THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
The University Faculty Senate
AGENDA
Tuesday, October 29, 2019
112 Kern Graduate Building

Senators are reminded to bring their PSU ID cards to swipe in a card reader to record attendance.

In the event of severe weather conditions or other emergencies that would necessitate the cancellation of a Senate meeting, a communication will be posted on Penn State News at http://news.psu.edu/.

A. MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Minutes of the September 17, 2019 Meeting in The Senate Record 53:1

B. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Senate Curriculum Report of October 8, 2019 Appendix A

C. REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL - Meeting of October 8, 2019

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

E. COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

F. COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY

G. FORENSIC BUSINESS

Senate Special Committee “Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct”

Forensic Discussion on Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct Appendix B
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs, Intra-University Relations, and University Planning

Office Space Appendix C
[20 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None
I. LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, sections 6(f) Committee on Faculty Affairs and 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations (Tenure Flow Report)  
Appendix D

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, sections 6(f) Committee on Faculty Affairs and 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations (Promotion Flow Report)  
Appendix E

J. ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs

Revision to AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities”  
(Ombudsperson and gender changes)  
Appendix F

Revision to AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities”  
(Faculty Definitions)  
Appendix G

K. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits

Benefits Mentor  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  
Appendix H

Senate Committee on Global Programs

Travel Safety Network (TSN)  
[15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion]  
Appendix I

Senate Council

Report on Fall 2018 Commonwealth Campus Visits*  
(Additional privileged information available to Senators in the Senate Meetings tab of BoardEffect)  
Appendix J

Report on Spring 2019 College Visits*  
(Additional privileged information available to Senators in the Senate Meetings tab of BoardEffect)  
Appendix K

* No presentation of reports marked with an asterisk.
L. NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

None

M. COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, December 3, 2019, 1:30 p.m., Room 112 Kern Graduate Building.

All members of the University Faculty Senate are asked to sit in their assigned seats for each Senate meeting. The assignment of seats is made to enable the Senate Chair to distinguish members from visitors and to be able to recognize members appropriately. Senators are reminded to wait for the microphone and identify themselves and their voting unit before speaking on the floor. Members of the University community, who are not Senators, may not speak at a Senate meeting unless they request and are granted the privilege of the floor from the Senate Chair at least five days in advance of the meeting.
COMMUNICATION TO THE SENATE

DATE: October 9, 2019

TO: Nicholas Rowland, Chair, University Faculty Senate

FROM: Mary Beth Williams, Chair, Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs

The Senate Curriculum Report dated October 8, 2019 has been circulated throughout the University. Objections to any of the items in the report must be submitted to Kadi Corter, Curriculum Coordinator, 101 Kern Graduate Building, 814-863-0996, kkw2@psu.edu, on or before November 7, 2019.

The Senate Curriculum Report is available on the web and may be found at: http://senate.psu.edu/curriculum/senate-curriculum-reports/
SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE “ADDRESSING ALLEGATIONS OF FACULTY MISCONDUCT”

Forensic Discussion on Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct

(Forensic)

RATIONALE

The Special Committee Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct has submitted this forensic report to seek the guidance of the University Faculty Senate. The University Administration is tasked with advancing Penn State’s mission, and within that context, is tasked with the essential role of stewardship. To that end, the administration of the University is committed to ensuring that faculty values, reflecting the highest aspirations of faculty academic professional culture, are appropriately institutionalized through rules and procedures that are fair and appropriate. To accomplish this, it is essential that the faculty maintain a climate that values faculty and fosters prompt and fair resolution of their concerns and grievances.

Faculty members are expected to adhere to the AC47 which outlines General Standards of Professional Ethics as well as all applicable University policies. However, with over 6,500 faculty members at the University, regretfully, some faculty members occasionally engage in misconduct, or are alleged to do so, and administrators may face the need to respond to allegations of misconduct. The majority of these incidents can be resolved informally, often with the assistance of the unit or university ombudsperson. Other incidents of faculty misconduct can be addressed by existing policies and accompanying procedures, such as our documents relating to affirmative action situations. Certain forms of faculty misconduct, if substantiated, may lead the University to commence pre-termination proceedings via existing policies, for example; forms of misconduct that constitute “Adequate Cause” for termination are addressed in the Policy AC70 “Dismissal of Tenured or Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members.” There is however a need for a process for addressing significant allegations of misconduct or a serious pattern of misconduct that fall outside existing policies and procedures.

The University is committed to providing fair process to faculty members facing allegations of serious misconduct related to their faculty appointment responsibilities. The process should allow the faculty member an opportunity to respond to allegations before the University would make a finding adverse to the faculty member or imposes sanctions, including serious sanctions short of termination, and the process should include an appeals process.

THE CHARGE

On March 19, 2019, Senate Special Committee for “Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct” was charged by then Senate Chair Michael Bérubé. On June 18, 2019, the committee was re-established and re-charged by current Senate Chair, Nicholas Rowland:
“In an organization as large and complex as Penn State, allegations of faculty misconduct are inevitable. While AC-70 (Formerly HR-70) defines dismissal procedures for tenured and tenure-eligible faculty, the University is not well-equipped to make discerning judgements in cases that involve faculty accused of substantial violation of university policy that do not rise to the level of dismissal. New procedures for addressing allegations of faculty misconduct are essential for the future well-being of the University. To facilitate this process, a Special Committee is charged to draft a report that:

- Provides a rationale for creating a new policy that addresses allegations of faculty misconduct;
- Includes justification for and definition of “Wrongful Conduct,” “Minor Discipline,” and “Serious Discipline” in the scope of the policy;
- Outlines an appeals process;
- Addresses the role of the academic unit ombudspersons and the rights of the faculty representation by advisor or by legal counsel;
- Includes “protection from retaliation” set forth in AD-67 (“Disclosure of Wrongful Conduct and Protection From Retaliation”); and
- Defines “faculty member” consistent with AC-76, including faculty members who have administrative responsibilities.

The Special Committee is expected to deliver:

- A Forensic Report on Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct for the University Faculty Senate Plenary meeting of October 29, 2019; and
- An Advisory and Consultative Report on Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct for the University Faculty Senate Plenary meeting of December 3, 2019.”

**BENCHMARKING**

The Special Committee reviewed and deliberated on Policies Addressing Allegations of Misconduct from the following peer institutions:

- Illinois
- Indiana University - Bloomington
- Maryland
- Michigan
- Michigan State
- Nebraska
- Ohio State
- Pittsburgh
- Purdue
- Rutgers
- Wisconsin

**QUESTIONS For Discussion**
The Special Committee has been charged to draft a policy to address “Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct.” For that purpose, and among other things, the committee seeks guidance and input from the Senate on the following topics.

Faculty Misconduct

- What are some examples of serious misconduct by a faculty member?
- What types of serious misconduct should be grounds for serious disciplinary actions such as suspension without pay or a reduction in salary?

Process

- Consistent with existing policy, what process should be established to determine whether serious misconduct by a faculty member has occurred?

Appeal Process

- If an allegation of serious misconduct is substantiated and the faculty member wishes to appeal, what should an appeals process look like?

Senate Special Committee “Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct”

Suzanne Adair
Katherine Allen
Mohamad A. Ansari, Co-chair
Kathy Bieschke, Co-chair
Dawn G. Blasko, Resource Member
Kathy Drager
Carey Eckhardt
Galen Grimes
John Nousek
Richard Robinett
Samia Suliman
Candice Yekel
SENATE COMMITTEES ON FACULTY AFFAIRS, INTRA-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS, AND UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Office Space

(Forensic)

Background
Current space standards at Penn State set an official maximum size for the office space of administrators, faculty, and staff (https://senate.psu.edu/senators/agendas-records/october-29-2019-agenda/office-space-guidelines/). For example, while a "Secretary/Receptionist" shall not have an office larger in size than 100 square feet, a Dean may not have more than 400 square feet. The “Maximum Square Feet Per Station” for Faculty of any rank, tenure-track or tenure-exempt, is 150. There are no minimum standards for office space at Penn State.

Through new buildings and renovations, University leadership has the opportunity to remake the work environment provided to faculty. It is important that future work environments are an improvement on previous work environments, which allow faculty to, as President Baron requests, strive for excellence in their teaching, research and service endeavors.

Questions
To foster discussion in this forensic opportunity on the floor of the Senate, the following questions have been formulated:

1. What models for office space are currently available at Penn State?
2. How do office spaces – private, shared, and open spaces – reflect and impact the University’s mission?
3. Are there any basic features of office space that faculty generally share or need?

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
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Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, sections 6(f) Committee on Faculty Affairs and 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations (Tenure Flow Report)  

(Legislative)  

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate. 

Rationale 
This proposal recommends changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(f) “Committee on Faculty Affairs,” item 5, and section 6(j) “Committee on Intra-University Relations,” item 5. 

The existing statement for the section “Mandated Reports,” which indicates that there are no mandated reports for the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, does not reflect current practice. For the past twenty or more years, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has annually requested that an informational “Tenure Flow Report” be prepared for the committee by the Office of Planning and Assessment, and the committee has subsequently presented this annual informational report on the floor the Faculty Senate. This annual report, therefore, should be recognized in the Standing Rules. 

Additionally, because rates of promotion affect faculty in colleges and campuses across the commonwealth, this report should be jointly sponsored by the Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations. As there needs to be a division of labor in the production of mandated reports, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs should be responsible for approving this report for publication to the Senate Agenda. 

Recommendations 

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add]. 

Recommended changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(f), are as follows: 

5. Mandated reports: [Delete]none[End Delete][Add] Tenure Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Committee on Intra-University Relations). The Committee on Faculty Affairs shall have the authority to approve the Promotion Flow Report for publication to the Senate Agenda [End Add]. The Committee on Faculty Affairs shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.
Recommended changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(j), are as follows:

5. Mandated reports: [Delete]none[End Delete][Add] **Co-sponsor a Tenure Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Committee on Faculty Affairs)**[End Add]. The Committee on Intra-University Relations shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

**Revised Policy – Clean Versions**

Changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(f):

5. Mandated reports: Tenure Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Intra-University Relations). The Committee on Faculty Affairs shall have the authority to approve the Promotion Flow Report for publication to the Senate Agenda. The Committee on Faculty Affairs shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

Changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(j):

5. Mandated reports: Co-sponsor a Tenure Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Faculty Affairs). The Committee on Intra-University Relations shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES**

- Johnathan Abel
- Michael Berube
- Renee Borromeo
- Victor Brunsden, Chair
- Beth King
- Jeffrey Laman
- Binh Le
- Judith Ozment
- Nicholas Rowland
- Elizabeth Seymour
- Keith Shapiro
- Ann Taylor, Vice Chair
- Rodney Troester
- Kent Vrana
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES

Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, sections 6(f) Committee on Faculty Affairs and 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations (Promotion Flow Report)

(Legislative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the Senate

Rationale

This proposal recommends changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(f) “Committee on Faculty Affairs,” item 5, and section 6(j) “Committee on Intra-University Relations,” item 5.

The existing statement for the section “Mandated Reports” indicates that there are no mandated reports for the Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations. Recent changes to AC-21, which create the possibility of promotion from the second rank to a third rank for full-time non-tenure-line faculty, should be monitored, similar to the monitoring capacity of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs in their annual “Tenure Flow Report.” Thus, to exist in parallel with the “Tenure Flow Report,” the proposed report for non-tenure-line faculty is entitled the “Promotion Flow Report.”

Additionally, because rates of promotion affect faculty in colleges and campuses across the commonwealth, this report should be jointly sponsored by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs. As there needs to be a division of labor in the production of mandated reports, the Senate Committee on Intra-University Relations should be responsible for approving this report for publication to the Senate Agenda.

Recommendation

Please note that the following contains bold text for additions and strikeouts indicating deleted text. Deleted text is notated with [Delete] [End Delete]. Added text is notated with [Add] [End Add].

Recommended changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(f), are as follows:

5. Mandated reports: [Delete] none [End Delete] [Add] Co-sponsor a Promotion Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Committee on Intra-University Relations) [End Add]. The Committee on Faculty Affairs shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.
Recommended changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(j), are as follows:

5. Mandated reports: [Delete]none[End Delete][Add] Promotion Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Committee on Faculty Affairs). The Committee on Intra-University Relations shall have the authority to approve the Promotion Flow Report for publication to the Senate Agenda [End Add]. The Committee on Intra-University Relations shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

Revised Policy – Clean Versions

Changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(f):

5. Mandated reports: Co-sponsor a Promotion Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Intra-University Relations). The Committee on Faculty Affairs shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

Changes to the Senate’s Standing Rules, Article II, section 6(j):

5. Mandated reports: Promotion Flow Report (Informational, jointly with Faculty Affairs). The Committee on Intra-University Relations shall have the authority to approve the Promotion Flow Report for publication to the Senate Agenda. The Committee on Intra-University Relations shall send its Informational Reports to the Senate Council.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND RULES
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- Renee Borromeo
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Revision to AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities”
(Ombudsperson and gender changes)

(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Rationale
These revisions align the policy with current practices of having an alternate ombudsperson and by gender inclusiveness. The current version of AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” (formerly HR-76) does not include information regarding an alternate ombudsperson. These revisions also stipulate that individuals are elected by the faculty body, not appointed. Additional changes are made to address gender inclusiveness.

Recommendation
The committee recommends that AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” be modified in the following way:

Please note that additions appear in bold and deletions are struck through.

AC76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Formerly HR76)
Policy Status:
Active
Policy Steward:
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

POLICY'S INITIAL DATE: September 1, 1973

THIS VERSION EFFECTIVE: May 31, 2011

- Purpose
- Scope
- Conciliation
- Ombudsperson
- Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
- .... Establishment of the Committee
- .... Operation of the Committee
- .... The Role of a Hearing Board
- .... Decision of the Executive Vice President and Provost
- Guidelines for Implementation
- .... The Senate Report
- .... Definition of Faculty
- .... Issues for Review: Limitations
- .... Application of Policy to Other Professionals
- .... Obligations of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
PURPOSE:

This policy defines the procedures to be followed when issues involving faculty rights and responsibilities have not been successfully resolved through the normal channels of administrative responsibility and procedure.

Disputes are best addressed through direct discussions among the parties to the disputes. When such direct discussions fail to resolve the dispute, the parties should avail themselves of the Ombudsperson process. All Penn State faculty and administrators are strongly urged to make use of the unit or University ombudsperson as appropriate. Only when matters cannot be resolved through that process, should the formal procedures described in this policy be used.

SCOPE:

A. In these procedures the term "faculty member" refers to members of the University faculty as defined in the University Faculty Senate Constitution (Article II, Section 1) plus any other University employees in academic positions which lead to permanent tenure. (This definition is subject to the clarifications of the Guidelines for Implementation section of this policy.)

B. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities established by the procedures may review petitions from faculty members and administrators involving:

1. Any situation in which a faculty member asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of: a) academic freedom; b) procedural fairness; or c) professional ethics. The Committee does not review cases of alleged discrimination or of sexual harassment as defined in AD41 (see section F below). However, claims that involve discrimination or harassment plus one of the three areas named above will be investigated simultaneously by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and by the Office of Affirmative Action. Each body will examine the part(s) of the claim within its respective area of competence, will share evidence where appropriate, and will inform the other of its findings. (See "Consultation Between Review Bodies" below).

2. Any situation in which an administrator seeks a Committee judgment as to appropriate action toward a faculty member who, in judgment, may be failing to meet responsibilities.

C. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will normally consider only petitions which involve, as a direct party, faculty members as defined above. Exceptions to this restriction
apply to University academic employees (a University academic employee is a person whose
duties include instructional, research or creative responsibilities) as follows:

NOTE: This definition of academic employee excludes graduate assistants.

1. Dismissal. Any University academic employee may make use of these procedures upon
receipt of notice of dismissal. A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of
appointment.

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

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

D. Cases of substantive dispute involving the termination of tenured appointment for cause or for
reasons of financial exigency or program elimination or revision, or the release of a faculty
member during the provisional appointment period with less advance notice than that specified
in University policy, shall be considered at a hearing by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure
under the "Committee Procedural Rules" described in the Policy AC70 Dismissal of Tenured or
Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members.

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

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

CONCILIATION:

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

Selection and Responsibilities of Ombudspersons

A. An Ombudsperson [Add] and an Alternate Ombudsperson [End Add] shall be [Add] elected [End Add] by the faculty in each of the colleges, campuses and academic units.

For those not associated with an academic unit, or in cases where the appropriate ombudsperson may be in doubt, the following policy shall be applied:

1. Where appropriate, the ombudsperson [Add] and alternate ombudsperson [End Add] will be from the same academic unit to which the employee is most closely associated. For example, research associates in the Applied Research Laboratory will have access to the ombudsperson for the College of Engineering.

2. In cases where there is disagreement or doubt as to the appropriate ombudsperson, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall make the determination.

3. In cases where the ombudsperson is in doubt as to [Add] their [End Add] [Delete] his or her [End Delete] jurisdiction, [Add] they [End Add] [Delete] he or she [End Delete] shall ask the Executive Vice President and Provost for a determination.

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

C. Functions for the ombudsperson are:

1. Clarification of misunderstandings;

2. Advising faculty and administrators as to appropriate courses of action;

3. Assisting in the informal resolution of differences;

4. Assuring that appropriate department, college and/or campus procedures are exhausted before referring the case to higher levels;
5. Informing the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and appropriate college or campus officials if a matter cannot be resolved at the lower level and the case is to be referred to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

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

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

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

Six faculty members and three deans will be elected as alternates for three-year terms. Two of the faculty members shall be from academic voting units other than those at University Park. The term of office for members and alternates will be three years commencing on July 1. The terms will be staggered to provide for continuity.

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

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

Operation of the Committee

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

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

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

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

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

The Role of a Hearing Board

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

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

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

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

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

The parties will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence. The University administration will make reasonable efforts to cooperate with the Hearing Board in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence. Parties will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses.

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

Decision of the Executive Vice President and Provost

Conclusions and recommendations from the Committee or a Hearing Board shall be submitted to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University through the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall notify the Chair of the decision that has been reached.

In the event that the Executive Vice President and Provost's decision is not in accord with the conclusions of the Committee or the Hearing Board, the reasons for that decision shall be specified to the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities who will inform the Committee and the parties directly involved. (See also Notification of the Executive Vice President and Provost's Decision in the "Guidelines for Implementation" section of this policy.) At the first regular Senate meeting of each academic year, the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will present a brief general report of the Committee's activities.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

The Senate Report

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

The term faculty member shall include the Senate's definition of its electorate plus all research equivalent ranks as specified in the Policy Manual AC21. The definition is as follows: All persons who are not candidates for degrees at Penn State, who hold full-time academic appointments, and who fall into one of the following categories -- those holding professorial, research or librarian titles, those who are full-time instructors or assistant librarians, and those other full-time academic employees who are members of the Graduate Faculty, but who do not fall into either of the above categories.

Issues for Review: Limitations

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

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

Application of Policy to Other Professionals

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

Obligations of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

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

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

Consultation Between Review Bodies

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

After receiving the conclusions and recommendations on a case from a Hearing Board, the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University shall notify the parties directly involved, appropriate University administrative officers, and the Chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee as to his or her decision. The Chair shall be responsible for informing the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

UPDATES:
6/10/10 - Minor editorial adjustment to Operation of the Committee section.
10/20/09 - The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules voted to change the term of ombudsman to ombudsperson.
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SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

Revision to AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities”
(Faculty Definitions)
(Advisory/Consultative)

Implementation: Upon Approval by the President

Rationale

Recent revisions to AC 21 “Definition of Academic Ranks” have made it necessary to implement changes to the current version of AC76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” (formerly HR76) to be more inclusive of faculty rank covering a broader array of our peers and clarifying academic appointment as recognized in AC 21. Additional changes were made to create consistency within the document and remove superfluous examples.

Recommendation

The committee recommends that AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” be modified in the following way:

Please note that additions appear in **bold** and deletions are struck through.

AC76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Formerly HR76)

Policy Status:
Active
Policy Steward:
Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

POLICY'S INITIAL DATE: September 1, 1973

THIS VERSION EFFECTIVE: May 31, 2011

- Purpose
- Scope
- Conciliation
- Ombudsperson
- Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
- .... Establishment of the Committee
- .... Operation of the Committee
- .... The Role of a Hearing Board
- .... Decision of the Executive Vice President and Provost
- Guidelines for Implementation
Appendix G

PURPOSE:
This policy defines the procedures to be followed when issues involving faculty rights and responsibilities have not been successfully resolved through the normal channels of administrative responsibility and procedure.

Disputes are best addressed through direct discussions among the parties to the disputes. When such direct discussions fail to resolve the dispute, the parties should avail themselves of the Ombudsperson process. All Penn State faculty and administrators are strongly urged to make use of the unit or University ombudsperson as appropriate. Only when matters cannot be resolved through that process, should the formal procedures described in this policy be used.

SCOPE:

A. In these procedures the term "faculty member" refers to all full-time faculty including instructors and all professorial ranks and equivalent ranks as defined in Policy (AC21). Members of the University faculty as defined in the University Faculty Senate Constitution (Article II, Section 1) plus any other University employees in academic positions which lead to permanent tenure. (This definition is subject to the clarifications of the Guidelines for Implementation section of this policy.)

B. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities established by the procedures may review petitions from faculty members and administrators involving:

1. Any situation in which a faculty member asserts that he or she has suffered a substantial injustice resulting from a violation of: a) academic freedom; b) procedural fairness; or c) professional ethics. The Committee does not review cases of alleged discrimination or of sexual harassment as defined in AD-85 or AD-91 (see section F below). However, claims that involve discrimination or harassment plus one of the three areas named above will be investigated simultaneously by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and by the Office of Affirmative Action. Each body will examine the part(s) of the claim within its respective area of competence, will share evidence where appropriate, and will inform the other of its findings. (See "Consultation Between Review Bodies" below).
2. Any situation in which an administrator seeks a Committee judgment as to appropriate action toward a faculty member who, in his or her judgment, may be failing to meet his or her responsibilities.

C. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will normally consider only petitions which involve, as a direct party, faculty members as defined above. Exceptions to this restriction apply to University [Add] faculty personnel as specified below (“Application of Policy to Other Faculty Personnel”), such as part-time faculty (with at least a six-month appointment). [End Add] [Delete] academic employees (a University academic employee is a person whose duties include instructional, research or creative responsibilities) as follows:

NOTE: This definition of academic employee excludes graduate assistants.

1. Dismissal. Any University academic employee may make use of these procedures upon receipt of notice of dismissal. A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.

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

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

D. Cases of substantive dispute involving the termination of tenured appointment for cause or for reasons of financial exigency or program elimination or revision, or the release of a faculty member during the provisional appointment period with less advance notice than that specified in University policy, shall be considered at a hearing by the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure under the "Committee Procedural Rules" described in the Policy AC70 Dismissal of Tenured or Tenure-Eligible Faculty Members.

E. Cases involving questions of ethics related to research and other scholarly activities shall be referred to the Vice President for Research (See [Add]RP02[End Add] [Delete]RA10 [End Delete]).

F. Cases involving a claim of discrimination or sexual harassment will be referred to the Office of Affirmative Action (See B1 above). Should a multipart petition be filed that claims discrimination or harassment and also one of the grievances for which the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and/or the Standing Joint Committee on Tenure is responsible, each
CONCILIATION:

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

OMBUDSPERSON:

Selection and Responsibilities of Ombudspersons

A. An Ombudsperson shall be appointed in each of the colleges, campuses and academic units. For those not associated with an academic unit, or in cases where the appropriate ombudsperson may be in doubt, the following policy shall be applied:

1. Where appropriate, the ombudsperson will be from the same academic unit to which the employee is most closely associated. For example, research associates in the Applied Research Laboratory will have access to the ombudsperson for the College of Engineering.

2. In cases where there is disagreement or doubt as to the appropriate ombudsperson, the Executive Vice President and Provost shall make the determination.

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

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

C. Functions for the ombudsperson are:

1. Clarification of misunderstandings;

2. Advising faculty and administrators as to appropriate courses of action;
3. Assisting in the informal resolution of differences;

4. Assuring that appropriate department, college and/or campus procedures are exhausted before referring the case to higher levels;

5. Informing the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost and appropriate college or campus officials if a matter cannot be resolved at the lower level and the case is to be referred to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

6. The ombudsperson shall not:

   - Hold hearings;
   - Exceed the role of conciliator and advisor;
   - Substitute his or her judgment for that of appropriate administrative and/or faculty bodies;
   - Serve as counsel for either party to a complaint before the Hearing Board.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Establishment of the Committee

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

Six faculty members and three deans will be elected as alternates for three-year terms. Two of the faculty members shall be from academic voting units other than those at University Park. The term of office for members and alternates will be three years commencing on July 1. The terms will be staggered to provide for continuity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Role of a Hearing Board

For a particular case, a Hearing Board, consisting of two faculty members and one Dean to be chosen from the Committee by methods of its own selection, will be established to hear the case. The Hearing Board will elect its chairman from among its members. A member will remove himself or herself from a case if he or she deems himself or herself disqualified by reason of bias or interest. Each party will have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause. If disqualifications and challenges make it impossible to set up a Board with 3 members from the Committee or elected alternates, the Senate Council will select substitutes for a particular case. Each party will have a maximum of two challenges of such substitutes without stated cause. If a hearing is scheduled, notice will be served with a specific statement of the complaint at least 20 days prior to the hearing. The party complained against may waive a hearing or may respond to the complaint in writing at any time before the hearing.
Hearings before a Hearing Board will not be public. Publicity and public statements about the case by either the faculty member or administrative officers will be avoided until the proceedings have been completed. The Hearing Board may have present at the hearing such assistance as it deems necessary.

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

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

The parties will be afforded an opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence. The University administration will make reasonable efforts to cooperate with the Hearing Board in securing witnesses and making available documentary and other evidence. Parties will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses.

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

Decision of the Executive Vice President and Provost

Conclusions and recommendations from the Committee or a Hearing Board shall be submitted to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University through the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall notify the Chair of the decision that has been reached.

In the event that the Executive Vice President and Provost's decision is not in accord with the conclusions of the Committee or the Hearing Board, the reasons for that decision shall be specified to the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities who will inform the Committee and the parties directly involved. (See also Notification of the Executive Vice President and Provost's Decision in the "Guidelines for Implementation" section of this policy.) At the first regular Senate meeting of each academic year, the Chair of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities will present a brief general report of the Committee's activities.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

The Senate Report

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

Definition of Faculty

[Add] As noted above under “Scope,” the term "faculty member" refers to all full-time faculty including instructors and all professorial ranks and equivalent ranks as defined in Policy (AC-21). Exceptions to this definition are specified below in “Application of Policy to Other Faculty Personnel.” [End Add] [Delete] The term faculty member shall include the Senate’s definition of its electorate plus all research equivalent ranks as specified in the Policy Manual AC21. The definition is as follows: All persons who are not candidates for degrees at Penn State, who hold full-time academic appointments, and who fall into one of the following categories — those holding professorial, research or librarian titles, those who are full-time instructors or assistant librarians, and those other full-time academic employees who are members of the Graduate Faculty, but who do not fall into either of the above categories. [End Delete]

Issues for Review: Limitations

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

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

Application of Policy to Other [Delete] Professionals [End Delete] [Add] Faculty Personnel [End Add]

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

Obligations of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

The preliminary determination referred to in the third paragraph of Operation of the Committee must include a Committee judgment that the appropriate department, college and/or other unit administrative procedures have been exhausted prior to the point the Committee decides whether or not to review the petition further. In making such a judgment, the Committee shall consult with the ombudsperson in the appropriate college or campus.
In the event the Committee decides to informally review the case or hold a hearing, the petitioner, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, the appropriate college and/or campus official, and the college or campus ombudsperson shall be notified immediately.

Consultation Between Review Bodies

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

Notification of the Executive Vice President and Provost's Decision

After receiving the conclusions and recommendations on a case from a Hearing Board, the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University shall notify the parties directly involved, appropriate University administrative officers, and the Chair of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee as to his or her decision. The Chair shall be responsible for informing the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

UPDATES:
6/10/10 - Minor editorial adjustment to Operation of the Committee section.
10/20/09 - The Senate Committee on Committees and Rules voted to change the term of ombudsman to ombudsperson.
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“IBM Benefits Mentor with Watson” (https://www.ibm.com/us-en/marketplace/benefits-mentor-with-watson) is a decision-support tool that Penn State employees will soon have access to that allows them to make evidence-based decisions, by leveraging data and artificial intelligence, on the selection of Penn State’s healthcare benefits plans. The program will take employees’ actual health care claims over the last 18 months and calculates out-of-pocket expenses under the PPO plan and PPO Savings plan, so that employees can quickly identify the best-fit plan. Employees will also be able to input data to assist with projecting costs for the coming year. Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits for Penn State’s Human Resources since 2015, will deliver the presentation entitled “Benefits Mentor.”
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Travel Safety Network (TSN)

(Informational)

Currently at Penn State:

All students, faculty, and staff traveling either in a group or individually for University purposes (with a club, organization, team, college, or department) or with University funding must record international travel in the [Travel Safety Network] TSN database prior to departure as outlined in the University’s International Travel Requirements Policy. Quoted from: https://global.psu.edu/article/travel-safety-network-tsn. The policy referenced in the quotation is TR-01: https://policy.psu.edu/policies/tr01.

Gary Langsdale, University Risk Officer since 2003 and subject matter expert on travel policy, will deliver “Travel Safety Network (TSN),” a presentation about the origins of TSN, its impact on the University, and policies, procedures, and outcomes associated with the service.
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What is the TSN?

- Network of offices around campus that support and encourage international travel
  - Global Programs
  - Risk Management
  - Export & Compliance

- One-stop process for travelers to complete international travel registration
Why TSN?

- Natural Disasters
- Pandemics
- Political Unrest
- Terrorist Attacks
Why TSN?

Travel Insurance thru TSN Offers:
• Emergency Evacuation Services
• Medical, Political, Natural Disaster
• Repatriation of Remains
• Routine medical care from an illness or injury

Why TSN?
• Mental Health Resources
• Doctor/Clinic Support
• Emergency Hospital Support
• Dental Services Finder
• Prescription Equivalent Services
Penn State travelers in 2018

Benefits of TSN

- Access to 24-hour emergency assistance
- Access to automatic International Insurance
- Access to expansive international network of pre-approved medical facilities

24/7 365
Benefits of TSN Continued

- Group Registration for U.S. Dept. Of State Smart Traveler’s Enrollment Program (STEP)
- Access to specific travel resources – trip planning, logistics, safety and security advice/analysis
- Export Control Regulations and Customs Compliance Reviews for University Affiliated Travel

Big Ten Schools
National Peers

Positive Feedback

- It’s nice to have Penn State’s support!
- System is more streamlined than past versions!
- Glad to have international insurance coverage!
Feedback: We Hear You

- We are working to develop a blanket approval process!
- Flight & lodging information is now optional!
- Only restricted travel needs to be approved!

We've added additional information to the TSN receipt!

2015: 15 forms
2019: 3 forms
New TSN coming soon!
Appendix I
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Restricted Travel Approvals

Policy

Int. Trips
International Incidents

This is why we're here:

86  80  157

Questions?
The Senate Officers visited seven Commonwealth Campuses during the 2018 Fall Semester: Penn State Harrisburg (September 26, 2018), Penn State Brandywine (September 27, 2018), Penn State Great Valley (September 27, 2018), Penn State Abington (September 28, 2018), Penn State DuBois (October 29, 2018), Penn State Greater Allegheny (November 28, 2018), and Penn State New Kensington (November 28, 2018).

During these visits, the Senate Officers met with staff, students, faculty, and administrators. Each group was met with separately to encourage open and frank discussions. Two basic questions were asked in each meeting: “What do you enjoy about your unit and your position?” and “What are the challenges faced in your unit or position?” These simple questions led to rich discussions.

Executive Summary

Each of the campuses visited varied, of course, in its placement within the geography of the Commonwealth, its student population, and even its mission. Despite these differences, there were many shared positive attributes expressed by students, faculty, and staff. They spoke of the close-knit community they are able to belong to on their campus that supports close faculty-staff-student engagement, a lower cost of college attendance due to lower tuition rates and an ability to commute to campus, strong local expertise among faculty and staff, and an appreciation of the benefits of being part of a large Research 1 institution while in a smaller community setting.

There were also common concerns and needs expressed that came through our discussions with those who work and learn at these locations. Common themes included:

- Increasing access and affordability for students
- Improving the ability to promote programs and campuses in local markets
- Concerns related to varying course content and quality across Penn State campuses
- Rising out-of-pocket health care expenses
- Ongoing frustration with the implementation of new enterprise systems
- A perceived trend in centralization at the University that can have unintended consequences on Commonwealth Campus locations
- Expanding student access to courses across campuses
Campus Summaries

In addition to the overall Executive Summary provided above, each campus had its unique attributes and challenges. Below is a campus-by-campus summary, while the appendix to this report provides detailed notes from our visits with each campus. A careful reading of the appendix will illustrate the unique attributes and successes of our Commonwealth Campuses, as well as the important issues they are confronting. It is our hope that detailed information provided will ultimately reveal pathways for improvement.

Penn State Harrisburg, The Capital College

Staff at Penn State Harrisburg focused their discussions with us on issues related to "new system fatigue," rising health care costs, parking, changes in University payroll procedures for staff who work less than 12 months, compensation and benefits that they feel are not competitive with other area employers, dissatisfaction with CollegeNet, units with poor faculty-staff relations, and a perceived need for greater police presence on campus.

Students spoke about their experiences with varying course content and rigor across Penn State campuses, difficulty getting access to needed courses, a need for improved facilities, parking difficulties for commuter students, and a desire for improved communication about available career opportunities and counseling.

Faculty spoke about their desire to improve graduate enrollment rates; concerns related to health care (including the potential negative impact of the new student health insurance requirement and the potential negative impact of rising costs on staff hiring and retention); their desire to offer more online and hybrid courses for residential students, perceived issues related to faculty and administer relations; perceived delay in the rollout for the review and promotion of fixed-term faculty following the University's changes to AD21; a perception that faculty hiring committees have little real input in the academic hiring process; and a desire to better understand "One Penn State 2025" and its impact on student learning.

Penn State Brandywine

Staff shared concerns about reinstatement delays and negative teaching impact when FTII faculty and independent contractors have a break in service, barriers to serving students who have experienced academic difficulty when they return to their studies (particularly if doing so in the Spring semester because of the short amount of time between Fall and Spring), a desire for more support for faculty who want to do fieldwork with students, and issues related to attracting and retaining a diverse student, staff, and faculty population on their campus.

Students were interested in getting more four-year majors on their campus, having more high-quality non-American food options on campus, extending the hours of operation for
their campus library, inadequate parking, and improving communications about available scholarship opportunities.

Faculty spoke about a perceived lack of equity across the University for women, including gender parity in achieving promotion and tenure, and the negative potential impact with the restructuring of its diversity commissions; increasing faculty workloads and a need for more staff support; a desire to increase enrollments by adding more majors; concerns for the funding of Commonwealth Campuses; inadequate general salary increases and the negative impact on faculty and staff morale, performance, hiring, and retention; the rise in personal health care costs; administrative turnover (particularly of development officers who are hired away in what one person referred to as a “revolving door” dynamic); ongoing system fatigue and frustration; a need to have better pathways for research collaboration across the University; a need for more mental health resources for their students; and concern that Associate Professor service expectations make it difficult for their faculty to secure promotion to full professor.

Penn State Great Valley

Staff at Penn State Great Valley shared the findings of a campus survey from 2017 that revealed issues related to poor faculty-staff relations that they feel are ongoing despite training that was sponsored by the campus, concerns that they are short-staffed and undercompensated for the geographic area in which they work and live, and an overall feeling of system fatigue and related frustration.

Faculty spoke of growing class sizes, a desire for food services at their location (they currently do not have a cafeteria or coffee service), an interest in having more support to engage in research, concerns for their campus climate as raised by the 2017 campus survey, and a desire to enable students to retain their Penn State identity and email address after graduation as a way to keep in contact with those individuals.

Students talked about the constraints related to having a masters thesis that much be completed in the campus’s 7 week course terms, their desire to have more information about independent project opportunities available to them, increased transparency with regard to scholarship awards, their interest in becoming involved with the University’s Data Analytics and Business Intelligence Strategy Initiative, as well as its sustainability efforts, concerns for a perceived lack of curricular coherence across course sections, a need to increase and improve campus facilities and resources, and a desire to be more engaged in student activities and governance opportunities at their campus and with University Park.

Administrators confirmed staff reports of workplace climate concerns and added concerns for increasing their faculty presence on campus and trying to market their campus in the popular Philadelphia market where even Penn State World Campus is a competitor.
Penn State Abington

Penn State Abington staff spoke about their commitment to "access and affordability" given the high number of at-risk students who gravitate to this campus and are in need of support both academically and financially, issues related to the implementation of policies through LionPATH, student difficulties navigating multiple different University systems instead of a single portal, ongoing concerns related to the negative impact on students of the University's late fee policy and procedures, the need for more advising staff in order to meet students' needs, opportunities for increased faculty involvement in marketing the campus's programs, a need for space in order to meet the campus's growth goals, and a desire to seek University-supported graduate study outside of Penn State for campuses like theirs that are geographically far from Penn State's doctoral granting opportunities.

Students brought up concerns for improved and additional facilities to support both living and learning on campus, a need for on-campus catering services that are available and affordable for student events, a desire for a meal plan for commuter students, help addressing rising tuition rates to keep Penn State affordable for all, improved room assignments for large-enrolling classrooms, perceived differences in funding and resources for the campus' athletic teams, and better support for campus Thon organizations.

Faculty focused their comments on a need for the University to make decisions that keep in mind the unique missions and needs of each campus and its student population, concerns related to salary compression and its impact on recruitment and retention, a desire to have access to the resources and opportunities comparable to that of other campuses within the University, the importance of keeping access and affordability forefront in the University's actions, concerns for the negative impact of the Common Schedule on their ability to schedule events and meetings, a desire for clarification of the promotion criteria for fixed-term faculty, improving student advising through the increased use of professional advisors, a need for open and transparent communication related to the responsibilities and buy-outs for program chairs, and improving classroom assignment decisions to ensure adequate space is provided.

Penn State DuBois

Staff at Penn State DuBois spoke about their concerns related to their students’ limited level of access to University Park and World Campus courses, confusion about processes and responsibilities when using WorkLion, the potential negative impact of the University’s new student health insurance requirement, adverse changes made to their schedule related to the Common Hour, needed renovations to their Multipurpose Building, frustrations with LionPATH including the need to use a separate system to track non-credit enrollments, a desire for additional professional development opportunities to prepare for career advancement, and their desire to be allowed to teach seminar courses.
Penn State DuBois students discussed the need to renovate their Multipurpose Building, too, as well as a need for additional student-centered space for events, meetings, etc. They also talked about a desire to have extended food service hours with additional healthy options, concerns about the implementation of “Smoke-free Penn State,” observed differences in course content and rigor across Penn State campuses, varying quality of instruction, a need for access to up-to-date software and equipment to support their learning, and difficulty getting access to needed courses.

Faculty on campus discussed their frustrations when having to deal with multiple systems when handling processes like transfer credits, a general new system fatigue, interest in learning more about the recent “Third Party Content Report,” a desire for increasing the use of professional advisors, the unintended impact on faculty of having a shared chancellor/DAA role, confusion over the new AD21 promotion processes and requirements, the adverse impact on course offerings and program growth opportunities when cutting back numbers of teaching faculty, and classroom management issues related to incorporating dual enrollment students into select courses.

**Penn State Greater Allegheny**

Staff at Penn State Greater Allegheny spoke about the workload impacts of growing campus enrollments, a perceived disparity in duties and pay in comparison with colleagues at other campuses, a general new system fatigue, frustrations due to delays in service and a loss of a local “advocate” under the new HR Shared Services system, and the negative impact that a one-year hold on rehiring during a VRP can have on smaller campuses.

Students focused their comments on a desire for more healthy food service options, as well as a need for improving facilities across campus along the lines of the positive changes recently made to their Frable Building.

Penn State Greater Allegheny faculty said they would like to see more coverage of campus events in the news media in order to bring positive attention to the campus, additional faculty in order to offer more courses and provide more research opportunities for undergraduate students, and closer initial involvement with their colleagues at University Park when changes to curricula offered at their campus are being considered. They also shared their concerns about the recommendations from the University’s Academic Integrity Report and the possible negative impacts of its recommendations on Commonwealth Campuses, an observed delay in the processing of ORP submissions that is having adverse consequences on grant proposals and classroom assignments, a desire for more healthy food service options, a significant need to improve their library facilities, and the difficulties they are experiencing with finding local health care providers that participate in the Aetna plan.

Administrators added their own concern for what they perceive as an over-centralization of University processes and procedures, which they said can add unnecessary steps and overlook local expertise. They also spoke about a desire to have more direct campus
representation on the central University committees that will be working on One Penn State 2025 in order to ensure that the implementation of the initial report’s recommendations is well thought out with regard to their impact on the Commonwealth Campuses.

Penn State New Kensington

Staff at Penn State New Kensington wanted to discuss the negative financial impact of the University’s late fees on students, the loss of needed staff due to the VRP and the problems they face trying to rehire staff in a competitive market where wages are higher outside the University, issues they have encountered due to the UPMC/Highmark “battle” in their region, increased dental expenses under the new plan, and a desire to see a financial return when an employee does not need to participate in Penn State’s healthcare plan because they are covered by a spouse who works externally. They also spoke about the challenges they face competing against other higher education institutions when looking at factors like cost and ability to transfer credits into the University, concerns related to their students’ access to World Campus courses, frustration with the curriculum approval process, a desire to offer first year seminars as a way to create a sense of community and strengthen retention efforts, opportunities for staff to contribute to the classroom by sharing their expertise in first year seminars, and a need for more multi-functional and private meeting spaces for students on campus to support recruitment, retention, and student/faculty/staff interactions.

Campus students were concerned about having a sufficient recruiting presence at their location, needed improvements to the transfer credit process, a desire to have greater access to University Park facilities and faculty to support learning, increased access to courses via the Digital Learning Cooperative, experiences they have encountered when one University system seemed to not “talk to” another University system, the negative impact of the Common Hour on scheduling student activities, a desire for more cross-University collaboration among students in support of student activities, and a desire for lower prices for campus food services and campus housing.

Faculty talked about a need for greater resources to support cross-University research collaboration, their commitment to "access and affordability" and a need for more student financial aid and scholarships as a recruitment tool, a desire to expand their marketing reach beyond their current service area and to be able to promote their unique programs beyond their service area, interest in more fully promoting each campus’s associate degree programs as a means for increasing access and affordability, better serving student needs through reimagining and restructuring space, concerns related to poor customer service experiences with central University offices, and a need for additional mental health services.
Further Information

The appendix to this report provides more detailed information regarding each of these campus visits. It can be found in the Senate Meetings tab in BoardEffect.
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The Senate Officers visited five academic units during the 2018-19 academic year: the College of Nursing (January 8, 2019), the Bellisario College of Communications (March 14, 2019), the College of the Liberal Arts (March 14, 2019), the Eberly College of Science (April 4, 2019), and the College of Health and Human Development (April 8, 2019).

During these visits, the Senate Officers met with staff, students, faculty, and administrators. Each group was met with separately to encourage open and frank discussions. Two basic questions were asked in each meeting: “What do you enjoy about your unit and your position?” and “What are the challenges faced in your unit or position?” These simple questions led to rich discussions.

Executive Summary

Each academic unit varied in their enrollment, their academic programs, and the nature of their student populations. They shared common praise for the colleges and the University, particularly for their students, the resources available to them, collegial working environments, the reforms to AC21 that provided new promotion pathways and ranks for fixed term faculty, and their colleges’ leadership.

When asked about their challenges, consistent themes were also evident:

- **Reimagining IT**: There were a number of concerns about the potential changes that this initiative will bring to the IT structure at the University; we heard a strong desire for more guidance and direction on what it will entail.
- **The Graduate School**: There were ongoing concerns with regard to the Graduate School, specifically the way in which policies are created and implemented, as well as for the leadership structure of the Graduate Council.
- **HR Shared Services**: Units expressed a general dissatisfaction with the new HR Shared Services structure and a perception that staff roles and responsibilities, which can be unique within their units, are not adequately reflected by the University's job profiles and salary bands.
- **WorkDay**: We heard concerns regarding unnecessary redundancies in the system, frustrations over increased length of time to complete tasks, and a need for more direct staff and administrative access to WorkDay to improve communications and reduce data entry errors.
- **Simba**: With the launch of Simba coming, many staff, faculty, and administrators shared their frustrations with the new support systems that have been introduced in the last few years, voicing a strong desire to have more “boots on the ground” individuals involved in system design and user testing.
• **Annual performance reviews for staff:** Many shared concerns regarding the annual performance process, which now includes a simple 1-2-3 ranking scale that they feel makes it difficult to differentiate and reward staff performance

• **Exam proctoring resources:** We heard a general dissatisfaction with the availability and cost of exam proctoring resources across the University, with a call for additional resources both on campus and online

• **Academic advising:** While issues related to advising varied across colleges, there was a shared recognition that professional advising is essential in University Park colleges

• **Funding for Fixed Term faculty promotions:** Several units raised voiced a desire for central University support for the funding of fixed term faculty promotion raises in order to prevent units from having a disincentive to promote these individuals,

• **Staff recognition:** We heard a call for better recognition of staff contributions to their colleges and to the University to incentivize and recognize their value to the University, as well as a mechanism to provide staff with a stronger voice at the University, particularly with regard to policies that materially affect their working conditions

**Unit Summaries**

In addition to the overall themes shared above, unique information was learned from each academic unit. Below is a unit-by-unit summary. The appendix to this report provides detailed notes from our visits with each academic unit that provides greater detail. A careful reading of the appendix will illustrate the unique attributes and successes of our academic units, as well as the important issues they are confronting. It is our hope that this information will ultimately reveal pathways for improvement.

**College of Nursing**

Staff in the college shared their concerns for ongoing systems fatigue, data entry frustrations with regard to Activity Insight, a desire for more timely communications from the College and University, a need for better internal customer service across the University, frustrations with the annual performance process and the limited scale with which performance can be ranked, a perceived loss of local connection to Human Resources support, increased growth at the University and impact on workloads, the potential impact of the Reimagining IT initiative, and a desire for increased public recognition of staff contributions.

Students we met with discussed their concerns for the cost of their Nursing education (particularly the many resources and supplies they pay for) and a desire to have more flexibility in their schedules to participate in academics and extracurricular opportunities outside of their college.
Faculty from both University Park and Hershey locations shared their concerns regarding a decrease in the amount of teaching and learning support they have access to; a hope that more fixed term faculty will receive multi-year contracts; frustration over the amount of time it takes to enter their information into Activity Insight, as well as a dislike for the resulting format of the output; a desire to have faculty workloads addressed in the College to better incorporate how clinicals and responsibilities for Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) students are factored in; a desire for increased support for those who are being asked to pursue a Ph.D.; frustrations with the quality of videoconferencing capabilities between University Park and Hershey; and a dissatisfaction with the availability and cost of exam proctoring resources.

Bellisario College of Communications

Staff we met with reported frustrations with the processes for entering work time, vacation, etc. now in place with WorkDay; disappointment with the new process that requires completion of an English Fluency Certification form for every faculty member regardless of their native tongue; a disconnect between You@PSU and WorkDay (the former is now used only for JRWs and the latter is now used for annual reviews) and frustrations with the annual performance process and the limited scale with which performance can be ranked; and a need for increased support for their heavily used staff advising services.

The student we met with shared both praise and frustration for the College’s staff advising, saying that it is valuable but that it can be hard to get an appointment due to busy advisor schedules; a desire to have a way to filter the communications they receive from the College and University based on interest; and a request for common space for students much like the one provided by the Smeal College of Business.

Faculty who attended shared their ongoing concerns with regard to the Graduate School, specifically the way in which policies are created and the leadership structure of the Graduate Council; frustrations with regard to how SRTEs are utilized; concerns about the University’s retirement and health benefits structures which utilize sole providers; questions related to how the University handled payments for those who participated in the Voluntary Retirement Program (VRP); and a desire for central University support for the funding of fixed term faculty promotion raises in order to prevent units from having a disincentive to promote these individuals.

Administrators added their concerns for the University requirement to have a common schedule, which they reported can make it difficult for a college like theirs to schedule sufficient time for courses requiring lengthy meeting times (like production studios).

College of the Liberal Arts

Staff from the College shared concerns related to Human Resources, particularly frustrations with the annual performance process and the limited scale with which performance can be ranked and what they perceive as a narrow perception of staff roles.
and responsibilities as reflected by the University’s job profiles; dissatisfaction with the new HR Shared Services structure and a desire to have a single point of contact with HR Shared Services rather than a ticketing system, as well as more direct access to WorkDay to improve communications and reduce data entry errors; concerns about a potential increase of centralized marketing and communications at the University that they fear might not meet college-level unique needs and challenges; worry about the launch of Simba; a desire for staff to have a stronger voice at the University, like the faculty do via the University Faculty Senate; and a feeling of inequity with regard to University policies related to maternity and paternity leave.

Students shared a feeling of discrepancy among graduate stipends that they feel has not been sufficiently explained; a sense of a lack of diversity within some of their academic programs; concern for students who did not qualify academically for financial support upon admission (but who are now excelling) and difficulty with providing them with the financial support they need; frustration for international students who have to pay late fees if their H1-B visa application is delayed due to a Penn State administrative delay; and questions about the role of engaged scholarship and the timing of events that promote engaged scholarship opportunities.

College faculty reported that some office spaces are insufficient in size (and/or are shared), making it difficult to meet with students and colleagues or to have space to concentrate on their work; frustrations with regard to how SRTEs are utilized in the fixed term promotion process; ongoing system fatigue and frustration for policies that have been changed or cannot be implemented due to system limitations; a desire to have more University support for the recognition of competitive academic teams and clubs, much like it promotes athletic team achievements; questions about how administrators evaluate teaching beyond the SRTE; and requests for more support and investment in teaching and learning at the College level.

Administrators added concerns related to research, particularly with regards to lag time within the IRB approval process and the Office of General Counsel (e.g., when their assistance is needed with grants and contracts); ongoing space needs for the college; frustrations with the new Graduate School requirement to provide annual Graduate Assistant stipends of at least $25,000 per year, and a desire for central University support for the funding of fixed term faculty promotion raises in order to prevent units from having a disincentive to promote these individuals.

Eberly College of Science

Staff from the College spoke about heavy workloads and a perceived lack of recognition for their roles; varied relations with tenured/tenure-line faculty; frustration for the level of General Salary Increases and promotion opportunities that can be limited by their lack of ability to demonstrate experiences that are required by HR but not part of their current position; a sense of disparity with regard to classification and pay across the University; frustration for what they see as a narrow perception of staff roles and responsibilities as reflected by the University's job profiles and salary bands; dissatisfaction with the new
HR Shared Services structure; a desire for recognition of the unique nature of academic advising in the college, which requires them to advise students across the University; a request for increased support for professional development; a desire for increased public recognition of staff contributions; overall system fatigue and increased workload related to new systems; a request to have more "boots on the ground" users involved in user testing and development; a need for staff to have a stronger voice at the University, like the faculty do via the University Faculty Senate; and a request for increased faculty support to better incentivize and recognize faculty for their work with special living communities.

Students expressed a desire for mentorship training and accountability for college faculty, both at the graduate and undergraduate levels; a desire for more engaged and productive relationships between graduate advisors and their students in order to support time-to-degree progress; and a request for more interdisciplinary classroom experiences to better prepare them for future career opportunities.

Faculty discussion focused on concerns related to the enforcement of prerequisites, particularly when students take prerequisite courses at another institution; enforcement of class schedules prior to a semester break; suggestions related to the messaging surrounding campus cancellations and a request for resources that provide tips and strategies for how to address missed class time; a dissatisfaction with the availability of exam proctoring resources; ongoing concerns with regard to the Graduate School, specifically the way in which policies are created and the leadership structure of the Graduate Council; difficulties in finding sufficient classroom space, particularly for large class needs; a request to be able to schedule classroom spaces during finals week; and a sense of disparity with regard to staff classification and pay across the University.

Administrators added concerns regarding the potential impacts of the Reimagining IT initiative and IT staff anxiety over the process and their level of input.

**College of Health and Human Development**

Staff shared a desire to better understand the advising structure at the University and to have better consistency within that structure across the institution; a frustration with WorkDay related to perceived unnecessary redundancies, increased length of time to complete tasks, and a need for more direct access to WorkDay to improve communications and reduce data entry errors; ongoing system fatigue and a desire to have more “boots on the ground” users involved in user testing and development; frustration related to the General Education reform and what has seemed like changing and/or conflicting instructions they have received; and a need for increased accountability related to the University's diversity and inclusion efforts.

Students who attended expressed a desire for increased communication and collaboration across academic programs, as well as a call for improved efforts toward diversity and inclusion.
Faculty expressed frustration with regard to the role of HR in the faculty hiring process and their lack of ability to make competitive job offers; a desire for access to national resources, such as the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity, to better support women seeking tenure; a need to support faculty involvement in efforts to diversify the graduate student population; a request for more flexible marketing of the college and programs to appeal to today’s students; a call for refining systems like LionPATH to be less cumbersome to use; a desire to address the slow-down in the curricular approval process during the summer semester; and concern for staff in their college who report a fear of retaliation when raising questions or concerns.

Administrators added a request for clarifications and guidelines related to providing summary SRTE data for promotion and tenure dossiers; a need to be able to identify course prerequisites across an entire program of study (versus having to look this up course-by-course); and suggested other academic units replicate their strategy of sharing items of interest from Faculty Senate with staff as a way to better facilitate communications.

Further Information

The appendix to this report provides more detailed information regarding each of these campus visits. It can be found in the Senate Meetings tab in BoardEffect.
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Chair Rowland called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. on October 8, 2019, in 102 Kern Graduate Building.

The minutes of the Tuesday, August 27, 2019 meeting were approved with one correction.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

The Faculty Advisory Committee to the President met this morning with Provost Jones, and discussed the following topics:

1. University investments in fossil fuels.
2. Efforts to improve the working lives of Adjunct and Part-time faculty.
3. Communication and transparency regarding general salary increases.
4. Holiday closure policy for staff.
5. Members of FAC also followed-up on items from the August 23, 2019 meeting.

The next FAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 12, 2019. Please submit any topics for FAC consideration to any of the Senate Officers or the elected FAC members, Bonj Szczygiel, Carey Eckhardt, and Rose Jolly.
Remarks from the Chair

Chair Rowland reported an update on consultation with the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) on feedback about the move toward “pay for play” and the NCAA’s recent efforts to defend the “amateur athlete model” in court. The resulting letter, which also includes survey response material on the very same topic, is on the Senate website. The Senate received positive feedback from Bonnie Ownley, the chair of COIA, indicating that Penn State’s response memo was among the finest in the country. Chair Rowland thanked Mark Stephens, chair the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, and Faculty Athletic Representative, Dennis Scanlon for their assistance.

Chair Rowland also discussed the Senate responses to the new Academic Integrity Committee. The report summarizes feedback gathered from the past year; and reports although senators support the many aspects of the reports, they voice concern over the shift away from location-based systems, the treatment of international students in the report, and the interpretation of evidence used to justify recommendations in general. A subset of the Academic Integrity Task Force should work with the University Faculty Senate to re-visit recommendation two.

Chair Rowland discussed a memo, sent to the Senate by Cesar Martínez-Garza, Associate Professor and Coordinator of Mathematics, from Penn State Berks. The University’s Undergraduate Mathematics faculty held a vote following its Spring semester meeting to ratify the current request. It is the position of the UG Mathematics faculty that our students are better served by adding the GQ classification to inter-domain courses. In order to move forward, Senate leadership encouraged Undergraduate Mathematics faculty to submit a formal request to the Senate, which must include more detailed background information on why GQ is not currently eligible for inter-domain courses, explain why they should be, its benefit to students and a recommendation for Senate action. A joint sub-committee, with Senators drawn from our Standing Committees on Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid, Curricular Affairs, and Education, will consider the request.

Also, one quick last note: during the first plenary session of the year, in addition to recommending to faculty that staff appreciation is significant – we heard about the importance of making accommodations for students seeking to explore their spiritual lives during holy days. Student complaints about faculty not accommodating holy days are at an all-time low, so, we are on the right side of history on that one.

Vice Presidents’ and Vice Provosts’ Comments

Provost Nick Jones began by discussing the issue of staff scheduling over winter break and assured council that staff that choose to work instead of taking a vacation day will have heat in the buildings. He reported that reporting requirements for Foreign gifts are changing to make it much more burdensome and may require all gifts from foreign sources be reported, even those that are very small. The next phase of the strategic plan implementation and oversight has begun. The budget news is not good and despite cuts of finding 36 million of recurring savings, the units will have to begin recycling 1 to 2% of their budgets. There is a budget town hall meeting next week.
**Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke**

Ongoing Executive Searches: Vice Provost for Global Programs: Two candidates have been identified, one came last week and the other will be in this week.

Dean, College of Arts and Architecture: Two candidates, both will be on campus the last two weeks of October.

AD77: Engaging in Outside Professional Activities (Conflict of Commitment) This policy describes the mechanism and principles that permit University employees to engage in activities outside the University while preserving their primary professional duties and responsibilities to the University. University employees are encouraged to engage in outside activities when such activities enhance the mission of the University and do not compete with the University.

The policy stipulates that each College submit guidelines specific to their unit that operationalize this policy, and that these guidelines be displayed on a single website. These guidelines should, at a minimum, identify a representative set of teaching activities that do, and do not, require approval from the Budget Administrator and Budget Executive. They may also identify types of teaching activity that require approval only from a Dean or Department Chair, identify specific teaching activity that will not be approved under any circumstances, and provide other clarifications the College deems appropriate.

**Rob Pangborn, Vice President and Dean of Undergraduate Education**

Summer/Fall Baccalaureate paid accepts have held reasonably steady since the corrections were made after the Add/Drop period for paid forfeits and no-shows and are up about 375 or 2.4% compared to last year. The draft census of fall enrollments to be released this week shows a net increase for the entering baccalaureate class of 278, or 1.8% from 2018-2019, reflecting at least in part, the attrition of summer starts who did not return for fall. The census will provide details on the official enrollments for all degrees across the university.

Undergraduate Admissions began to make direct offers of admission for fall 2020 to first-choice Commonwealth Campus applications this week.

The new Discover Penn State scholarship program is set to go, designed to encourage enrollments from the contiguous states: NJ, NY, OH, MD, VA, WV, DE, and DC.

Scholarship recipients must start at a Commonwealth Campus and schedule 30 credits per year (completing at least 24 credits) in order to be eligible for renewal. First-time students with be considered to receive $6K scholarships for the first two years and $7K for the next two years if they remain at a Commonwealth Campus to complete their degrees. Transfer students enrolling at a Commonwealth Campus with be eligible for $6.5K scholarships for up to 3 years.

Interviews of two finalists for Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions were held last week, and interviews to two additional finalists will occur this week.
Vice Provost for Educational Equity, Marcus Whitehurst.
A recent case of an insensitive letter about a football players hairstyle has generated a lot of negative press. Many people inside and outside the Penn State Community have condemned the letter as demonstrating racism and bias and a new website will go live later this semester.

Vice Provost for On-line Education, Renata Engel. Vice Provost Engel was pleased that the World Campus student government will be represented on the Faculty Senate just as other student groups such as CCSG, UPUA and GPSA have seats on the senate. Details are still being worked out. Reciprocity agreements are being developed that can help students seeking internships.

Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, Madlyn Hanes was not able to attend.

Senate Officers no comments

Executive Director, Blasko. no comments

**ACTION ITEMS**

There was one P-4 proposal for closure of the Agricultural Communications Minor approved by Senate Council after consultation with the Faculty Affairs and Curricular Affairs Committee.

The University Faculty Senate has a consultative and advisory role on the academic impact of proposals that involve the establishment, reorganization, naming or discontinuation of academic organizational units. Senate Council reviewed a request from the Provost to change Graphic Arts from a program to a Department. The Senate committees on Faculty Affairs and Curricular affairs were consulted and had no concerns. There was a brief discussion about a letter from one department head indicating concerns about resources. Senate Council voted that the proposal be implemented as described in the documents.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS.**

Roger Egolf, Senate Historian and Chair of Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology, discussed the relationship between the Senate, Senate Council, and Graduate Council from a historical perspective.

**GRADUATE COUNCIL.** The Graduate Council has transitioned smoothly to shared governance. In addition to creating governance documents (Articles of Authority) that were approved by the Senate Council, they elected their own leadership. Dr. Ken Davis presided over his initial meeting as chair of the Grad Council on September 11, 2019 and the activities of the council proceeded smoothly. Graduate Council will have their next meeting of this academic year on Wednesday, October 17, 2019.
SENATE AGENDA ITEMS FOR October 29, 2019

FORENSIC BUSINESS

The Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs, Intra-University Relations and University Planning co-sponsored a forensic report entitled, “Office Space.” A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by a Szczygjel/Eckhardt motion. 20 minutes were allotted for discussion.

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, “Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, section 5(e) Committee on Faculty Affairs, re: Mandating Tenure Flow Report”. A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by a Szczygjel/Eckhardt motion. After discussion it was decided that both the tenure flow and promotion flow report should be cosponsored by Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations.

Senate Committee on Committees and Rules, “Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, section 5(j) Intra-University Relations, re: Mandating Promotion Flow Report”. A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by a Szczygjel/Eckhardt motion. After discussion it was decided that both the tenure flow and promotion flow report should be cosponsored by Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations.

Senate Committee on Student Life, “Proposed Senate Policy 89-00 Student Privacy Regarding Letters of Recommendation”. There was an extensive discussion of the proposed policy that included questions such as whether graduate students and undergraduate students would both be included, whether faculty or students would be responsible for obtaining the release of student records and who would be responsible for keeping the records. Past Chair Bérubé made a motion to return the report to the committee and Senate Council voted to send it back to Student Life for clarification.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Chair Rowland explained that the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs decided to withdraw the report AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” (Executive Vice President) for clarification.

Faculty Affairs, Revision to AC-76 “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” (Ombudsperson and Gender changes) was placed on the agenda by a King/Kirby motion.

Faculty Affairs, “Revision to AC-76, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” (Faculty Definitions) was placed on the agenda by a Sinha/Stephens, motion after a change to remove “visiting scholars” who are not Penn State Employees from the groups that can petition FR&R.
INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. “Benefits Mentor.” A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by an Eckhardt/Petrilla. The presenters were allotted up to 15 minutes for presentation and discussion.

Senate Committee on Global programs. “Travel Safety Network (TSN).” A motion to place the report on the agenda was made by a Petrilla/Szczygiel motion. Up to 15 minutes were allotted for presentation and discussion.

Senate Council. “Report on Fall 2018 Commonwealth Campus Visits.” The report was placed on the agenda by a King/Eckhardt motion. The executive summary of the campus visits will be included with the agenda and the details will be placed in the Senate box folder. The report will be presented on the Senate website only.

Senate Council. “Report on Spring 2019 College Visits.” A motion to place the report was placed on the agenda by a Szczygiel/Sinha motion. The executive summary of the college visits will be included with the agenda and the details will be placed in the senate box folder. The report will be presented on the Senate website only.

On a King/Eckhardt motion, the Agenda for the October 29, 2019 Senate meeting was approved.

Chair Rowland thanked Council members for their attendance and participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

*Dawn G. Blasko, Executive Director*
Date: October 22, 2019

To: All Senators and Committee Members

From: Dawn Blasko, Executive Director

Following is the time and location of all Senate meetings October 28th and 29th, 2019. Please notify the University Faculty Senate office and committee chair if you are unable to attend.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2019

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

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

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2019

8:00 a.m.

   Intercollegiate Athletics – 102 Burrowes Building

8:30 a.m.

   Committees and Rules – 201 Kern Graduate Building
   Curricular Affairs – 102 Kern Graduate Building
   Educational Equity and Campus Environment – 315 Grange Building
   Faculty Affairs – 202 Hammond Building
   Faculty Benefits – 214 Business Building
   Intra-University Relations – 504 Agricultural Sciences and Industries Building
   Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology– 510A Paterno
   Outreach – 114 Kern Building
   Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity – 502 Keller Building
   University Planning – 424 Ag. Administration Building
9:00 a.m.
   Admissions, Records, Scheduling, and Student Aid – 203 Shields Building
   Education – 110C Chandlee Lab
   Global Programs – 412 Boucke Building
   Student Life – 613 Kern Graduate Building

11:00 a.m.
   Student Senator Caucus – 114 Kern Building

11:15 a.m.
   Commonwealth Caucus Meeting – Nittany Lion Inn, Assembly Room

1:30 p.m.
   University Faculty Senate – 112 Kern Graduate Building
Date: October 22, 2019
To: Commonwealth Caucus Senators (includes all elected campus Senators)
From: Rosemarie Petrilla and Michael Bartolacci, Caucus Co-chairs

MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2019 – 8:15 PM
102 KERN BUILDING

Guest Speakers: Jennifer Wilkes, Rick Brazier, and Kathy Bieschke

Topic:
Faculty Contracts

Zoom Connectivity Information:
Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://psu.zoom.us/j/384648300
Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16468769923,384648300# or +16699006833,384648300# Or Telephone:
Dial: +1 646 876 9923 (US Toll), +1 669 900 6833 (US Toll)
Meeting ID: 384 648 300
International numbers available: https://zoom.us/u/bWAGfK2hj
Or an H.323/SIP room system: H.323:
162.255.36.11 (US East)
Meeting ID: 384 648 300
SIP: 384648300@zoomerc.com

**************************************************
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2019 – 11:15 AM
ASSEMBLY ROOM, NITTANY LION INN
A buffet luncheon will be provided at 12:00 p.m.

Agenda

I. Call to Order
II. Announcements
III. Committee Reports
IV. Other Items of Concern/New Business
V. Adjournment and Lunch