all other things Senate. So please join me in welcoming Reci to the Senate.

In the interim of all this change, the Senate office has held it together. Thank you, Anna, Dawn, Kadi, and Kathy, each of whom has gone above and beyond the call of duty and then a little bit more above and then a little bit more beyond. And I'd be especially remiss not to extend a special thanks to Paula Brown, who's, as you can see, diligently working at this exact moment, our wonderful Office Manager, who somehow managed the office through all these changes while simultaneously training our newest addition.

Paula, you're a warrior. Thank you and everyone else in the Senate office for everything. Since we're making announcements, please allow me to introduce a new guest to the Senate. This is Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, with emphasis on faculty development, Dr. Jennifer Hamer.

Dr. Hamer is responsible for leading strategic efforts that expand and reconceptualize programs and services associated with the professional development of faculty at the University. Dr. Hamer, you're most welcome. Thank you for joining us.

One more. Dr. Laura Weiss, our new Senior Vice President for Research is also joining us today coming to us from Georgia Institute of Technology and replacing, if that is possible, former Vice President Neil Sharkey, who is now retired. As it happens, Penn State is where Laura Weiss became Dr. Weiss earning a doctorate in Acoustics and subsequently working here for more than 16 years, including as the head of the Autonomous Controls and Intelligence Systems at ARL, Penn State's Applied Research Laboratories. Thank you for joining us, and welcome back.
But wait. There are yet more guests. In May 2019, the University announced the administrative fellows for the 2019-2020 academic year. They are Dr. Gary Chen, Assistant Dean for Digital Learning and Director of the Office of Digital Learning.

Dr. Chen’s mentor is none other than Eric Barron-- our President-- Lisa Kerchinski-- Director of Career Development for the Schreyer Honors College, whose mentor is Vice President for Government and Community Relations Act-- more and lastly, but not least, Juris Doctor-- I came to find out-- Debra Thurley-- Executive Director of Research Compliance and the Office of Research Protections, where I'm sure that JD comes in handy, who'll be mentored by our Provost Nick Jones. Congratulations on being selected as Fellows, and good luck out there.

Moving on. We have two more brief remarks before we'll get comments from senior leadership. The first one is going to be brief. The second one is a little bit more substantive. First item, editorial revisions to Senate Governance Documents. Consistent with legislation last year, Senate Council approved five editorial changes to Senate rules which, are now posted on the Senate website. If there are no objections in the next five days, then the recommended changes will be implemented immediately. If there are objections, then the changes go back to committee on committee. And rules are reformatted as legislative reports and then will be brought back to the floor of the Senate for a vote.

Second item. For many of our students, religious holy days are an opportunity for introspection, prayer, and personal reflection. Many students, therefore, choose not to attend classes on holy days and instead opt to be with their families or attend to matters of a more spiritual nature.

On some holy days, depending upon the religious beliefs, our students may not be permitted to work, which would include time and energy devoted to in-class coursework, out of class homework, and various other extracurricular co-curricular activities. Our Senate Policy 4277 on class attendance requires that reasonable accommodations be made for our students, who opt to miss class due to a religious observance.

Our policy reads, "instructors should provide within reason the opportunity to make up work for students who miss class for legitimate unavoidable reasons, such as religious observance. However, it should also be recognized that not all work can be made up and that absences can affect student performance in class. So please be reminded of this a student's request time for religious observances this fall.

Also, please note that the dates for holy days may vary from year to year and differences between religious calendars and the secular calendar are based on that, I mean. Official dates are available on Penn State's Holy Day Observance Calendar, a website supported by Student Affairs." Thank you, Student Affairs. That's a terrific website. It's a great resource.

So in closing with this final remark, thank you Vice Provost for Educational Equity, Marcus Whitehurst, for all your efforts to make Penn State a more diverse and inclusive place to work and live, an especially big thank you goes out to Aaron Kaufman, Executive Director of Penn State Hillel, both for helping me prepare these remarks and also for ever so gently correcting me every time I said holiday instead of holy day. Thanks for that.
Thank you both. We admire your tireless advocacy for our students. Thank you. A quick step back, thinking about the year coming up, one, when you see good work by the staff try to recognize it, rather than silently taking it for granted as part of their job.

Two, do all that you can to make accommodations for our students as they explore their spirituality and observe religious holy days this year. Thank you. Moving on.

Agenda Item E, comments by the President of the University, we respectfully invite President Baron to the floor. Dr. Barron the floor is yours.

**COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

**Eric Barron, President, Penn State University:** Thank you very much. I think with the applause and thank you's that I would just add my own thank you. Some of these things no doubt you've heard, but it's nice to say them out loud again.

Obviously, an awful lot of individuals decided Penn State was the place that they wanted to be. The common app makes a big difference, but undergraduate applications were up some 26,000 students. There are many universities out there that would love to have 26,000 applicants, not just to have their applicant pool go up 26%.

University Park paid accepts are up 4%, Commonwealth Campus up 2%. It could be the most diverse class that we've had coming in as students, very promising with that in that regard. The quality of the students is up. When you start to think about that, especially with the demographics of the state of Pennsylvania, that's a profoundly positive statement that so many people want to come in the door to this university.

Last week, Neal Sharkey, despite being retired, came into the office to double check the research numbers so that it could be announced on the arrival of Laura here. And the research expenditures were up 4.5%, bringing the total to $968,600,000. That's a significant number.

And those of you who are quickly doing the math, that's $31.4 million shy of a billion dollars a year in research expenditures, which is certainly heady company even among the best research universities in the country. And all this at a time in which competition for grants and contracts are quite intense. It's quite a statement about what our faculty here at Penn State are doing, how competitive they are, and the work they're willing to put in order to make sure that their peers and others look at them and say that's where the dollars from the state and federal government and corporations should go.

That was an all-time record. And development also hit an all-time record, although that came in the middle of the summer, when they finally had tally that after July 1, but it was $373 million in donations to this university. That's an all-time record. It's the second year in a row that we've had an all-time record.

It's clear that in three years of this capital campaign that $300 million, which only happened twice in our history is now the norm. Significant number of scholarships have been added here, especially focused on access and affordability. Quite fascinating that the impact, the world theme, exceeded its target goal in three years with two years left to go in the campaign.
And the goal for this year set based on the development officers at the campuses and colleges is $407 million, which would, of course, be another all-time record and the first time this institution will have crossed the $400 million mark if successful. So, I just want to say thank you, because that says a lot about who we are and what people expect for their education to come to this institution and have so many people want to get in the door. It certainly says a great deal about the efforts of our faculty, both in the quality of the teaching and how attractive this institution is, but also to attract those types of research investment. And hopefully, it also suggests that our alumni and partners believe and where we're going by giving their hard-earned dollars for particular themes like access and affordability, and transformative experiences for our students and for those big ideas that allow us to impact the world.

The only other thing that I would like to say before taking questions on any topic, is that we've had two years in a row of 0% tuition increase for in-state students. And in that time, I've been here, that's the third time that we have taken that step, which is significant. And it tells you, both on the University side and on the board side, the effort that we're going through or driving to do to contain the costs of this institution.

Historically, we have taken one year at a time. Partly, it's our budget processes. And it's just partly how it is that we do business.

Literally, we look at what the increased costs are that we have. And we look at what the increase in changes in revenue are. And then we look at the rest of it and said, how much of that can we make up on cutting the budget, and how much do we need to make up by changing tuition with what the state does or doesn't do being a factor that modulates the two of those?

So, what we see both in terms of getting external consultants and interactions with the board is that there is a real push here to make this University more efficient and more effective. That's always a challenge and a big issue. And many, many people will wonder the degree to which that will create stress. But what we are doing is really looking carefully at where it is that we can save dollars. But we're focusing very strongly to make sure that the efficiency isn't a budget cut but is an opportunity.

And we're working very hard to balance that notion of, if we're more efficient, how many of those dollars go into access and affordability for our student, particularly those students that are the most vulnerable not to graduate or the most vulnerable in assuming debt that contains risk for them, but also balancing that against a very concerted effort that this institution must always have innovation dollars if we are to move forward. This is becoming a very deliberate part of the discussion that we have with the board of trustees, is balancing access and affordability, which is extremely important to all of us, balancing that with the need to be innovative all at the same time and making sure that we're rewarding faculty and staff for their contributions to the University by having a merit raise pool each year and to cover an aging set of infrastructure. Because, not surprisingly, a huge portion of our campuses was built in a time frame of 50 to 65 years ago.

So, and we have a lot of aging buildings. What you will see in terms of our thinking and perhaps it'll be something that, as we go along will be of more and more interest to everybody is really a three year process and a partnership and bargain that's based on efficiency balancing with access, and affordability, innovation, salaries, and construction. And it will be a much more deliberate process, and hopefully one that we feel rewarded by at the end because of what we can accomplish with the dollars that we save. Of course, that's not easy, but that's what our objective is.
And with that, I'll end. And I'm happy to take questions on any of the topics or anything on people's minds. But I do want to make sure that at start of the year a lot of good numbers and records that you have a lot to do with. Thank you very much.

Nicholas Rowland: Questions for the President. Please state your name and unit for those especially those that are online.

John Nousek, College of Science: Recently, there was news that an entering freshman at Harvard University was denied admission to the country as an immigration restriction from apparently having bad Facebook tweets from friends. Although, I understand he's been admitted now, what's Penn State's policy with respect to immigration restrictions on students? And can you see any effect on our international enrollments as a result of such things?

Eric Barron: So, basically, our view is a qualified student is a qualified student. And our job is to educate the individuals in this commonwealth, the nation, and increasingly the world. What we want is a diverse population of students. And we want a qualified group of students that can benefit from the Penn State education.

There is absolutely no doubt that there are lots of issues that are rolling around in this topic that make this environment challenging, including countries who are sending the signals that we're risky to come to the United States and including lots of activities by this nation that makes us appear to be less welcoming than we have been in the past. And this makes a difference. Applications from international students around the country were down to two years in a row.

Last year, it looked like our admits we're going to be down. And at the last minute, a couple of days, we had kind of a surge. And we were very close to where we were before, but you saw many international students who were choosing to be in a larger city, rather than a rural location.

And this year, we had a drop in the number of international students. That's a very challenging environment. I feel that we're doing much better than a lot of my colleagues are speaking about. But nonetheless, this is a challenge. And I think it may get worse before it gets better.

Chair Rowland: Additional questions for the President?

Eric Barron: Easy day. Oh.

Brianne Pragg, Graduate Student Senator: So last week, the Board of Trustees approved the new apartment rates for the White Horse Apartments, the graduate student housing, with the increase, the rate for a one-bedroom apartment will be $1,168 a month. But many graduate students are being paid only $2,347 a month or less with a minimum stipend being just over $2,000. So that means over 50% of their stipends will go towards rent. Are there plans to increase the rent again next year? And if so, will the graduate employees’ stipends be increased to offset those costs?

President Barron: So, obviously, we made a significant effort to increase the salaries. I think it was 3%. And the housing costs went up 2%. The housing costs now I would point out compared to State College, we do nine-month rentals. That ends up being significantly below market.
It's quite amazing what the marketplace is charging in State College these days. And our costs are based on, not making a profit, but rather to break even. We're very consciously thinking annually about the salaries of our graduate students and increasing them.

I do not know what will happen next year to graduate housing rates, because it will be based on changes in cost. Because the way our auxiliaries operate is, they are designed to break even, minus a small percentage that allows us to store up a little bit of money to replace them, to refurbish them. And that is the rule for the housing. It's basically the costs and the salaries of the staff and the costs of the operations of the buildings. And of course, we wish it was less.

**Paul Thompson, Harrisburg:** Last year, during one of these sessions, you were asked by a student about the policy on active shooters in the community. There was an example. An active shooter left that establishment just outside of campus and turned right instead of left.

At that time, you explained that that was normal procedure to what happened. But has been any more thought, because you said there was going to be a task force. Do you think or thought about anymore thought about policies on active shooters and just general home ed security issues?

**President Barron:** So, I think you're already seeing emerging, a much more active communication in terms of the actions that-- the run-hide-fight, you're seeing much more discussion of that and a deliberate effort to communicate particularly to our students. But we can't make announcements on emergencies in another jurisdiction for which that jurisdiction isn't giving us factual information. If anything went wrong because of that, we would be looked at as the blame for it. And we really are dependent on the police in a particular jurisdiction.

If it was our jurisdiction, then we're getting the information immediately and we know what to say. But if we were to sit there and say, Okay, here's an active shooter somewhere in State College, we don't know where they are, and the event is already over, but we've stopped everybody from going anywhere in State College, you can imagine the fallout. Or if we would decide we knew which way someone was going and we've said it and they went another way and then something happened, where the person felt safe, and they weren't, and we had given them the wrong information, that would also be problematic.

We really are following the rules that the police and the police jurisdictions set for us and not grading their own. This is important. On the other hand, my understanding is there was a lot of discussion among the jurisdictions on how it is that they can get as rapid an information as possible so that if there is a threat to a campus that we would know it and be able to respond accordingly.

This really depends on the speed of communication between jurisdictions. But my understanding is there were a lot of conversations about how we can get the information faster and be able to respond. In real time, with everything going on, it's not even clear that anybody other than some of the local officers know exactly what's going on.

We would have issued a statement after the fact as a warning. And it just doesn't work. Wish it was easier and better.

**Chair Rowland:** Any additional questions? Seeing none. Thank you, President Barron.
Chair Rowland: Agenda Item F, comments from the Executive Vice President and Provost. We respectfully invite Provost Jones to the floor. Dr. Jones the floor is yours.

Nicholas Jones, Executive Vice President and Provost: Thank you very much. I'd like to just share with you a few changes in leadership personnel that have taken place since the last meeting, although some of them were anticipated. There is an Interim Dean of the College of Medicine. That is Kevin Black, who had been serving in a Vice Dean role with responsibilities for among other things the State College presence of Hershey. Good to have Kevin in that role and we will be gearing up to do a National Dean search very shortly.

Daniel Conway is here as the new Dean of Dickinson Law in Carlisle. Clarence Lang started beginning of July as Dean of the College of the Liberal Arts. Kim Lawless, our new Dean of the College of Education, started earlier this month.

Cynthia Lightfoot is serving as the Interim Chancellor at Penn State Brandywine. Dawn Welsh is now serving as the Interim Vice President for IT and Chief Information Officer. And Michael Verderame, who is here, Michael, is serving as Acting Vice President, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School. Quite a few changes in the last couple of months.

Search updates, we have two searches in progress. Both of these searches have been extended from the Spring semester. First, Vice Provost for Global Programs, we have a series of campus interviews that will be beginning later this month on September 29.

We have I think it's two candidates coming in this cycle of the search. And Dean of the College of Arts and Architecture Campus interviews will be beginning the week of October 7 for that search. And we have three candidates coming in for that one.

And just on that note, Bobby Corner has agreed to stay on as Dean of Arts and Architecture, even though officially she was ready to retire, until we have her successor in place. Much appreciation to Bobby for that commitment. Rob Crane continues to serve as the Interim Vice Provost for Global Programs.

Just a few other brief announcements. The first two are issues that were brought to our attention by the Senate last spring. And we had quite a bit of activity over the spring and summer to address these. One was a concern about how the University treated students who have DACA status relative to admission and residency.

There was a concern expressed, because it seemed like we were perhaps talking the talk but not walking the walk. And it turns out that there's some complexity in our application process that coupled with the fact that we do not ask students to declare whether or not they are DACA, if they even know whether they're DACA or not. We had a group come together to discuss this issue when concerns were expressed.

And we are now shifting our approach slightly to base decisions of residency as it affects tuition to be based on domicile and more specifically recent domicile for applicants. That means that a student who is a DACA student, who applies but checks the international box will be for the decisions about tuition
judged on domicile rather than citizenship. This is an important adjustment that will enable us to sort of be true to our word in how DACA students are treated or processed by the University.

I could give you more specifics, but it turns out there's a lot of detail and nuance that needs to be worked out as we implement this and policy, but it will go into effect for the current admissions cycle. We'll be able to take care of that. I thank the Senate for bringing this concern to our attention. And I think we have a good resolution.

The second issue that Senate raised, which was also a good one and one that we had already been thinking about, but the Senate gave us really the momentum to put a group together to consider in more detail is the issue of late fees. When a student or the students authorized payer receives an invoice in August for the fall semester, if they do not pay by the specified time, they incur a late fee. And the late fee is assessed at the rate of 1 and 1/2% per month, which you're doing the math, I can see it, rolls up to an 18% annual rate. That's pretty steep.

It turns out it's what most of our peers are charging, but there was a concern about the continued accrual of late fees. It's 1 and 1/2% the first month. Then another 1 and 1/2% on top of that. And then it would continue through the fall and then on into the spring.

However, something happens midway through the fall semester. And that is that the student has a delinquent account. And is unable to register for the spring.

That's a pretty stiff penalty right there. It doesn't seem to make a whole lot of sense, that in addition to not being able to enroll, we continue to accrue a late fee at the rate of 1 and 1/2% per month. Obviously, the student can't pay. Otherwise, they would pay and enroll for the spring.

It is important that we have a late fee structure in place. Otherwise, there is no incentive to pay on time. We will be accruing the late fees only for the semester in which they are incurred.

Depending on your perspective, that pace places a cap on the annual percentage rate of if it's three or four months, 4 and 1/2% to 6%, or it places an absolute limit on the amount of late fee that is going to be charged to an individual student. But basically, in the fall, you stop accruing late fees in December. And this is largely in line I think with the spirit of the Senate's recommendation. And actually, I think practically meets most of the expectations and from our perspective is more workable.

We've got some work to do to make sure that this is implemented across the board, but we're getting that done. And again, I thank the Senate for bringing this issue, this concern to our attention. I think we're in a much better place with this. And this is a much more reasonable position for us to take.

I was waiting to get a text from Mary Lou Ortiz, but I didn't. I'm going to have to wing it. The President alluded to some of the changes that are coming down the pike around the way.

We make budget, do our budget process, and make resource allocation decisions as a university. We put together back in the spring, David Gray and I charged Mary Lou Ortiz, the University Budget Officer, to lead a task force to think about our budget processes in advance of us going live with SIMBA, the new business information system in July of 2020. And that was a great task force.
They did pretty intense work over the spring and have reported out. We've shared the results, not only with the Board of Trustees, but also with the President's Council, Academic Leadership Council. I'm not going to go into the gory details here, but just share four of what I think are probably the more profound recommendations that will impact all of you in this room.

First, if you ever got confused about permanent versus temporary funds, we're going to do away with that construct. We will budget financial resources. I think we've long been in a position where permanent funds and temporary funds are governed by different policies, guidelines, practices. That in and of itself limits our ability to be truly flexible and discretionary in the way resources are allocated.

And of course, everything that we know is built up around this construct. And it's going to be quite a bit of work over the next nine months to unwind that and come up with a more contemporary approach. We're putting the teams together that will help us do that.

I'll keep you posted but stay tuned for developments in this space. It's really going to be a whole lot better and a whole lot simpler. And certainly, the President and I won't have the challenge that we have of trying to explain to people outside the University how this all works, because it can be pretty confusing.

In addition, we will be moving. The President made reference to sort of budgeting a year out. We will be bringing more robust five-year budget planning to all units. We've been doing that for the University for some years now, but the expectation is if we're not having permanent and temporary funds, we need to look further into or project model further into the future to ensure that there are resources in place to do the job that we need to do. That's going to be a new way of thinking. And will challenge all of us I think to be innovative and creative about that process.

We will be budgeting all funds. This doesn't mean that we're going to be sticking our noses into people's research budgets or other directed sources of funds, but it is important as we make decisions about general funds allocations that we consider all sources of revenue and all costs that are incurred by units. We will be looking in a more consistent and robust way at all funds.

And then finally, we've evolved into a pattern of having carry forward, which is basically a unit balance at the end of a fiscal year. The process of approving carry forwards has been largely separated from the budget process. So, in the new process that we will be developing, carry forward will be considered as an integral part of the budgeting process.

You'll have a beginning balance that was last year's carry forward. There will be a discussion about your anticipated income and expenses and needs for the year. And then there will be a balance at the end of the year projected, which will be your carry forward into next year.

It's a pretty simple construct. And it's about probably the way 99% of the rest of the world budgets. We just haven't.

I think this is much more intuitive, much more logical, much easier to explain. And I think will again give us much better flexibility in terms of making decisions about resource allocation. Stay tuned through the year as we bring you updates on that.
And my final point is just to do a shout out to the Office of Physical Plant. And I think I saw Bill Sitzabee sitting in the back of the room. Specifically, Environmental Health and Safety, we had an audit done for environmental health and safety back in the spring. And we got the report back from that audit. And frankly, it was quite scary.

We have a lot of work to do in terms of how we manage our space to ensure that it is a safe working environment for our employees and our students. There were a lot of areas that, if we had a color coding for us for the space, we would be grading as red, meaning really quite troubling in terms of safety issues or safety practices. We're putting a process in place to systematically go through and target some of what we consider to be the higher risk areas first for attention. And we will be making the investments necessary to bring those spaces up to standard.

I will also add that as part of that process I asked Bill to give me a walkthrough of some of the spaces that would fall into said red category. And it was pretty scary. There were obviously infrastructure challenges that in some ways are quite easy to fix. But what was probably more troubling to me is we do have some issues to address in terms of laboratory culture. And I don't mean the types of culture that grows in Petri dishes, although maybe that too in some cases.

But what we observed, for example, was we would walk into a laboratory and there would be students working around hoods or on benches. And they weren't wearing lab coats. They weren't wearing proper eye protection. That was bad.

What was worse was when they saw the Provost, the Director of Environmental Health and Safety, and the Vice President for OPP walk through, they looked at us and said, hello, very politely-- that's not the issue-- and then they went back to work. There was almost no acknowledgment on their part that the fact that they were completely inappropriately attired for what they were doing. That just didn't seem to click at all. And so, we'll be getting back across the University to people who have responsibility for laboratories to make sure that they and their students and staff are following proper protocols.

If there is an article about Penn State Environmental Health and Safety in the Chronicle of Higher Education, we want it to be about the culture of safety and environment that we've been able to build here and how successful it's been. We don't want it to be the other type of story. And that's what we're really striving to get to.

That's going to require quite a bit of work. And maybe some of in the room will be hearing from Bill. And if you don't hear from Bill, you might hear from me. Anyway, we're going to need your help with this. And we are certainly prepared to make the investments necessary to facilitate it. I'll stop there and happy to take any questions.

**Chair Rowland:** Are there questions for the Provost? Please state your name and unit.

**Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango:** I'm delighted to hear that the old budget model with temporary and permanent money is being changed. And now, I assume it'll be much easier for fixed-term faculty to get three and five-year contracts now from what we've previously temporary money.

**Provost Jones:** Actually, or what's going to happen is-- well, you'd have to have a pretty slow afternoon to do this, but if you scan all of our policies, you will find that many, many, many Penn State policies,
either directly or indirectly make connection to that permanent and temporary construct. With that, being removed across the board, it's going to have really a profound change on many of our policies and indeed the way we do business. I think that some of these issues, like the ones you raised, we haven't gone through the details of it yet, but many of those are going to be rendered completely moot by this change.

**Chair Rowland:** Other questions?

**Jonathan Schofield, Student Representative for the Commonwealth Campuses:** You were talking about late fees in the beginning your speech. This year, at least, I've had a lot of students come up to me and ask me about the over awarding problem for financial aid. With those late fees be applied to the students that could not afford the tuition with no financial aid and had to wait for financial aid to come into their account

**Provost Jones:** I'm not sure I quite understand. Bottom line is if you receive a tuition invoice and you don't pay it by the due date, you then incur a late fee just as you do with a credit card. We're just going to limit the amount of accrual that happens after a three- or four-month period.

**Jonathan Schofield:** If they could not afford the payment without or with-- sorry.

**Provost Jones:** Oh, I think I know what you're asking. You're asking about are they still eligible for financial aid if they're late.

**Jonathan Schofield:** Yeah. The financial aid came in late for some students, and they could not afford the tuition payment. Would they still occur late fees?

**Provost Jones:** If I think it's probably fair to say that if financial aid comes in the late, resulting in a student being unable to pay, we would waive the late fee in a case like that and hold them only accountable for the tuition payment if it's something that was through no fault of their own.

**Chair Rowland:** Other questions?

**Ryan Godbey, Counsel of Commonwealth Student Governments:** Earlier you had brought up the first point that faculty senate had brought to your attention last year about the DACA students. I was wondering if there's any plan on having a similar approach on students that are here on asylum and refugee status that came here post-primary education.

**Provost Jones:** For post-primary education?

**Ryan Godbey:** Yes. After high school.

**Provost Jones:** Oh, Okay. We hadn't thought specifically about those categories, but I don't see any reason why proper consideration would not be given in a manner consistent to what we're doing for students' DACA status. If we're shifting to criteria that are based on domicile, I would expect actually that students in those categories would probably be swept into the same criteria that we would be applying in DACA cases.

**Chair Rowland:** We also have a question from Mediasite.
Anna Butler, Faculty Senate Staff Assistant: This question is from Vinita Acharya: College of Medicine: How long does a student have to live in Pennsylvania to be considered a resident? If someone has moved to PA just a year ago, is that person considered a PA resident for tuition purposes?

Provost Jones: Rob, it's two, right, is it? Bob, the Registrar is in the back of the room and can answer that. There's a mic behind you, Rob.

Robert Kubat, University Registrar: Our policy is that a student has to be a resident of Pennsylvania for one year before they enroll in the University. So, they can't move to Pennsylvania, enroll at the University, and then be here for a year, because that's considered they moved here for educational purposes. So, they have to be here 12 months before they enroll in the University.

Provost Jones: So, the answer is it is one year, yes.

Chair Rowland: Excellent. Further questions in the front please?

Karin Forte, Penn State Harrisburg: My statement is a little bit more of a comment. My husband is an EHS director for a corporation. And when I tell him the quote of "quite scary," I'll be interested to see the look on his face.

It's something he encounters every day, of course. Being from a Commonwealth Campus, I just wondered if these safety audits are being done there as well. And if not, I hope that someone might make that happen.

Provost Jones: Yeah. Bill, the audit, was it University wide or did it focus on University Park?

Chair Rowland: Bill, could you wait for the microphone?

Bill Sitzabee: Well, we have four dedicated EHS professionals that are out strictly out in the Commonwealth Campuses.

Provost Jones: And did our audit look at university wide or was that focused on University Park?

Bill Sitzabee: Yes, sir. It was university wide. Yeah.

Provost Jones: Okay. It was.

Chair Rowland: Further questions. Here in the middle. Thank you, Kathy.

Kevin McDade, Penn State Shenango: In regard to EHS, the infrastructure that we have for training, it seems to lag behind a number of other sites that I've been to in the past in labs.

For example, some of the video training have no quizzes attached to them. You just watch a video and you just print the last screen. There's also no sort of reminders when you're training is up. I think an update on the infrastructure might help a lot of the people be in line with some of the policies that we have.
Provost Jones: Yes. That is certainly part of the focus of this effort to ensure that we have proper comprehensive and robust training.

Chair Rowland: Great. We'll one more question from Mediasite, please.

Anna Butler: This question is from Daniel Perkins from Agricultural Sciences. He's referring to the Wall Street Journal top 500 universities and colleges. Any thoughts as to why our dramatic drop over the five years? We are now number 10 of the Big 10 schools. And approximately five years ago, we were number three out of the Big 10.

Provost Jones: So, and it is that time of year that only rankings are coming out. I would begin with just a general statement that Penn State's unique structure of being one university geographically distributed challenges every type of ranking system relative to giving us a fair and comprehensive assessment. That's just a problem, period.

Then rankings I would say fall into three general buckets. The first is the US News and World Report bucket. US News and World Report ask us for data. And these data go through Lance Kennedy-Phillips’ office, the Vice Provost for Planning and Assessment.

We put the data together. We scrub them. We clean them. We make sure that they're as accurate as possible. Subject to the constraints at reporting for an institution structured like ours is different from many, many of our peers, but at least we have control of the data that go in.

In some instances, the other bucket is ranking organizations just pull data that they can find from various sources and combine it together using algorithms that we don't know or understand. We don't know what data they are using. We don't know how they are interpreting the data. But we know one thing, that whenever they divide one data point by another, they probably, in many cases, have incompatible numerator and denominators.

They may be choosing a numerator that represents the University as a whole and a denominator that represents University Park. And that will generally produce an inflated statistic. That is a challenge when we do not control what data are submitted and can make sure that they're consistent.

Then the third bucket is the one where rankings are based on opinions. And we participate in many of those. For example, even when US News does its rankings of departments or disciplines, it is based on opinion only that is solicited from faculty members, generally department chairs or deans from universities across the country. That's a purely opinion-based one.

The Wall Street Journal rankings are ones that befuddle us. To some extent, we're not quite sure how those numbers are being calculated, what the particular entries mean. I have asked Lance and his team to do their best to get under the hood of that so we can understand, because if you look at some of the elements that comprise the ranking, some of the rankings in an individual column just simply don't make any sense at all for Penn State, how we could be that high or that low depending on what it is.

It's a challenging environment. It is a little bit like playing whack-a-mole, because it seems this time of year every other week there's a new ranking that comes out. And it is very difficult for us to ensure that those agencies have the correct data and are doing the right thing relative to Penn State.
Chair Rowland: Other questions?

Renee Borromeo: Penn State Mont Alto, I applaud the university's efforts on changing the admission or at least clarifying the admission status for the DACA applicants. Very, very thankful for that. I'm just wondering, is there going to be a provision for those students who were admitted under the previous maybe more confusing rankings? I mean, if they're already here and they're paying international student rates, but they've actually been living locally for more than 10 years, it would seem like maybe we could have a retroactive, a system where maybe they wouldn't at least moving forward have to pay the exceedingly high rates.

Provost Jones: Yes. So, two mechanisms. One is I think everybody is aware that students who feel that they are being charged non-resident tuition but should be paying resident tuition can always appeal that decision. So, we do have a mechanism by which students can appeal.

But I think once we get these criteria all pinned down and boxed in and a process in place to look at new applications as they come in, we will certainly look at the possibility I think of going back to students who are already here and if it is appropriate changing their status from non-resident to resident. I think it should be possible to do that once we get everything in place. We certainly don't want to make them work through the whole system, paying what we now realize was perhaps an inappropriate amount.

Chair Rowland: Questions? Paul, last one.

Paul Thompson, Penn State Harrisburg: My notes from last spring show you making a statement at the very end that you were going to look at adjuncts or FT-2s. You were going to have a group to think about that. Has that progressed at all?

Provost Jones: I wouldn't necessarily say it's progressed at all, but it is still our plan for this academic year to do exactly that.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Any final questions? Thank you, Provost Jones

Provost Jones: Thank you all very much.

SPECIAL INFORMATIONAL REPORT

Chair Rowland: Now, guests of the Senate will deliver a special informational report, which is sponsored by members of our Senate Council. In their August meeting, members of the Senate Council unanimously approved a motion to reorder the agenda to accommodate a report by Associate Vice Provost for Online Programs Renata Engel and Assistant Vice President and Senior Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, Yvonne Gaudelius. The report is quite fittingly titled, One Penn State Report to the Faculty Senate.

To the members, the Senate Council that made this possible, One Penn State is a major initiative in the Senate this year. Thank you for allowing this report to be showcased so prominently in our plenary meeting. This report is especially made for the Senate and will guide Senate Standing Committees under on their charge to determine how the Senate can contribute to the President's ambitious vision set out in the One Penn State Initiative.
So, please be at the ready. This is a working meeting. Everybody knows that I hope. Take those comments, whether they're critical, whether they're laudatory.

Prepare them for your chairs of your committees. That will go ahead and get funneled to me. We'll create a large and kind of cohesive memo that will be used for the Senate, as well as being shared with the Executive Implantation Committee. So, with no further delay, Dr.'s Engel and Gaudelius, you can have the floor.

Renata Engel: Thanks, Nicholas. Thank you very much both Nicholas for putting this on the agenda, Senate Council for approving this. This item, One Penn State 2025, was on the agenda in April of 2019. It's been an informational report. And you have access to it.

What we intend to do today is identified in the summary that was prepared for this agenda, which was really to provide a recap of what One Penn State 2025 is. And then to really share with you the progress that's been made since April, because there really has been quite a bit. And I think many of your committees have seen that in the work of the Senate with regard, to some of the charges that came out of the Senate for the 2019-20 year.

What we're going to do is just simply go through a recap of what One Penn State 2025 really means. What is it? Well, it really is a look at what we do already.

We are one University and have been, but there are also opportunities that digital age has provided to us to actually really strengthen our commitment to our students and to reinforce what it means to be one university now that there is opportunity for perhaps greater mobility for students and certainly the way students access the materials that they have, the resources they have, and access to the faculty that are at the University. That is in a sense what it is really about. It emerged out of the transforming education pillar of the strategic planning process of the University.

And, in fact, One Penn State 2025 now stands as one of the signature initiatives out of that strategic planning process. But again, its roots are back into some of the work that began several years ago. We have a vision that is really captured in the statement here. And it is in the report.

What I’d like you to recognize is it already builds on our traditions as one university, but it's really strengthening that position for the high-quality education that we are known for. And it's doing so with an eye toward looking at the flexibility, the greater integration, the opportunity for mobility for our students and for our opportunities to actually leverage business and transactional things that can make students path through the educational process more seamless and more integrated.

It will take a lot of effort for us to get there. And one of the things that we were able to do as we thought about this vision is to create a set of guiding principles. Now, these guiding principles are here. And they're in much greater detail in the report from April.

So, there's a lot more detail that is presented there. What I'm going to do right now is just go through them just to highlight what they essentially mean and represent as we're going forward. The first one, seamless student experience, think of this as the life cycle of the students and the way that we interact with students.
Think of the business processes, the transactional pieces. One of our committee members was fond of saying that he hoped that what we would get to was that students' cognitive energy could be placed on their studies and not so much on the business transactional pieces that the University has for students. But it also deals with access that students might have to co-curricular types of activities, regardless of where they happen to be to be located or what campus they're assigned to.

Some of the examples that you will see whenever I highlight these are off to the side, but they are by no means the extent of what is possible here. When we look at the curricular coherence one, this is really again leveraging the strength of the University to have a shared curriculum, where students have mobility. How do we make that stronger? How do we create greater pathways, multiple pathways, on and off ramps that are different perhaps and the ones that we have now? And what we're talking about here is really the core, the degree, the actual degree that a student is earning.

When we look at guiding principle, number three, which is responsive and relevant curriculum, think of these things as the things that might be the things that hang on that backbone of a degree. They could be some of the micro credentialing or things along those lines, where students might want specialized knowledge, but they could also be representative of the modality. It could be the way that a student might receive that. It could be accelerated. It could potentially be chunked in different ways.

Think about the modality, as well as what those opportunities could be when we think about the future and what digital affordances provide to us. When we look at guiding principle number four, it's really reflecting that lifelong learner or as we like to think of this as a Penn State, your University for life, as President Barron refers to it, and as some of our colleagues also refer to it as thinking of us being an age-friendly university. What does that mean? How do people re-engage with us after they've completed their degree? And are there ways for them to have access to the great content and the new knowledge that's being created at this University?

And of course, guiding principle five ties it all together with thinking about ways of being the most efficient and most effective institution with the kinds of infrastructure, whether it's technology, or budget models, or business processes, or whatever it happens to be that really helps all of the other pieces work very well. Now, what I'm doing is on hand this over to Yvonne. And she's going to talk to you about what has been done since April. And there's been a lot.

**Yvonne Gaudelius:** Thanks, Renata. So, as Renata said, that's sort of a recap of what was in the informational report that came to senate at the end of April. We've, of course, been meeting and working since then.

And what we're trying to do here is show them the overlap. As Renata said, this is one of the signature initiatives now out of the strategic plan, and then the University Faculty Senate, and the intersection between those two really try to move this effort forward. We really want to align efforts here, not duplicate efforts, really pull in the same direction on this effort. I mean, make no mistake, this is 2025, because this is going to be a heavy lift.

There's a lot of work to happen here. And it's going to take several years. It really does need to be an aligned, coordinated effort in order for this to happen.
Just to give you some indication then of what's happening in each of those. And I think people from their committee meetings this morning probably are aware of bullet number one on the right-hand side there, that 11 of the 15 faculty senate committees have been charged with looking at alignment issues. And thank you to Nicholas and the leadership of the Senate for taking that on and really incorporating this. And every committee, except for CC&R, have been asked what does One Penn State 2025 mean for -- and then fill in the name of the committee.

To really consider how the work of that committee-- and this ties back to what partly what Renata was saying about all of the infrastructure, all of the types of work that those committees do, how do we do those in a way that leads towards One Penn State 2025, rather than pulls away? And Provost Jones is the sponsor of the Executive Committee for One Penn State 2025. We're not on either of the co-chairs.

Our last slide is the membership of that committee. We also are very pleased to have Beth Seymour as a member of that committee. So, the chair elect of the Faculty Senate will always sit on the executive committee of One Penn State 2025 to continue to ensure those connections and that shared governance around this.

And then each…we are close, very close to finishing the draft charges and membership for each of the guiding principle leadership teams. And those also will include Faculty Senate leadership or Faculty Senate representation, excuse me. And then one of the other nice crossovers is that the folks who are on the executive committee, many of those people sit on senate committees as either members or resources to those committees, again trying to ensure good communication, good collaboration across.

As I said, those charges in membership, we have another meeting this Thursday afternoon and hopefully at the end of that meeting will be this far away from finalizing those charges. And then we do have a meeting coming up with Provost Jones in October, where he will charge all of those five guiding principle leadership teams. There will, of course, be a number of subcommittees coming off of those leadership teams.

As I said, this is too big a project, too heavy a lift to imagine that having five committees, plus an executive committee, is going to get this done. It's just not going to happen. There will be many, many more subcommittees.

We're also trying to figure how to-- and working very closely-- and thanks to Lance Kennedy-Phillips and the folks in his office, since this does come off of the strategic plan as a strategic initiative-- figuring out how to communicate both progress that's being made and a recognition too that there's no way that we're going to know everything that's going on in these spaces and the work that people are doing in their individual units, a way to that people can communicate those efforts back to us so they can be included. These are the same five circles that Renata had up there, the five guiding principles, but just to give you an idea of some of the activities and changes that are happening. And these are really happening, since April.

Well, the first one's been in progress a little bit longer, but Penn State's new mobile app, Penn State Go, which will start to provide that kind of integrated seamless space where students can do both transactional things and find out information and, in some cases, hopefully reducing 24 clicks on a website to three pushes on an app we want to get away from. And the nice thing about this too that doesn't just reduce that effort for students. It reduces that effort across the University.
If we can have everybody in this university not have to do 24 clicks of something and instead do three pushes on an app, it's progress for everybody. We're in the final stages of forming a committee that's going to look at piloting some common online courses across the University during summer and seeing how that might work. And again, we have policies right now that support that and that students can register anywhere during the summer. But can we really start to have course offerings during the summer that address student need that help them graduate on time and that give us sort of greater coordination so that we're not all teaching the same online course in the first six weeks of the summer and then nobody's teaching it in the second six weeks, for example? And right now, we don't have a lot of that conversation.

Achieving curricular coherence. Again, there will be a lot of work with Faculty Senate on this one in particular, but a reminder that this is building off of policies like 42.10 that Senate approved in the last few years that mandates that 80% of the learning outcomes of a course and the core content must be the same across all courses no matter where they're offered, no matter what modality they're offered in. And then examples like the BS in Health Policy Administration, where we have faculty across five campuses that are working very, very collaboratively in a strong faculty disciplinary community, so hoping to recharge that idea of disciplinary communities really give it strength and create structures where people can talk to each other easily.

Relevant and responsive programs, and this is going to include everything from the types of work that Great Valley is doing, where they have some very innovative master’s programs, a lot of accelerated courses. So, seven-week courses, rather than 15-week courses, they found that much, much more appealing to adult learners, because then every semester you can finish two courses. You actually feel like you're making real progress towards a master's degree, rather than just taking one course a semester, trying to be more responsive to learners there. It will also include looking at things like micro credentialing, badging, and trying to do that in a more systematic way across the University.

Renata already mentioned, the idea of making number four, let Penn State be your university for life, how we can repurpose content, how we can reach people more effectively. And again, a great example here of things that are already being achieved in this space is the College of Agricultural Sciences development of their Atlas platform, which reaches learners across the Commonwealth. And, of course, Agricultural Sciences has extension agents in every county of the Commonwealth, so they have very much a real mandate to do this. But they have really enabled this.

They have a very sophisticated CRM to reach people, which is a Customer Relations Management system-- sorry, if you don't-- that's what a CRM is, so that you can get very, very tailored information to people and make that content and programs available. We know that Penn State has this incredible expertise in research. We want people to come to Penn State to get that information, not to go somewhere else for it. And then finally, there is a Senate effort right now looking at-- and several Senate committees are charged on this, but a university-wide proctoring solution.

World Campus has had a proctoring solution. The contract on that's about to expire, so we've put together a team that's looking at other possibilities in that space. But really trying to do this because-- and again, we have multiple systems rising up. So, for one thing, we're probably paying more than we should be paying. And for students, every time they have an exam proctored, if it's in a different system, they have to learn that system. If faculty are teaching in more than one location, they have to learn multiple systems. It's inefficient in multiple ways.
A great example of a success here was Career Services, which managed to-- and people said this couldn't be done. We had 37 Career Services operations across the University, all using, in some cases, instances of the same software, managing to coordinate that through one effort. We’ve heard from employers that it's tremendously beneficial. All students can now see all jobs rather than just the jobs in their career center. And employers have access to all those students rather than a subset of students. So, it's really a win-win. So, trying to do things there where it really is a win-win.

Also, understanding, too, that infrastructure feeds across all of the other four and it's going to be part of accomplishing all of those things. And whether infrastructure or whether we're talking about our learning spaces, whether we're talking about budget processes, whether we're talking about HR processes, academic policies, thinking of infrastructure very, very, very broadly.

And finally, because we do want to leave some time for questions, this is the membership of the executive committee. As I said, a number of these folks do sit on Senate committees as well. So, they'll be happy to share more information on any of those committees. I'll also offer up that we'd be happy to do that at any time. And I think we'd now like to take questions and comments. I know we probably won't get to all of the questions and comments. But as Nicholas reminded people at the beginning, I think one of the goals is that you also communicate thoughts that you might have to your Senate committee chair and that those chairs will coordinate those and get them to Nicholas, and he'll collate that into a larger document and share that with us on the executive committee. So, questions?

**Chair Rowland:** Questions for our guests?

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** Saltz, at least last I checked. Actually, I have one other comment to make. But I'm just now looking at this Executive Committee Membership. And other than Elizabeth Seymour, I don't see any other faculty on it. I think that's interesting. But I guess the discussions that I've had-- oh, sorry. The comments that I want to make is a discussion that I've had-- whatever group of faculty I've met with it's been this one topic, and that is ensuring the quality and integrity of online classes. I'm teaching two online classes now-- actually, three online classes now. And I'm frustrated I can't require a proctor. Now, I understand you're working on the proctoring issue, which is great.

But I also hear complaints that the quality of courses varies greatly between different locations and that stuff. And, in part, that maybe there needs to be an academic home for online classes or to somehow be more closely related. I tell you, it's just a great concern on-- and I've created several online classes, and I've tried to keep them on par with my face-to-face. But still, it's much tougher to get good quality of online classes.

And then just one other quick story. At our campus, we're a very small campus, we have had trouble finding tutors for certain classes. So, I made the suggestion, I said, oh, maybe now, because of the technology, we can get tutors from University Park. Apparently, what the answer we were given was, well, they've got too many students here that they're working on, that they can extend themselves to the campuses. Well, I think certainly One Penn State 2025-- that needs to be done.

**Renata Engel:** So, I'll just provide a comment. I know you didn't have a specific question there. But I do think the One Penn State 2025, particularly around the aspect of thinking about the quality across all of the programs-- and this is something we always think about, whether it's online or residential. But I think there has been perhaps a disproportionate amount of support to courses that are delivered and designed...
and through World Campus in comparison to sometimes when courses are developed and designed that might not have the benefit of learning desires. And I think that's what you're speaking to when you're thinking about instructional design support.

So some of the proposals we'd like to see or some of the ideas we'd like to see that will come through this could be more of a networked approach to learning design and instructional design support to support faculty, regardless of what local resources they may have and to think about that. And I think the same thing is true with regard to student to academic support. So, whether it happens to be tutoring or whatever type of support it is. When we think about the digital affordances we have in this kind of age, we should be able to share those resources more freely. And the platforms are needed, of course, to do it, but so is the ability for us to make sure that those resources are used appropriately. So, comment well-taken, Ira.

**Yvonne Gaudelius:** I'll just add one thing really quickly. For example, on the Summer Online Pilot Program, we are intentionally going to add or have on that committee someone from learning support and someone from instructional design. Because I think part of what we need to do, if we want to offer these courses in a coordinated way, is also offer those resources in a coordinated way. So absolutely.

**Cynthia Young:** University Park, Department Head, African American studies. So, a couple of questions about the principles. So, for one, in the achieve curricular coherence, you talked about the idea of strengthening disciplinary communities. So, I would ask you to think also about interdisciplinary communities, the fact that departments like Women's Gender and Sexuality studies, African American studies, Latina studies, et cetera-- think about many different issues from an interdisciplinary perspective. So that's number one.

Number two is a broader thing about summer online, which sounds great in theory, but I think one of the issues for programs and departments like mine is that if we came late to the game of being online and there's a kind of moratorium or at least a real slowdown in terms of how many courses can get created, then that ultimately ends up disadvantaging us as we try to build out our representation in the curriculum. So that's just a comment. And then finally, design-relevant and responsive programs-- it's disappointing, I guess, not to see any kind of specific reference to thinking about how race, ethnicity, gender diversity, all of those things are part of a responsive and relevant program.

I find this a little bit mystifying because it doesn't seem to have a very-- there's a lot of talk that feels more technical as opposed to educational. And maybe that's because there aren't very many faculty being represented. But I would ask you to think about that and think about the fact that faculty are really at the heart of how you would do this.

**Renata Engel:** Yeah, absolutely. So, I think in some of the cases-- just commenting on the last point with regard to some of the topic areas, I think we see a variety of places where those topics will come from. And many of those, particularly in three, will also be those places where interdisciplinary will come in. I think original discussion around this when it came from the committees was originally thinking about things related to business environments. But very quickly, I think, there was a shift even in that discussion to say there's other social, economic, global issues that could actually influence that in a way. So, if they weren't specified in the report, they were part of discussions that did take place. So, we have some of those. But I appreciate very much the reminder of the importance of being more specific of that. Thank you.
Chair Rowland: Alok?

Alok Sinha: College of Engineering: Hi. I was also surprised to see that almost no faculty are in the Executive Committee. My second question or comment is, have you thought about bringing uniformity within one campus? Because in a college, there are a lot of areas sent from department to department. So that could be another area to work on.


Chair Rowland: You could give it to David. He's right there. Pass it on back. There you go.

David Smith, Division of Undergraduate Studies: So, I see in this a lot of positive things around making the experiences more seamless for our students. And there's certainly a lot of barriers that are administrative in nature for our students. What I think is, in my perspective, missing, though, is really something that's more explicit about what we want to have happen. And really, from my vantage point, it would be, how do we make it more equitable, the outcomes for our students?

And so, I think that-- seamless is great, but what's that? How do we get to something that really helps ensure that all students can be successful here at the University? And I think that's in there and it's implicit. I would challenge people to try to make it more explicit as something that we really want to achieve as an institution.

Yvonne Gaudelius: Yeah, absolutely, David. And I think for all of the committees. And that's, I think, what the vision was trying to express, too, that it really is trying create a very different environment here and one that is focused on success for all students, knowing that that's also going to improve life at Penn State for faculty and staff as well and everybody in the community hopefully. But really, to keep that present. And I think that's why we have this guiding vision and where we arrived at this.

Chair Rowland: Very good. OK.

John Liechty, Eberly College of Science/Smeal College of Business: I am at Eberly and Smeal jointly. You came, of course, and presented at university planning committee, and we had a number of conversations with you. I still have, I think, reservations or at least some concerns. I certainly am in favor of trying to make this a more streamlined experience for our students. I think that's something that would be very good. I think it raises important governance issues, particularly the curricular coherence issue. So if we're going to have a uniform curriculum to some degree, my view is that one of the great strengths of Penn State is the diversity that we offer through our Commonwealth Campuses and through our campus structure, that we can cater to and adapt to the needs of a wide variety of types of students.

The ability for faculty and staff at the different campuses to accommodate those students in the way they think is best, I think, is one of our great strengths. Having the ability to migrate people through our system and move from one campus to another, if they feel that's appropriate, is good also. So, I applaud those efforts. I do worry, though-- or I'm concerned about scenarios where-- I know we have some examples where there have been coalitions of areas of subject matter that have come together and done multi-campus curriculum. But there's many, many more that haven't done that.
And so, I would feel it challenging if people looked, maybe, to University Park to set the agenda or University Park looked to the rest of the university campuses outside to set the agenda. It's going to become, I think, a very cumbersome mechanism to try to potentially approve a change to a class, to add a new class, if all physics classes have to be or all accounting classes have to be going through some central organization that is coordinating this, as opposed to done at the college at campus level.

So, it was not very clear when you made the presentation how it would work. In effect, your direct comment back -- how do we get curricular cohesion? How do we all agree what's going to be in Physics 100 or 120? It's got to be either done at the college levels or brought together at some overall university level. And so, your response back in the committee was, that will be up to the faculty to decide how to do. And that then brings back to the point that's been raised by almost everybody who stood up. Why do you have so few faculty represented on the committee that is supposed to actually solve this problem?

Yvonne Gaudelius: So maybe one point of clarification. When courses -- and certainly I'll look to my colleagues in the Senate. I haven't worked on Curricular Affairs for a long time. Courses already are approved and agreed upon. There are not 10 versions of Physics 100, there's one. And by Senate policy, it dictates that anybody who teaches Physics 100, or any other course, that 80% of the core content and learning outcomes have to be the same. So that's not something we're proposing, that's Senate. And again, I'll defer to my Senate colleagues for corrections. And in terms of the coherence, let me add, too, I think what we're really talking about, and Renata mentioned this earlier, is pathways for students.

Because we see students make decisions about admission when they're 17 years old in high school, so talking traditional age students, they don't realize that by choosing a certain curriculum at a certain campus, they're locked in for four years and it can be very difficult for them to change. We want to make that clear to students how they can move. We talk about our mobility; we talk about 2 + 2. It's really making then how that 2 + 2 works explicit and making sure that it does work rather than it doesn't work if you've entered this program or this program or this program.

Lisa Posey, Smeal College of Business: Hi, I think that same issue is more relevant maybe also to programs. The colleges really, in a sense, own the programs. They are the ones who propose a program, design the program. And so that's the area where when you try to make that something that's across multiple campuses -- and also, the idea that a course is a course. There may be sets of courses that certain colleges would like to have taken at their location, which is part of what we have in the rules. But of course, then there's questions about, can you designate which classes that would be? And there's arguments that you can't.

And the other thing about this idea of the 80%, I think the issue is more if you assessed all the students across those different, would they all get the same average grades? Or are certain classes giving out easier grades? Or the material, the topic is on the syllabus, but maybe it's easier to do well in it. And I think presently there's gaming that goes on, where students do poorly in a class at one campus, drop it, and then switch to another campus so that they can get an entrance to major grade that helps them get into a program or something like that.

So, I think the idea of uniformity across campuses in terms of assessing people could be -- I don't know how you would address that. But do we want that? Do you want a student at one campus to be assessed at the same level as somebody at a different campus? Because there's lots of different campuses with different students that have different backgrounds, where it's really good that they're not all assessed on
exactly the same thing in exactly the same way. So, is it this uniformity just on paper in terms of topics? Or is it really uniformity of the actual experience that we want to aim for?

**Renata Engel:** I'll make a comment on this. And I see that Lance Kennedy-Phillips is still here in the room. I think when it comes to looking at assessments, which is really, I think, one of the things you're referring to, as a university we look at outcomes’ assessments. We look at those program by program and course by course. The faculty, of course, are addressing that at a course level and the programs are expected to address that at the program level, whether it's an accredited program specifically by a discipline or whether it's for Middle States Accreditation. But the Middle States does expect us to assess at a program level, and they expect those outcomes to be achieved.

So, it is something that faculty are already doing. And the processes that are in place to do that are through Lance's office to gather that information for Middle States. I think what you raise, though, in a sense, is a very good point and something that actually can be examined, I think, through the process of looking at One Penn State 2025 because we can certainly determine how robust this is. Are we delivering on what we say we believe to be delivering? Are we adhering to our learning outcomes? Every curricular proposal for a new program has those learning outcomes with it. And so, we have the mechanisms and we have the processes already in place at the institution to do that. And I think this helps us both reaffirm it and look at it and say, where can we get better? How do we do a better job at this in the places we feel we might not be doing it as well? And this gives us the opportunity to strengthen that. I think it goes back to, again, we're one university and we can figure this out as one university, but we can't do it separately. So that's the part about-- yeah. So, thanks.

**Chair Rowland:** Okay. We're already over time right now, but this is important. So, if you've got a burning question, let's hear it.

**Jennifer Nesbitt, Penn State York:** Hi. I think this has a lot of really amazing potential and I hope that what I'm doing is drawing together some of the comments that have come before. But it seems from this presentation that you have a pretty good idea of what student goals are and that One Penn State addresses that.

[MUSIC FROM PHONE]

But your--

[LAUGHTER]

Is that like being on the Oscars? Do I have to go? But it says a fluid, personalized, and collaborative environment that enables students, faculty, and staff to achieve their goals. And I have yet to hear much that tells me what the committee thinks my goals are. And that worries me because we see plenty of examples in other areas of industry where the employees are dragged along after the fact. We can make this work amazingly if we are at the center of the process. So, thank you for considering that.

**Yvonne Gaudelius:** Yeah. Thank you.

**Chair Rowland:** Michele?
Michele Duffey, College of Health and Human Development: I'll take that one step further. What is the plan to be able to improve collegiality, consultation, disciplinary communities, interdisciplinary communities, whatever we want to call it or whichever groups we want to be in? I think that's the next step to that question. And I'm not sure that's really embodied here. And who would be the lead on that?

Renata Engel: So, in some cases, I think what you're going to see is those leadership teams are going to have some of this. And we don't have that leadership team two, but I see a strong piece there, two and three. And the committee or that leadership team that's being formed right now has, I think, quite a bit of representation, both either from the senate or from across the university. But you're absolutely right, it does need to have that strength there.

Yvonne Gaudelius: And I think, too, we have a strong recognition that there also has to be budget and infrastructure to support that. Because you can't just expect people to do these things on top of everything else and make it work. I can remember years ago in the college-- and this has been fixed since then-- but when we couldn't even find out who all of the ANA faculty across the university were. So, the idea that we could reach out and bring people together was impossible. Like I said, that was fixed. But if we don't even have systems that then support that kind of work, then this will never happen. So that's where guiding principle five also comes in.

Chair Rowland: Going to take one last comment in the very back.

Yvonne Gaudelius: And we're happy to get comments by email afterwards, too, by the way.

Jim Fairbank, Penn State Erie, Behrend College: I wonder what it means to you when you say we're a 24/7, 365-degree institution. Because I've had a conversation with a number of my colleagues, and there's a lot of concern about that, particularly as far as what are the boundaries for a faculty member. I think this ties right into what Jennifer was saying as well. Thank you.

Yvonne Gaudelius: And I know one of the comments we got early on that was a lot of faculty saying, I already work 24/7, 365. And certainly, that recognition that as you're working on your research and everything, you're not necessarily stopping because it's Friday at 5 o'clock. I think here, we're more thinking-- and some of these things-- using, for example, artificial intelligence to be more responsive for students. But I think it'll still absolutely be within the bounds and the rights of faculty.

And in fact, I think we would encourage faculty to say, yes, I'll answer your email, but I'll answer it in two days or in a day, whatever the appropriate response is so that-- we're not expecting that faculty are going to be sitting there on December 27 answering student emails. But are there ways that we can create automated systems that can answer student emails? And as we think, too, about our adult learners, the population that is most likely not to finish a Penn State degree are first time adult learners who are seeking a degree. And you think about those folks. They're quite often working full-time.

If they need something processed, they have to get to a Penn State office typically between the hours of 8:00 and 5:00. So, they have to take time off work, travel to a campus, and do those things. We have a lot of processes that are not yet online that are not available after hours. So, it's even taking some of those very simple steps to make the business part of the university operate for students year-round.

Chair Rowland: Wonderful. Thank you so much for your time and for that special report. Thank you.
FORENSIC BUSINESS
None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chair Rowland:

[LAUGHTER]
Our Senate Committee on Committees and Rules has one legislative report that was introduced in April 2019. We will discuss and vote on this report today. The report is titled "Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article III, Election to the Senate, Section 8," but is also colloquially known as the New Attendance Policy, which can be found in the agenda as Appendix E. Current Chair Brunsden and past Chair turned Parliamentarian Shapiro will co-present the report and stand for questions.

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: Good afternoon. So, as the chair said, this is a holdover from April. Believe it or not, there are naughty faculty.

[LAUGHTER]
I know this is hard to comprehend, but there are Senators who do not turn up on a routine basis. Currently, the only basis that we as an organization have for replacing members is if they miss this plenary meeting. However, the work of the Senate is done in the standing committees. And so, when we routinely have roughly a quarter of the Senators missing multiple committee meetings every year on a routine basis, this creates a problem. We have a lot of work to do. We need all of our people to do it. And it's getting difficult when we have Senators who, quite frankly, don't do it. So, the committee has decided on this legislation to try and help fix this problem.

Keith Shapiro College of Arts and Architecture: The change here really comes down to adding that committee piece into it. Also, I think we changed the language a little bit to emphasize what Senators should do rather than what they shouldn't do. So, we think that maybe when we look at this, it ends up being a little bit more instructive, a little less punitive. Also, the bar is quite high. So, we're talking about two years in a row. So, you would have to miss more than half of the meetings two years in a row.

It's really not intended to be punitive. It is intended to encourage people to come to the committees where the work is done so that people in the committees and the chairs of those committees don't have to necessarily carry a lot of weight that they wouldn't otherwise have to carry. Those of you who are here all the time, you know at some of your committee meetings, you're ending up and your chair is ending up having to do a massive amount of work. And in some of those committees, we're having a real hard time getting the reports at the end of the year. So, we're hoping this will help encourage people to be a little bit more diligent about coming to those meetings.
Victor Brunsden: And if I could add one more thing for those colleagues out there. This does not pertain to sabbaticals, absences that you have to make for conferences, professional responsibilities, medical leaves, other official leaves. So, this is only if you are basically being a very naughty Senator and are not attending your committee and/or plenary meetings. In the course of our normal professional duties, we sometimes have to do that. And sometimes there is a coincidence of multiple meetings that mean that you cannot make it for a couple of meetings in a row. You are not the people that this is aimed at.

Chair Rowland: Are there any questions? Seeing none. Are we ready to vote? We will use clickers for voting today. The system provides a precise count for each vote taken, allows for confidential voting, and provides immediate results. Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Please raise your hand if you need a clicker or your clicker doesn't work. Senators joining us by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on PollEverywhere.com. Oh, whoa.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Chair Rowland: Just need to throw out the voting page so you all know what you're voting for.

[INAUDIBLE]

[LAUGHTER]

Binary code, right?

Victor Brunsden: A to accept, B to reject.

Chair Rowland: Do we have the vote from Mediasite? Yeah, Dawn?

[INAUDIBLE]

Chair Rowland: Keith, what do you want to do as Parliamentarian? What should we do?

Keith Shapiro: Should we deal in terms of not being able to get the vote from Mediasite?

Chair Rowland: Yeah.

Keith Shapiro: We still have to poll them.

Chair Rowland: That's right. That's what I thought.

Keith Shapiro: Sure. So, if they're here, then [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Rowland: If I understand the situation correctly, there is some trouble right now with Mediasite. But because these Faculty Senators are, in fact, in attendance right now, we do have an obligation to get their vote. So please just a moment of patience and we'll see what we can do.

[SIDE CONVERSATION]
Do you want to announce this vote?

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

None

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

None

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

**Chair Rowland:** We're going to move on with the agenda in that case. We are going to return to this momentarily. Please just record the vote, and we'll reveal it, I guess, in time. Okay. Thank you. Sorry about that, everyone. Moving on. Agenda Item I, Legislative Reports. There are none. Item J, advisor consulted reports. There are also none. Agenda Item K, Information Reports. We have five reports.

**Report on Educational Equity in the Academic Curriculum**

The first report, titled "Report on Educational Equity in the Academic Curriculum." This has been voluntarily withdrawn from the committee at this time for further consideration in the future. So, it will not see time on the floor right now.

**Report on Equity for Learning Support for Commonwealth Campuses V. University Park**

The second report is available in Appendix G titled, "Report on Equity for Learning Support for Commonwealth Campuses V. University Park." This report was prepared by our 2018-2019 Senate Committee on Educational Equity and Campus Environment and will be presented on the web only. Questions, comments, concerns can be emailed to current Chair Clements.

**Report on Survey of Employee Satisfaction with Aetna CVS Caremark Results**

Our next report can be found in Appendix H. The report is sponsored by our Committee on Faculty Benefits and titled "Report on Survey of Employee Satisfaction with Aetna CVS Caremark Results." 20 minutes has been allocated for the presentation of this discussion.

Originally, the report was to be delivered by Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits, Greg Stoner, who unfortunately cannot be available at this time. Chair Saltz, in turn, has graciously agreed to deliver the report and field questions. So, Senator Saltz, please take the floor.

**Ira Saltz:** Take it easy on me. I'm flying solo up here. Okay. So, you may remember, you all received a survey last year put together by HR and Faculty Benefits to gauge employee satisfaction with Aetna and CVS Caremark. So just some of the quick highlights. Employee satisfaction with Aetna, satisfied or very satisfied, 49%. Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, 22%. Given, I think, a lot of the problems that have
trickled up, I guess, the percentage dissatisfied and very dissatisfied was, I guess, lower than expected. Out-of-pocket expenses in 2018 versus 2017, 57% of respondents reported it was higher.

And the Office of Institutional Research dug down deeper and generally found that those who felt that their out-of-pocket expenses were higher were much more likely to be dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with Aetna. How satisfied with being able to keep the same providers-- this was an important question. And I guess gratifying that, almost 80% were satisfied. One of the reasons for not retaining Highmark or renewing with Highmark was the concern that many people in the West wouldn't have access to their UPMC providers, which had a large monopoly down there.

So, in that sense, the University's hands were forced to seek another third-party administrator. And that 80% were satisfied that they were able to keep their providers, I guess, is gratifying. Employee satisfaction with CVS Caremark, 58% satisfied and very satisfied, 16% dissatisfied. Out-of-pocket expenses on prescription higher than 2017, 40% said higher. Compared to Express Scripts experience with CVS Caremark, better 15%, worse 20%. Overall, I guess the survey found employees a bit more satisfied with CVS Caremark compared to Aetna.

Okay. I guess the other important thing is some of the lessons learned. 56% of those enrolled in the PPO plan did not know what value-based benefits were. And for those who don't know, if you have certain conditions, like hypertension, high cholesterol, diabetes, and I forgot the others, but the medicines that are prescribed for those would be at no cost to you. And so, this is a valuable benefit. And unfortunately, a significant number of employees didn't know that. So, we clearly need ways to continue to get this information out there. And I think that's going to have to be certainly a good focus on the next steps. *

* Benefit Correction from Ira Saltz:
I am sorry for any confusion I may have caused. I misspoke when I talked about Value Based Benefits during my presentation to the Senate during Tuesday’s plenary session. Value Based Benefits do not change what a person will pay for their prescription medicines. The description below is from Penn State’s Office of Human Resources website https://hr.psu.edu/content/value-based-benefits.

VALUE BASED BENEFITS
PPO Plan members who have been diagnosed with the following chronic conditions may enroll in Value-Based Benefits (VBB).

- high blood pressure
- high cholesterol
- diabetes (type-1 or type-2)

This program encourages individuals to manage these health conditions by keeping the individual's out-of-pocket expenses low. With VBB, all office visits, lab work and medical supplies related to these conditions are covered at 100% with no co-pays or coinsurance.

In order to take advantage of this voluntary benefit, plan members must enroll directly with Aetna. If you were already a participant with VBB and Highmark, you do not need to re-enroll. End of correction.
And 40% didn't know that Aetna and CVS Caremark had a pricing tool, which would allow you to compare, well, if I got this service here versus there-- and yet, another question, which I didn't put on here, was, how much value did you place on having these tools? A large percent said they found that very valuable, but evidently didn't know these pricing tools were available.

Just one thing I threw in here. It was not revealed from the survey, but there is also a great deal of people who are getting prescriptions on a 30-day supply that could convert them to mail order at a 90-day supply and it would be cheaper. So that's also another thing, that we need to get that out of there. And again, very few people downloaded the Aetna app or the CVS Caremark app. I've downloaded both. I use the CVS Caremark app all the time. It's very, very convenient.

Reasons for choosing the health plan. So, there were thousands and thousands of comments. So those comments put in had to have been made by 30 or more people. This is sort of saying the same thing, so we count them together. The main reasons that people chose the PPO Savings Plan were because they got this seed money from the university or they had a low utilization of health services because of good health and/or age and that it had a lower premium. Those who chose the PPO plan chose it because of cost, that sense that they didn't think they could afford the savings plan, that it would be a lot more out-of-pocket expense, advancing age, risk aversion, chronic health conditions, and the existence of the value-based benefit.

Implication of these findings. I guess the one thing that perhaps I, and maybe others hopefully, find troubling is that there's sorting going on based on age and health, where those who are healthy and young are choosing the PPO Savings Plan and those who are advancing age and may have chronic conditions are choosing the PPO plan. And the issue with that is that what it does is, since both plans are financed separately, those who are getting older or have chronic conditions are now probably paying a higher percentage of their expenses out-of-pocket. This is a classic case of adverse selection, for those familiar with that concept.

If all we are offering is somebody saying, okay, we'll pay 25% of the cost, 75% of the cost, it's not really insurance anymore. So that's certainly, I think, one of the topics we'll take a look at. Now, there is some data researching going on in there. And so far, we found that there isn't a big difference. But some of that may be because of imperfect sorting, people choosing the wrong plan for them.

And so I guess one of the things I do want to point out while I have this opportunity and an audience is that by open enrollment in November, we should have in place a tool that you'll be able to use which, based on your actual claims data, will tell you, okay, this is what it cost you this year enrolled in this plan, here's what it would have cost you if you enrolled in the other plan. And then you could play around with projections for next year and it would tell you what your likely out-of-pocket expenditures would be. So that would--

[APPLAUSE]

Yes. Yeah, so that will hopefully take care of this imperfect sorting. Okay. I just wanted to quickly run through some of those and, I guess, take questions.
Chair Rowland: Yes, please.

Ira Saltz: And I'll get ready to duck.

Chair Rowland: Questions for Ira?

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thank you for the report. I read it carefully and I found it very helpful. And I appreciated that there was some under-the-hood extra sorting to see what might really be going on. But when our caucus met yesterday-- the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences Caucus, we still have concerns about-- hindsight's 2020, but as someone whose research used survey research, some of the questions, I think, could have been asked a different way and you might have gotten more helpful information. For example, there were two questions that asked people to compare their 2018 health plan or prescription expenses with the previous year and say whether their out-of-pocket costs were higher or lower or about the same.

That doesn't tell you anything about whether people had similar services both those years or similar prescriptions. And I can just tell you, again anecdotally, but I've heard this and so have my colleagues from many colleagues, I have a son with two heart defects. He's had the exact same treatments every year of his 21 years. We have prescriptions we've had for decades. Physical therapy seems to be a common thing in our household, so we have that every year. I can tell you; they were higher-- they were absolutely higher.

So, the answers, I think, are very muddied because we got apples and oranges being compared. The other one, just as an example, was rate your level of satisfaction with being able to see the same provider or a health care practitioner you did prior to the move to Aetna. I would not assume that that was that large of percent that were happy. You're asking everyone, but it doesn't ask if the person had to change, if that was even an issue for them. So again, you're muddying apples and oranges. If the question had been asked, did you have to change providers? And if so, were you satisfied? So, some of the conclusions drawn I very much appreciated and some I'm worried we might be jumping to the wrong conclusion.

Ira Saltz: Well, just in general, you bring up the point even if somebody had higher out-of-pocket expenses, the question is, was that attributable to the change from Highmark to Aetna? Some cases, it may have been. In other cases, it may be general medical service inflation. So right, I think that question, in and of itself, wasn't necessarily going to tell us a lot. But I think the correlation was interesting, that those who had higher out-of-pocket expenses were generally more dissatisfied. I guess no big surprise there, but--

[LAUGHTER]

Obviously further drilling needs to be done, and there is. The Health Care Advisory Committee has a data subcommittee that's doing a lot of additional empirical research that we will be happy to share.

Chair Rowland: Great. Tim?

Tim Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: The comparison tool is really cool. I wasn't aware of it. But I think that with the survey and that question about did you know about it only gets to a little bit. So, I know about it now, but I'm still not going to use it a lot because I like my doctor. And so, if I'm going to
shop around-- so I have the same oncologist that I've had-- well, he retired, but I'm in the same place. I don't want to switch my oncologist. I'm happy. So, the tool only does so much, and it's not really taking a holistic approach. If I break my arm and I quickly look at the tool and, oh, it's cheaper to go to this clinic, sure. But the tool, it's taking this purely down to money, and that's not what it's supposed to be. I like my doctor.

**Ira Saltz:** Well, it's an option out there. I guess it's, I think, more in terms of prescriptions where people saw, oh, it's the same medicine whichever pharmacy I get it from. Oh, if I order from this pharmacy, it'll cost me this out-of-pocket versus that pharmacy. In that case, it was more useful. In terms of, well, which doctor should I go to, that's right, we have doctors, we develop a relationship with them, we like to stay with them. But others may be shopping around for a new family doctor.

**Chair Rowland:** Any questions further?

**Brandi Robinson, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences:** To Ann's point about anecdotal evidence about prescriptions costing more or services costing more, we don't need to rely on anecdotal evidence for that, do we? I would imagine that the prices are negotiated in each contract, both our most recent contract with Highmark and the Aetna one. We could pull data to say, OK, the top 50 prescriptions, here's what they cost this year versus last year. Couldn't we do that with prescriptions and common services to get at that question of really how much different they are?

**Ira Saltz:** Okay. I wish Greg Stoner were here to help with this question. But yeah, looking back, we can see what we spent on these. But when the contract is negotiated, none of the pharmacy providers were willing to say, OK, this is what the price of this medicine is going to be this year for the whole year. None of them were willing to do that. So unfortunately, some of these prescription prices can change mid-year. But I believe so, that looking back, we can go into the data warehouse and see what the average cost of this prescription versus that was. Yeah, we can do that.

**Chair Rowland:** [INAUDIBLE]

**Matthew Woessner, Council of Past Chairs.** One of the concerns I have is that every time we talk about Aetna, we have an avalanche of anecdotal reports about prices going up substantially. This happened when the senate officers visited, it happened in the Senate itself. And I think we quickly dismiss these things because they're anecdotal, but then we get survey data which is extremely imperfect at measuring it. We seem to be ignoring actual data we have, which would tell us how much we're spending. So, this shouldn't be that complicated.

And since you mentioned that, well, because of UPMC, we really have no choice but to go the way of Aetna. Are we simply saying that we're locked into Aetna for all time, that these price issues don't matter because the university simply has no one else to negotiate with? And what implications does that have for us trying to get more effective coverage if we're simply locked in because of the UPMC problem?

**Ira Saltz:** Okay. Well, let me clarify this. I'm not the one doing the negotiation, but we are already thinking ahead. It was a three-year contract with Aetna and CVS Caremark. We are now wrapping up year two. And so, we're in it for 2020. But we will, very shortly I presume, start the process of soliciting bids for 2021. And hopefully, maybe Highmark and UPMC reach some sort of agreement by then and
they could be back in the mix. But no, I think that there is a lot of looking at the data of costs and things like that that are going on out there.

We are also looking very closely at denial rates. Aetna came and visited and quoted a denial rate that that's in line with all the others. Yet, when the data committee did some drilling down, there appeared to be some very significant differences on denial rates. And so, I think that information is being gathered and hopefully will be factored into any bids that we receive in the future.

**Chair Rowland**: Very good. Thank you, Ira.

**Ira Saltz**: Thank you. You were-- I'm still standing.

[APPLAUSE]

**Chair Rowland**: All right. We have an update on the most anticipated vote of this academic year so far.

[LAUGHTER]

**Paula Brown, Faculty Senate Administrative Coordinator**: Yeah.

**Chair Rowland**: Yeah, please tell us.

**Anna Butler**: So, on Poll Everywhere, I have 8 accept and 2 reject.

**Paula Brown**: In-house, 141 accept, 4 reject.

**Avenues for Student Athletes to Report Concerns or Abuse by Coaches**

**Chair Rowland**: Very good. The motion carries. Moving on. Thank you. Our next informational report that will be presented is from the 2018-2019 Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics titled "Avenues for Student Athletes to Report Concerns or Abuse by Coaches." The report appears as Appendix J. We set aside 10 minutes for discussion. It will be presented by the current and, I guess, also past chair, Mark Stephens.

**Mark Stephens, College of Medicine**: Good afternoon, everybody. Nicholas, in the spirit of gratitude, I definitely want to thank the committee members from IAC, who, I think-- I don't think, I know they worked really, really hard on this report. I would also like to just draw your attention to pages 36, 37 of the agenda, where I think things are laid out in pretty good detail, the routes that athletes have to express concerns, to make reports in the context of the charge that Michael provided to the committee last year. And so really, my intent is to stand for questions and answer any that you have.

**Chair Rowland**: Questions for Mark?

**Maureen Jones, College of Health and Human Development**: Okay. So, I think this is a comprehensive list. The one question I have, though, is that we know, statistically, people don't know they're being abused sometimes. So, I know there's some education that goes on, but in listening to the latest work that comes out of the Larry Nassar stuff, the numbers of victims that didn't know they were a
victim is astronomical. So, I'm wondering what is in play to support this to make sure that people understand what's going on, so that they know that they could or should report it.

**Mark Stephens**: Thank you. And I would open that up to us as a community because I don't see that as being unique to athletics, I see that as being a question in general. So, I would-- yes, and ask for help in that. That's not an answer, that's a request.

**Chair Rowland**: Are there further questions that may or may not get an answer?

[LÄUTHER]

Great. Seeing none. Thank you, Mark.

[APPLAUSE]

**Undergraduate and Medical Student Research Opportunities and Initiatives**

Okay. Agenda Item L, new Legis-- oh, no. Sorry. I was almost rude to our guest. Our final information report, "Undergraduate and Medical Student Research Opportunities and Initiatives," found in Appendix J is sponsored by our Senate Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity. 10 minutes has been allocated for discussion. Associate Vice President and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education Alan Rieck will present the report and respond to questions. Vice President Rieck, the floor is yours.

**Alan Rieck, Associate Vice President and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education**: Thank you very much. We're actually a two-part report. I'll be talking about undergraduate research here, and Ira will be talking about the medical portion of this. First of all, Penn State can celebrate that we have much undergraduate research going on across the campuses across the colleges. We know that every college and every campus is supporting some form of research or creative activity or scholarship as we go through and look at the activities that are happening. They're investing into that and our students are having fantastic experiences.

We do not have a means, however, to pull that information all together to know exactly what is happening. We are working on that currently, and we'll talk about that in just a minute. The reason that the activity is so strong is because our faculty. The faculty make this possible. And we know from our own internal discussions plus a roundtable undergraduate research that to grow the undergraduate research opportunities means facilitating things so that faculty can make that happen. So that's part of our discussion that's going on. I'll go on. I'll talk and give you the information.

We have a series of events that happen throughout time in the Senate regarding Undergraduate Research. In August 2012, there was a special task force formed on Undergraduate Research in the Senate. They reported in April 2013, and they had some specific suggestions and ideas of how to go forward at three levels, either we excel at this and become a national leader, we stay in the middle of the pack, we do the minimal. Of course, they recommended we excel as much as possible.

Some of the recommendations that they made at that time have been taken very seriously and we've worked to implement those, including developing a central website resource for students to begin to look for faculty-student collaborative research projects. And the Undergraduate Research website is that. It
was changed recently so that that piece was front and center, and that was a result of student requests, that be the first thing that they see. So, we went about making that happen. They were talking very serious about staff positions to make research more accessible and productive across colleges and campuses, and many of the colleges and campuses have done that as well.

In 2016, the Special Committee on Engaged Scholarship also designate Undergraduate Research, one of the key elements for engaged scholarship. And that continues to be the case in the student engagement network, that it's the number one applied for grant opportunity as far as engagement goes. And we're excited to be able to offer those grants through that means so that students can have those types of opportunities.

In winter of 2017, through the generous support of Rob Pangborn and Madlyn Haynes, Penn State enrolled in an Institutional Enhanced Membership in the Council for Undergraduate Research, which makes individual memberships for all the Penn State community free if you go online and enroll. You have to look under T for The Pennsylvania State University to do it, but it is one of the opportunities that we have. And we've had a number of people that have taken advantage of that. We have people attending institutes at a lower cost. We have people and students presenting at ENCUR as well, and we're very excited about that.

One of the things we're doing as we go forward, as we try to make undergraduate research more accessible to students who don't come to us with those type of experiences in their mind, first generation students, underrepresented minority students, we're trying to provide an avenue for them to learn about the research opportunities, and then, therefore, follow up and facilitate their pursuit of those. So the university fellowship's office in collaboration with university libraries are putting together a series of seminars-- not even sure what the best thing to call them are-- but modules so they'll will be accessible to everyone in the university, on-site here and in libraries across the state, as well as some recorded events that will be archived and available at any time for students who can't make the specific time of their presentation. So, we're excited about that.

As we continue to pursue the gathering of data regarding what is the activity that's happening at Penn State, we start to think about how we can do that, what resources can we go to do that. Rob Pangborn graciously has funded Faculty Fellow for Undergraduate Research. Lara LaDage from Altoona is serving in that capacity, and she is working on several things, but one of them is how do we create a reporting mechanism that will at least give us a snapshot of what's happening. And this is a national question. Everybody struggles with this. Our struggle just happens to be a little more intricate because of our structure. How many times do we hear that in a day?

So, we're excited about those things. Just a real quick update on some of the programs that we have running out of Undergraduate Ed. The Erickson Discovery grants-- we're really excited about the fact that in the past three years we've offered over 70 of these grants to students for summer research experience, $3,500 grants for them to be able to do independent research that they propose. And you can see up on the screen the number of students that have applied from campuses this past year versus the number of students that applied at University Park, and then the distribution of those awards. The applications are reviewed by disciplinary committees.

So, the students enter into a specific discipline category, and there are committees of experts in that disciplinary field that review the applications and make the recommendations for funding. It's exciting
that we have pretty solid representation across the board for our students to have those type of experiences. The undergraduate exhibition took a little bit of a turn. This past year, we started to do two sessions. The first session early in the morning is an engagement exposition. So, students that have had an engagement experience, we want them to have an opportunity to present to the university community the growth experiences, the learning that took place in those events. It was very exciting last year, students did a fantastic job of talking about their growth and their connections to community.

We also, in the evening, have the normal-- what has been the traditional exhibition. And we have three ways for students to do that, the traditional research poster, oral presentations, which are intended to open it up to areas for which posters are not the normal presentation method, and finally, we have the performance medium, which has been very popular as well. Part of the challenge for the exhibition is the need for judges, and we had a tremendous response. Last year, we had about 124 people volunteer and 122 of them showed up, which was really exciting.

It's a group of people that really came in and they did-- they do it out of a service, and it's exciting to hear and see what the students are doing. We also, in the Office of Undergraduate Education, provide travel grant support for students to present at conferences. And this is a collaborative venture between department, college, and then our office, and if it's campus, it's campus, and then university college and our office. So it's been very popular, very well-used by students. We've had a number of students report and present at a number of exciting different venues.

You can see the number of students for domestic conferences here, international conferences last year. We separated those out because of the different requirements as far as the travel goes. And the total number of travel awards, 232 projects with 289 students, over $67,000 were used just from our office from undergrad ed, and that was matched probably at two other levels. So do the multiplication times 3 and you've got an idea of what we're spending for travel support.

So primary observations coming out of where we're at. Number one, the participation is increasing. In all the programs that we're running, we're seeing that, and we're also getting reports from other units that students are highly interested in this. When university fellowships did a survey just a few years ago, this is one of the things that students really wanted more information about, they wanted more access. So, we're working on making that happen. Of course, our numbers are encouraging, but compared to the overall numbers of the university, it's still a challenge. So, we're still trying to create opportunities for students that currently don't know that they exist.

One of the things that's exciting about the student engagement network is we're working on an assessment plan for these type of experiences, qualitative and quantitative. And as that assessment plan comes into fruition, it'll be applied to Undergraduate Research and will build off of that for Undergraduate Research as well. But we wanted to take our efforts and funnel them together at this point. But the potential for what we can say about what we're doing will increase in the future, and we're excited about that. And then finally, something I mentioned earlier, we're looking at ways to how to support faculty in order to be able to do this type of venture.

We know it takes a great deal of time and energy and effort. We believe also that it's highly rewarding, and I know many of the people even in this room have benefited from that and enjoy that experience. But we want to make that even more possible through a variety of means. And our focus really is on
underrepresented first-generation minority types of students. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Ira for a second, and we'll take questions at the end.

Ira Ropson, College of Medicine: Thank you. I will continue to try and keep this as short as reasonable. Oh. Well, maybe I'll keep it even shorter. [INAUDIBLE] We'll get started. Most of you are probably not familiar with the Medical Student Research Program unless you're at the College of Medicine. Well, every medical student is required to complete a mentored research project while they're in medical school. There are several purposes towards this. Number one, we want students to understand that their education is not going to end with their four years of undergraduate, that they will be participating in research in the future. And they need to understand how research is done in order to be able to apply that in their own practice.

Secondly, it makes them look better on paper. By that, I mean residency application programs are getting tighter and more competitive, and our history of having our medical students do research and publish those results is really helpful for them in the residency application process. Over the past few years, we've nearly doubled the number of publications that are actually seen in PubMed. For those of you who aren't familiar with that, it is the health sciences literature database for searching. Ok.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

Ira Ropson: Well, but you can roll down. Okay. Stop here. Okay. The medical student research project, all it has to be is health related. By that, I mean we have a wide variety of research topics from basic Science to Sociology because all of these things have relevance when it comes to medical education and research. So, we don't limit what kind of research projects that they do. What we want to make sure is that they're using appropriate research methods to address their particular research question. Whether it's a qualitative question or a quantitative question, they have to match their methods with their research. Scroll down, please.

So, what's the student responsibilities? Well, our program emphasizes that the student is intended to do research that they are interested in. I don't know how familiar you are with research in general, but there's nothing worse than someone who's doing a check box. So, the idea here is that they choose their research project based on their own interests. And once they choose that project, who's an appropriate mentor? That's another point that the students have to find. They had to submit a research proposal that outlines their research question, gives why it's significant, and some background about the research, and what methods do they propose to address that question. We realize that research is not necessarily publishable.

We grade on an effort curve. If you put in a sincere effort but the research project itself doesn't succeed because you can never get your sample size high enough, or your hypothesis was tested but the results were equivocal, you can't publish that kind of thing. But it still fulfills the requirement for medical student research. So how do the students find a project? Well, we have a website where anyone in the Penn State community, and indeed from people outside the Penn State community, can submit potential projects. Note the word here is potential projects. Just because you put one on the website doesn't mean a medical student is going to pick that project as their project.

On the other hand, most medical students have no idea what they want to do. So, they go based on, well, I'm interested in this. Is there other faculty who have research interests that match up with something I'm interested in? They'll talk to that faculty member, and between the two of them, they'll develop a project.
Students can be added directly to an existing project, but they still have to write a proposal because they have to be able to explain that research project in their own words in a way that's acceptable to the committee. So, students do research at Penn State, they do research at other campuses of Penn State. Yes, the medical school, most of the students are up there. But you should be aware, if you're not already, that there are 12 students in the medical program at the UP campus.

We are actively looking for more projects. By that, I mean, at any campus, if you have a health-related project that you think a medical student might be interested in, put it up on the website. We will follow through with it, and the students will have it available for them to at least look at. So that's one of the things I wanted for a take-home message today. And as I said, for that bottom-line number, there is about 135 students-- we're excluding M.D. PhD students from this number-- so from 140 students, we had 157 publications in PubMed. That excludes meeting abstracts.

It includes systematic reviews, research, case reports. But these are all things that are peer reviewed in PubMed. So, we're really happy with our success level. And I've listed my contact information here, and please do not hesitate to contact me. It's easiest to remember that the MSR-- if you search for MSR and Penn State by Google, it's the first that comes up. So medical student research, Penn State, it's the first page that will come up. And there is a bunch of information there that I'd love to have more people look at. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

On that uplifting note, it turns out that we've used all of our time.

Ira Ropson: So, we don't get any questions.

Chair Rowland: Very much appreciated. I imagine, since Ira's email is right there, you could also email him with questions or comments that you have. Thank you very much for joining us.

[APPLAUSE]

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS


COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Rowland: Agenda Item M, comments and recommendations for the good of the University. Are there any additional comments for good of the University? Also seeing none.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Rowland: May I have a motion to adjourn?

Ira Saltz: Motion to adjourn.
Chair Rowland: Is there a second?

Keith Shapiro: Second.

Chair Rowland: Motion carries.

GAVEL BANGS

The Senate has officially adjourned until October 29, 2019.
The following Senators were noted as having attended the September 17, 2019 Senate Meeting.
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