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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, October 29, 2019, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Nicholas Rowland, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Rowland: It is 1:30 PM, Tuesday, October 29, 2019, and the University Faculty Senate is now in session. Agenda Item A, Minutes of the preceding meeting. The September 17, 2019, Senate record was sent to the University archives and is posted on the Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions? Seeing none-- may I have a motion to accept?

Audience: Aye

Chair Rowland: Second?

Audience: Aye

Chair Rowland: All in favor?

Audience: Aye.

Chair Rowland: Opposed? The ayes have it. The motion carries. The Minutes of the meeting have been approved.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Item B, Communications to the Senate. The Senate Curriculum report dated October 8, 2019, is now posted on the Senate website.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Next, report of Senate Council. Minutes from the October 8, 2019, meeting of Senate Council is now available at the end of your Agenda, which include riveting topics discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on that same day? The next Item, Announcements by the Chair. These announcements are just a brief series of updates.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Item number one, about this time last year, then Chair, now Past Chair Bérubé in the front row here received a final report from the Academic Integrity Task Force. The Chair charged six Standing Committees with providing feedback. Members of the task force met with each of the committees to answer questions about the report in a Plenary meeting of the Senate December 2018. The Chair urged each and every Senator to review and report-- to view the report of the Academic Integrity Task Force and provide individual feedback in the form of comments, criticisms, and questions. Feedback was extensive and came in many forms. We received a formal report from one committee, statements from Campus Governance Units, and additional feedback transmitted to the Senate office through discussion forums, informal memos, email correspondence, and even as component parts of Meeting Minutes from the Standing Committees. While Chair Bérubé rallied support urging feedback from the task force, it was then incumbent upon myself to
formulate a response and summarize the ample feedback. Thank you, Michael. Full text from the resulting memo is also available on the Senate website and very brief summary.

And I quote, "Members of the University Faculty Senate did not contest recommendations to update current policy and procedure on academic integrity to improve consistency from location to location, recommendations to adapt to new modalities of academic dishonesty, and recommendations to improve integrity resources, especially resources for preventing violations and understanding appropriate sanctions." In contrast, members of the University Faculty Senate cautioned against the implementation of the current recommendation to centralize Penn State's Academic Misconduct process at this time.

Feedback indicated that the University should consider developing and presenting alternative models of what Penn State's Academic Misconduct process could be beyond a single model presented in the final report, in particular, alternative options, the creation of a centralized, University-wide adjudication committee to manage all student appeals and assign sanctions. In follow-up discussions since with members of the Academic Integrity Task Force, which have been very productive, the task force and the Senate agreed to work together and revisit the recommendation to create a centralized University-Wide Adjudication System. Meanwhile, implementation of many of the other recommendations is already under way, so more on that as that develops.

Item number two, in late August of this year, which somehow feels so long ago, the Senate office received a request in the form of a letter from the Chair of the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics asking Faculty Senates at Universities across the nation to provide feedback on any NCAA efforts to defend the Amateur Athlete Model of Collegiate Student Athletes in state and federal courts against a competing model, the so-called Pay for Performance Model, whereby student athletes can be compensated for the use of their names, images, and likenesses. Shortly thereafter, the Senate office circulated a brief survey regarding faculty opinions about the NCAA's recent efforts as well as Faculty opinions about the Student Athlete Model adopted here at Penn State. With the results of that survey in addition to robust counsel from I guess somewhat unsurprisingly Senate Council, we prepared a memo in response, the full text of which is also available on the Senate website. And the timing could not have been better.

As in the interim, the state of California's landmark Fair Pay to Play Act Bill was supported which allows financial compensation to collegiate athletes in the Sunshine State in the future. We'll watch that development very closely.

My good Senators on Intercollegiate Athletics between compensation for student athletes and the rise of gambling on college sports, we wish you well and good luck with this year. Last item, number three, last month, the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California's Rosier School of Education selected two winners for the 2019 Delphi Award, an award designed to recognize past success and support continued efforts to and I quote, "promote student success by systematically improving the working lives of Adjunct, Contingent, and Nontenure Track Faculty." As we all know, without the support of these cherished faculty, we would struggle mightily to live up to our 21st-century land-grant mission.”

Reading from the announcement, a collaborative team of instructors and administrators at Penn State University are recognized for their three-year push that culminated in a radical overhaul of Penn State's policy governing faculty appointments, a change that benefited over 3,000 nontenure track faculty across 24 campuses-- glad they got that one right. This included establishing a consistent and professionalized
title and rank system for faculty, setting standard promotion procedures, such as structured compensation increases during promotions, and forming committees made up of nontenure track faculty responsible for the evaluation of nontenure track faculty promotions on each campus. Penn State has thus been identified as a national leader in improving the working lives of its faculty and for us in the Senate who have done so much to cultivate this policy and who are committed to monitoring its implementation. Sorry, we've all done so much on this for so long. So, to everyone who contributed to the many, many, many, many and then some more changes, the good old AC21, Senator and Administrator alike, please let's take a brief shared moment to applaud our recent victory in shared governance.

[APPLAUSE]

I didn't expect to get choked up on that one. But that's all for me-- so moving on. Comments by the President of the University, we respectfully invite President Barron to the floor. President Barron, please address the Senate.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Barron: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity [INAUDIBLE] very well today [INAUDIBLE] Can you hear me? Oh, it's better.

Chair Rowland: Much better.

President Barron: --for which there appears to be some association with a fraternity. I just want you to know this is a State College Police matter, not a Penn State matter. But we are taking all deliberate caution to make sure students are safe hence the notion of an interim suspension. That's exactly what it is, interim. And so, I'm quite certain you will hear more later, but it is most likely to come through State College Police, rather than the University and the university after that.

So, I just wanted to make sure that to address it as best I could, but it's clearly limited since this is not our investigation. I believe you will hear more and more about budget process and seeking avenues for greater revenues and for reductions. I'm quite certain you will hear more and more about this as we go along.

The range of things that are on the table are everything from promoting greater retention rates to increasing the number of World Campus students that we have to addressing procurement strategies in this university to looking at the state retirement system for the University, to looking at anything that we possibly can. There is no looking at academic programs and there are value and importance to this University, but a range of things which I will call hopefully functional efficiencies that also save money.

We are in the process of looking at this from a set of principles over a period of three to five years with the principles being based on the notion of making sure that we have robust salary increases for faculty and staff, for making sure that we continue to promote academic excellence, and to make sure that the renewal of the physical plant of the University continues at an appropriate pace. And another part of that set of principles is actually, any savings goes into two buckets, one which was access and affordability, which may or may not be another freeze on tuition or may or may not be a greater investment in financial aid for our students.
So, this is one category for the savings and the use of those savings. The other is to promote innovation within this University. The only way we're going to do One Penn State 2025, if we have the opportunity to invest. The only way we're going to be able to look at themes within the strategic plan is to have dollars to invest. If we have holes in HR IT, we have to have the dollars to invest in that.

If we're going to continue to have seed grants from faculty proposals to the strategic plan, we have to have those dollars to invest. So hopefully, what you're going to see emerge through our conversations with the Board of Trustees over this year is a set of principles on how it is we're going to take efficiencies-- hopefully, efficiencies-- that saved dollars or opportunities for increased revenues and to turn that into access and affordability and innovation for the University quite deliberately. Part of the reason why I'm making a point to mention this today is that in Harrisburg today, bills emerged to have the University be able to buy back unfunded retirement as part of the surge system. Many of you may not know that over nine years, the Penn State contribution for SERS has increased by more than $100 million.

Now you can think of that pace of growth, and it is profound. The next year projection is that this will be $137 million, and that's essentially us getting $244 million from the state and turning around and writing a check for $137 million for the retirement benefits of faculty and staff. And so, this has had a pace and a growth that if you think about it, that's approaching a 1% tuition increase every year just to have the exact same benefits. So, nothing about benefits changes. Nothing about the access to TIA or SERS changes in this.

But this is an opportunity by which we could bond dollars to pay down Penn State's or a portion of Penn State's unfunded liability on retirement and save tens of millions of dollars to the University. And then if we have this framework occur, those tens of millions of dollars then get put into buckets of access and affordability and a bucket of innovation for the University.

This is the single largest savings we have so far identified in this multi-year effort of looking at where it is that we can save dollars. So, I wanted to make sure that you heard that directly from me. And if you all of a sudden hear that in the house, there's a bill on SERS and Penn State, what the significance of that is the opportunity at low-cost bonding to move that very large contribution to the state down to a level that approaches much more what it is that we invest in TIAA-- so those two elements.

And unless you want me to talk about name, image, and likeness, I'm good to take questions. Are there any questions about name, image, or likeness or any other item for the good President? Please state your name and unit.

Mohammed Ansari, Penn State Berks: I'm [INAUDIBLE] good afternoon, President Barron. How are you?

President Barron: Good afternoon.

Mohammed Ansari: I was wondering if you could speak to us about tuition increase for next year if the Board has decided or not. Thank you.

President Barron: So, there is no decision on this. It's part of this overall budget framework that we're discussing. We've done three in-state zeros in my tenure. That's quite a lot.
We are now operating with 70% of our source of tuition revenue at a zero-last year. We have a decline in the number of international students.

So, we've got to think about that revenue picture very, very carefully. And if you look at both state support and at tuition, this University is operating, I think, well, but operating that sub-inflation revenues for multiple years now. And it's partly because of how diligent we've been in saving dollars. But we don't have a sense of what the state is going to do.

If you're going up to an election year, that's sometimes a very positive moment for universities to get support. We look carefully at our census. And the amount of funds that we're generating makes a big difference if a bill like this pass.

There's a tremendous amount of work left to do. There's a very short cycle in both the House and the Senate, and it's quite possible these bills would be introduced, not reach the conclusion, and have to be picked up again. And still then it takes time to achieve these.

So, we're balancing all of these different things. It's just too early. It's just too early to say. So, but I do believe this University has a very strong commitment to it being affordable. And if in my mind if you're at inflation for tuition increase, that's manageable.

I do not want to suddenly see that we put a substantial additional burden in order to achieve some of these goals for our students. So, we'll see. No matter what I would expect it to be modest. And is it possible that it's less than modest? Yeah.

**Gary Thomas, College of Medicine:** I'm a neurologist at the Hershey Medical Center. And since we were talking about tuition. As a Penn State alumnus, I'm very proud of the fact that we've had zero tuition increase three years. As somebody who worked my way through college, it would be important to me. I just would be remiss if I didn't at least advocate for the medical students.

The proposal on the table would affect undergraduate students only. In-state and our medical students graduate on average with about $280,000 worth of debt. And this affects their ability to select needed subspecialties or primary care that doesn't pay relatively as well.

And so, when we're thinking about zero-tuition increase, if we could corral the medical students in that as well, that would be awesome for our students.

**President Barron:** Yeah. So obviously, quite a lot of transition-- Penn State Health and the College of Medicine. And I think people are very sensitive to that, and also, I think, sensitive to how it is you find revenues to support that. It is an interesting argument and discussion, which we haven't had before, not related to the medical school. Which is better for the success of our students-- a tuition freeze that saves every student $170 a semester, or to have a modest tuition increase and have the university have the capability to substantially increase financial aid for students that need it? And in my opinion, that's families making less than $100,000 a year, not even the federally defined. That group of middle-income parents and students are actually borrowing more than many of the other students.

So, which is more effective, to do that and to provide $5,000 increments for students that have substantial need, or keep tuition flat? You don't want to do it year after year after year and then compound this in a particular way, but I think we start to have to wrestle with that factor.
And part of the reason why I say that is that in the development side of things with open doors, we've had six categories of tackling student-- the loss of a student towards graduation or taking too long to graduate. We have several programs that address this, which one really appeals to our alumni is complete Penn State.

And here, we have well over 400 students that, within 30 credits, we're about to drop out. And in all but-- I don't remember the exact number, but it's less than 10-- we have on their way to graduate. And so that tells you how profoundly that source of money is. And the $170-- OK, that's not it. $2,000? $5,000? That's a gap and a barrier to graduation and completion.

And we also know that if you do not graduate, you do not have the same job, and the default rate on student loan you have triples. And so, this tells you where the source of the problem is.

And just incidentally, my daughter graduated from medical school, and I helped her all the way through undergrad. The debt is mind boggling, in my opinion. So, any other questions?

Chair Rowland: Okay, Seeing none. Thank you, President Barron.

President Barron: Thank you. Yeah.

**COMMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST**

Chair Rowland: Next item-- Comments from the Executive Vice President and Provost. We respectfully invite Provost Jones to the floor. Provost Jones, please address the Senate.

Provost Jones: Thank you very much. You know, it does always make me nervous when there's only two questions for the President. Okay, let me begin with just an update on searches.

Vice Provost for Global Programs - we are about to finish the next phase of that process, hopefully, resulting in a successful recruitment. So, stay tuned on that one. Dean of the College of Arts and Architecture-- we have a second candidate visiting campus this week. And once that individual has visited, we'll gather feedback, and make a decision on the way forward with that search.

We will be searching for a new Vice President for IT and CIO. We're in the process of putting together the Search Committee and doing what we need to do to recruit a search firm to assist us in that effort, so that is underway. I think you all probably saw the announcement that Barbara Dewey is retiring after serving with distinction as Dean of University Libraries next summer, so we will be firing up a search for her replacement in the not-too-distant future.

Of course, of those of you who think back to what it was like-- what a library was a decade ago or so when Barbara joined us, and even a decade before that, Libraries have changed a lot in terms of the services they provide and how they provide them. So, it does give us an opportunity to think about exactly what the scope and role of that that Dean's position will look like. So, we're going to be giving some thought to that before we get this search fired up.

Two weeks ago, about this time, we did a town hall in this room. Actually, some of you may have participated or joined by Zoom. It was me; David Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business;
and Mary Lou Ortiz, the University Budget Officer. We covered a number of topics, mostly budget-oriented, budget-related.

We talked a little bit about SIMBA. Reminder-- SIMBA July 1, 2020, we'll be going live with our new business-information system, and a lot of work going on right now to get ready for that go-live. We talked again about the recommendations of the Strategic-Budget Task Force. I mentioned those briefly at the last Senate meeting, and I think I pointed out that one of the recommendations-- and I got applause--was the elimination of the categories of permanent and temporary funds.

Okay, I thought I'd just lock one in early there. So now, the recommendations are actually available. And if you want to find them, you can go to the budget-office website, or to the announcements about the town hall and just click, and you can read them in all their detail. I think they are pretty profound and pretty significant changes for the University, and we are putting some implementation committees together around each of those topics to do the work that's necessary between now and July 1 to be ready for the SIMBA go-lives.

So many of you will likely participate in some of the conversations about how we're going to do that, but the significance of, for example, elimination of permanent and temporary funds category is broad, and it'll affect almost all aspects of University business. So please stay tuned, and I'll certainly do my best to keep you informed.

We also talked about the need to do a 1% across-the-board rescission. This this is like the 1% recycling that we used to do without the recycle piece. That's what a rescission is.

What we realized is over the last several years, we've made a lot of effort to reduce the need for commodity work to be done at the unit level and provided resources centrally to affect much of that. A lot of that has gone very well. Some of it maybe, arguably, not so well. But we continue to work on it. What we haven't been able to do is capture the savings that that produces by pulling resources from the units that now no longer have to do some of that work.

So, a 1% rescission is a relatively small skim off the top of most permanent operating budgets. It will generate about $11 million in savings for the University. We have a target of $35 million in savings for this current fiscal year. So, that's 11. We'd already identified nine. We've got 16 million more to find and we have a lot of work to do between now and June 30.

But that rescission will be a part of it. And I'm sure in all of your units, there will be some discussion about how that will be implemented. We also talked a little bit, and I won't mention it because President Barron did, about the Resource Optimization Initiative that resulted from some of the recommendations of Huron and shared with folks how that was going, and some of the initiatives that were underway.

So, I won't go into details on it. We have a number of additional task forces stored up, or in various stages of being stored up in areas that are important to the future of the University. We have one to Dr. Barron's comment. A task force on International student recruitment. It's getting a little harder than it was.

And there was a time where we didn't really need to think about that at all. We would get enough applications and those applications would yield students to Penn State in sufficient numbers that we felt pretty good about what we were getting, in terms of quality and quantity. It's gotten a little bit harder and
we need to think strategically as an institution how we're going to invest limited resources to optimize their processes for recruiting students from other countries.

As you can imagine, the costs of recruiting globally get very high very quickly. And so, we need to be very thoughtful about how to best do this and how to bring the resources of the-- any resources at the University that are focused on global activities together in order to leverage off one another. So that task force will be formed very soon.

We have another task force focused on tuition. It's, in fact, called the Tuition Task Force. And that is really to just take a step back and think in very, I would say, bold and holistic ways about how we set tuition, what our tuition structure is across the university, and are there different things we should be thinking about in terms of what that structure looks like.

What do we charge at University Park for freshmen? What do we charge for students’ upper class? In particular disciplines, we charge different amounts at the campuses. If you've ever looked at the tuition table, all I would say is you would probably think that it would be a good idea to have a Tuition Task Force. It's big and it's complicated.

And this is a good time for us to be thinking about whether or not there's a better way that we might be setting tuition. We have formed a task force, actually, at the recommendation of AAU looking at foreign influence. We're using many of the folks who were involved in the recently published Visiting Scholar Policy because they brought the type of expertise that we needed to that policy development.

But also, need to help us think through this. We don't have any particular concerns, but AAU suggested that institutions like ours take a look at ensuring that we have the proper checks and balances to minimize the likelihood of foreign influence on our activities. I think you all know that this is a pretty hot topic nationally right now. I think we do actually a pretty good job. We have lots of good checks and balances in place, and we balance openness with security pretty well.

But it behooves us to get a group together, take a look, make sure that we positioned where we need to be. So, that group is up and running. And I'm sure we'll engage you all in their deliberations, as well. Admissions. It's really a little early to talk about the admissions numbers for this coming year. And we're at the stage in the year where we're on a very steep gradient with November 1st just a couple of days away.

In general, we're a little bit behind where we were at the same time last year. But again, it's sufficiently early in the cycle. We don't need to be concerned. But we do need to keep our foot on the gas pedal. And that's all of us in doing everything that any of us can do to ensure that Penn State presents as a warm and welcoming community to potential students. One of the new programs that we have established this year is called Discover Penn State.

This is focused on trying to drive additional enrollments to many of our campus locations where we have capacity and opportunity for additional students. Some of you may be aware that we've had a-- we call it our Border Grant Program for the last number of years where we offer in-state or Pennsylvania resident tuition to students who are from high schools that are in counties that adjoin Pennsylvania.

That's been a successful program. Many of our peer institutions in other states have quite aggressively been pursuing Pennsylvania resident students with similar programs and going after that, the whole state.
So, we gave this a lot of thought and decided we would set up a program wherefore border states now--so, going around. New York, New Jersey, Ohio, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware. If we're going to have Maryland, we probably should have DC.

And if we're going to have DC, we probably should have northern Virginia. But we're doing it by state. So, it's Virginia, and of course near Hagerstown, Virginia's only 10 miles from Pennsylvania. So that's close enough. So, we have the circle of states around Pennsylvania. And students who matriculate to a campus from one of those border states will get a tuition grant for their first two years.

And if they stay at the campus for their remaining two years, we'll actually increase the grant a little bit as a bit of a motivation for them to stay. So, there's a little bit of a risk, a financial risk in this program, in that we're giving up full tuitions, out-of-state tuitions, that some of these students would have already paid. But we anticipate through the modeling that the additional numbers that we will recruit as a result will make up for that difference.

So, we're going to pilot this for a couple of years to see how it works, but we're pretty optimistic that this will result in a positive enrollment bump for the campuses. And then finally, our strategic plan. I actually have a presentation on strategic plan coming up in a future board meeting. So, I won't go into the details, except to say that your unit level reviews of strategic plan progress are well underway.

I think they're due November 1. Daniel, is that right? Okay. Just checking there. November 1. As a result of that process and the feedback you get, we're looking for folks to do revisions to their unit level strategic plans in the first half of 2020. And then, we'll be off and running with the back nine of the strategic plan, the implementation for the next five years. And we're, of course, working on revising the institution wide plan as well. So again, I'll give more updates and more detail at a future senate meeting. So, let me stop there and I'm happy to take any questions, if there are some.

**Chair Rowland:** Questions for the Provost?

**Mark Stephens, College of Medicine:** This is not really a question. It's more of a comment for senior leadership, and I speak as an individual. Like Dr. Thomas, I'm also a very, very proud alum of this institution. I suspect there may be others in our midst. I was personally appalled and offended by a letter sent to one of our student athletes recently that received a lot of notoriety in the press. And I think one of our fundamental responsibilities in this body is to protect our students and our student athletes, whoever our Penn Staters are. So, I just feel compelled to say that that kind of bias, bigotry, and intolerance cannot stand. And I thank Nicholas for helping us to put a letter together from the Faculty Senate to address that. Thank you.

**Chair Rowland:** Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

**Provost Jones:** Thank you for that comment. The University issued a strong statement in the wake of that communication. And hopefully, most of you have seen that in the course of the last couple of weeks when there have been other incidents where we felt that it was important for the University to speak out in a manner that's consistent with the values that we uphold as an institution, that we have done so. Thank you for that.
Chair Rowland: Other questions or comments?

Margaret Michaels, College of the Liberal Arts: I was just curious, kind of a point of clarification. This recruitment in the regions outside the states, is there some criteria for these students to get those grants? Because it seems a little odd to give such financial support to students outside the state at the potential expense of students in-state.

Provost Jones: No. I mean, the criteria are that these students are acceptable by all Penn State admission standards. And they have-- and we're not using need as a criterion for these, Rob, right? No. So need is not a criterion. We're continuing to invest considerable financial aid in Pennsylvania resident students.

And in fact, the intention here is to use the mechanisms that we already have, like the Provost awards, for example, those will be focused now more at Pennsylvania resident students. And this new program, what actually is in effect self-supporting the revenues that it will generate, the additional revenues that it will generate will be reinvested to drive the success. So, it doesn't represent at all any back off in our commitment to Pennsylvania resident students.

President Barron: Can I just add to it because this is also looking at the population of students at the campuses and the potential that it puts students in an empty seat. In which case, it adds revenue across the board that enables everyone. So, the bet is that this is more financially lucrative for the University to attract students from out-of-state, which also is an enhancement, I believe, for every campus that has a greater diversity of students in it.

So, I don't see it at all as a net loss or a change in revenues. I see it as an effort to incentivize more students to come into empty seats at the campuses. And so, it should be cost positive. And I think the reason why the Provost said pilot is to demonstrate that it's cost positive.

Provost Jones: Right. Exactly.


Tim Robicheaux, College of the Liberal Arts: So, I was looking at-- we have salary reports for several years that people put together. I can't find one for graduate students' stipends. And the salary reports we have gender, based by unit. Does that exist? And if so, where do we find that? And if not, when do we get to see it?

Provost Jones: Yes. So last year, as a result of some concerns that were expressed by the Graduate and Professional Students Association, we did an in-depth study of Graduate Stipend Equity, looking at issues like gender, race, national origin, and so on. The finding was basically a null finding that they were not different. There are differences in stipends, of course, by grade, by seniority, and by discipline. But, in terms of were there any systematic inconsistencies based on gender, race other factors-- apart from a few odd cases, a handful literally, less than one handful.

There were no inconsistencies. We published the summary of that study with basically, a one pager. I will say that the analysis that had to be done to draw that inference was very complex. I won't attempt to explain what it was, in part, because I don't fully understand the details. We actually engaged faculty in the Statistics Department here in Eberly College of Science to help with it because it was sufficiently complex.
There's a little bit of a challenge in sharing those data in a granular manner because you start to lose confidentiality. And because some programs are quite small, so we're not able to share the raw data. But one of the suggestions that was recently made is could we on a more regular basis get a report of some kind on graduate student stipends. And so, Lance Kennedy Phillips, who is the Vice Provost for Planning Assessment and Institutional Research, is working with his team to come up with a template that we can use for some reporting.

The earliest those data will be available probably, most likely, won't be for this year. But I would say next year, we'll try to provide that information on a more regular basis. It won't look like the faculty salary report just because of the nature of the beast is different. But we understand that people want to see what these numbers look like. And so, we're happy to put something together so that we can share them. I will say that we don't want to do the study that we did last year every year. One, because we don't even participate big changes from year to year. And second, it was a massive amount of work to do it at the level that it needed to be done.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Further questions? Go ahead, Josh.

**Josh Kirby, College of Education:** I'm from a program in a department that's small, but mighty. And we've taken great interest in the upcoming budget process and the changes to that. We're very interested in better understanding how a small program like us may be able to use this longer-term budgeting process that's available to us to innovate and to put together larger initiatives by making choices about saving in some years to carry forward.

We know that there's some amount of carry forward discussion that's happening. We were wondering about the circumstances which there could be increased, if it's a purposeful project. And how we can use the resources that we're given wisely and create efficiencies so that we can benefit and innovate within our own program, especially because I represent a technology related program. Thank you.

**Provost Jones:** Is Mary Lou here, we should sign him up for the task force. I think that--

[LAUGHS]

**Chair Rowland:** Let's write his name down.

**Provost Jones:** Actually, I think that was beautifully articulated. I like to think that in my earlier career, I too was associated with a small and mighty department. And we had a lot the same-- it was at a different institution, but we had a lot of the same challenges because we were small, and resources were limited. And there, our ability to-- well first, to not have permanent and temporary funds.

But second, to be able to strategically plan over a multi-year time frame was extraordinarily helpful in us being able to do exactly what you're describing, to plan for, but not any short-term investments. But medium- and long-term ones, as well, in a much more structured way than we've been doing it today. Which was basically you scrape a little bit of your permanent surplus every year.

Put it into temporary funds. Request permission to carry it forward with no particular budget associated with it. That creates all kinds of inconsistencies and actually I would say vulnerabilities for if you get too big a pot of money, there's a risk that somebody is going to-- like me-- is going to reach in and try to grab
it back. So, I think moving to a much more strategic and structured approach is going to be very helpful for departments and units of all sizes. Small departments, not accept-- well, small programs not accepted.

**Chair Rowland:** Other questions? Okay. Seeing none. Thank you, Provost Jones.

**Provost Jones:** Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

**FORENSIC BUSINESS**

**Chair Rowland:** First Item of business today is Forensic. The following report is from the Senate Special Committee and will be presented by the Co-Chairs, University Ombudsperson, Mohamed Ansari, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Kathy Bieschke. The report is titled Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct, which can be found in Appendix B of our Agenda. Paula has up the questions. 20 minutes has been allocated for the discussion, and I'm going to hold you to it. So, Mohamed and Kathy, the floor is yours.

*Forensic Discussion on Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct*

**Mohamed Ansari:** Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. On behalf of the Committee, Vice Provost Bieschke and I are pleased to present this forensic report on addressing allegations of faculty misconduct. As you all aware, one of the functions of the Senate is the forensic function. And in that spirit, we are here today to seek guidance and input from the Senate on the topics that are considered questions for discussion. And we would like to open the discussion by looking at each set of questions. I'm going to the next set. Kathy.

**Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost:** Right. So, you just start with the questions. So, first question. And we're here to listen to you. What are some examples of serious misconduct by a faculty member in your perspective, from your perspective?

**Provost Jones:** I can answer that.

[LAUGHTER]

**Mohamed Ansari:** I kind of want to hear from you. All right. Keep in mind that we need to be engaged because our charge is to write an advisory council report that we were brought to the Senate for your approval. So, we need to have you to have an input in this at the earliest stages.

**John Liechty, Smeal College of Business/Eberly College of Science:** I don't have a particular example that comes readily to mind. But I think there probably are principles that we can all perhaps reflect on. It would be helpful in guiding this thoughtful discussion. So I think one of the important principles is that those who have some authority over someone else should not be able to miss abuse or to abuse that authority to someone who is a student versus a student of a person who can give them a grade, for example.

Or be in charge of some allocations of resources that would be at least one type of misconduct that I would hope we stand firm against in this institution. I think another principle is a principle of this
principle of community, that there is a respect for the differences among the community. And there is a lot of ideologies that fall on different people's minds, and I prefer to try to be perhaps a bit more scientific about how we investigate the world than simply defend an ideology.

And this can go both ways because this pendulum of ideology can swing from left to right politically, etcetera. And so, I think you can get misconduct when there starts becoming potentially-- even potentially making examples. There are some examples where students, for example, try to dominate a classroom discussion or tar a particular faculty member because of their views or statements they've made. And I think we should stand firm to the principle of free expression and a broad discussion of ideas in our University settings. So, there's at least two principles, I think, could be considered as a basis for when the university would step in on regards to conduct.

Mohamed Ansari: Thank you.

Kat Phillips, University Libraries: Stand up. Sit down. I'm Kat Phillips. I am a librarian here. I think some examples of misconduct by a faculty member could be bullying or the threat of retaliation, even if it's implicit or explicit.

Mohamed Ansari: Thank you. Ann, take it away.

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: I'm Ann Taylor with the Mineral Sciences. I guess my first thought would be to go look at our University policies because we have many that address things like sexual harassment, conflict of--

Audience: [INAUDIBLE]

Ann Taylor: Right. Right. I get more-- I have a harder time coming up with examples that are the-- they're clearly bad, but maybe we don't have a policy that covers them. Those are the examples I think are more challenging to find. And may or may not have the serious disciplinary actions, the next question asked. But needs some attention.

Mohamed Ansari: Thanks. Let me just explain that the committee has a subcommittee that looked into all the existing policies to see if any policy that we have speaks to any kind of misconduct. So, there are bits of pieces of what we are trying to put in its central policy actually exist in the existing policies. And our subcommittee has looked into that.

Denise Costanzo, College of Arts and Architecture: Thank you for bringing the question to us as faculty. I do think it is a challenging one for us to respond to because those of us who are not administrators, the most information we may have would come from theory and general principles, as opposed to-- or even hearsay, as opposed to experience.

And also, those of us who are gratefully unaware of the pre dismissal procedures for tenure line faculty, it might be helpful to further the conversation if we could be provided with an outline of how that procedure currently works. And perhaps, examples of conditions or situations that have come to the attention or had to be dealt with by an administration that fell in between within this space that you're defining, between informal resolution and formal procedures.
That in, combination with an outline of the specific policies that come to bear, might help make this a little bit. Help us know how to respond to your question.

**Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost:** I mean, that's a lengthy conversation and we have 20 minutes, and five more questions. I can tell you that we're not intending to replace the already existing policies we have. So, we have well-established policies on sexual harassment, for example, on research misconduct, on how to remove someone's tenure. And we're not-- this policy is really to look at the situations that occur outside of those well-established policies.

I think a great example is the one that someone gave about bullying in a department. I think it's hard probably to ask you, just like it's hard for me to share because I don't actually want to talk about specific cases. And you don't want to talk about specific colleagues. And that makes sense to me. And I think you're right, that this is a tiny part of the population that just takes a tremendous amount of the time of administrators.

So, the kinds of things we're talking about are policies, things that are grievous, but don't quite-- we don't think that a set of faculties would necessarily vote to take someone's tenure away, which is a really big consequence. So, we want to have some tools short of that, that would help shape behavior or communicate this kind of behavior isn't okay, without just saying please stop doing this. Please stop doing this. Could you please stop doing this? We'd really like you to stop doing this.

Which is sometimes where you feel like you end up in these types of situations. I thought the principles you mentioned were really good when people abuse their authority, even if it's not prescribed in an administrative capacity. But you are voting on someone's tenure, for example, or you have access to resources that other people don't have, and you wield those in ways that are not reasonable. So, those are the kinds of situations that come to mind for me, without getting into the details of specific situations.

**Mohamed Ansari:** And also, I could add that we have, really, a list of many generic examples that we think would constitute faculty misconduct. But the reason for the forensic is not we come to you and tell you what we think it is a misconduct. It is for the Senate to tell us what they think. Because after all, when the report is present to Senate, then you as a Senator need to vote on it. So therefore, you need to really be involved from the beginning. And that's the whole idea. But they did not list any examples of misconduct in all, but as a report. But we could have. We have lots of examples. I don't have the time.

**Chair Rowland:** Should we move to the next question?

**Mohamed Ansari:** Next question?

**Chair Rowland:** That works for me.

**Mohamed Ansari:** Paula, could you please?

**Paula Brown:** I can.

**Mohamed Ansari:** And this is the process. So, our question is consistent with the existing policy, what process should be established to determine whether serious misconduct by a faculty member has occurred? Please.
Chair Rowland: Yeah. Michael, go ahead.

Michael Bérubé, College of the Liberal Arts: Immediate Past Chair. I hesitate to speak on this because I'm the person who charged the committee last year. And of course, this was very politically sensitive stuff. But I wanted to point out that we already have a policy on addressing allegations of Faculty Misconduct, but it's RPO 2 addressing allegations of research misconduct. This is something else, right?

So, this is exclusive of research misconduct. That's something to note. But I think mostly what we're talking about here is the nebulous things, like bullies and predators. Now, knowing that one person's brave truth teller is another person's obstreperous crank. It's sometimes hard to say one person thinks this person's a bully, and the bully himself, usually himself, doesn't see it that way at all.

I note Beth Seymour just forwarded to us the reports circulated at the BTAA conference two weeks ago. The University of Illinois came up with a 127-page document on addressing allegations of faculty sexual misconduct. And the first thing that they want to do in this task force, or this recommends, is dropping the legal standard of severe and pervasive. Right? In other words, the misconduct doesn't have to be severe and pervasive to trigger a response.

That said, there are still gradations of what constitutes misconduct on that scale, and we need something similar. We don't want a faculty members' behavior or misbehavior to rise to the level of severe and pervasive before anyone does anything about it. But we also want to be here trigger about an off-color remark, or a misstatement of some kind, or just a plain mistake. So, first of all, we need something like that.

We need something parallel to what we do with research misconduct to investigate, whether in fact, what level this in fact rises to. And I turned to that policy again, because when I charged the committee, I said at the end of RPO 2, the very last clause has a thing about addressing allegations not made in good faith where the tables can be turned. And the Vice President for Research can actually take administrative action against a complainant if it is found the allegation was not made in good faith. That is one way to protect people from capricious investigations under this heading. And I think it's worth considering. Thanks.

Chair Rowland: Oh, wait. Sorry. Let's do a MediaSite first.

Anna Butler, Senate Staff: This is a comment from Mike Tyworth in the Smeal College of Business. I recommend that Penn State adopt elements, if not all of the Chicago principles of free speech. Particularly, the prohibition on obstruction of freedom of expression.

Mohamed Ansari: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Maureen.

Maureen Jones, College of Health and Human Development: I think in this particular area, I'm really concerned about potentially leadership needing to provide significant documentation that any particular allegation is founded, that one student or one person would bring something against someone that wouldn't be fully vetted all the way through. So whatever process needs to be put in place, would have to be extremely well documented on the line of a legal conversation.
Because if the consequence is removal of some benefit or removal of permanency of employment, that's a huge issue to me. And I think often the folks that are in leadership, they're not police detectives. This is not what they do for a living. So, we have to put some resource in place that would give people an opportunity to gather the appropriate data to avoid a potential false allegation, even by accident, to make sure that we protect everyone in the process. The person's bringing the concern, as well as the persons being brought against.

Mohamed Ansari: Thank you.

John Liechty: John Liechty, again. I know I spoke again, but I think this is a really important point. The points have been raised. And as we look out to how we can deal with, essentially, contentious judgments around values, and we don't want to turn into a platform where a bully can use the tool to bully, for example. And I think the place to look is to our established judicial system where there's principles of due process.

And back to principles again, where people can know who's confronting them. They can see the evidence. They have a chance to respond to that. They have a presumption of innocence, until establishment of guilt. A number of things that have served as well as we as a civilization have tried to wrestle with how we deal with differences between people that can be quite substantial.

I don't know if you would have to go to a full court system. I would think that perhaps some of these things could be resolved by bringing people into a room and just having them talk and saying did you know that this person views it this way and did you know that way. And in some of those things, perhaps, that could be a beginning point because sometimes people are afraid of the confrontation without some person to intervene, perhaps.

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost: I think these are really great points. And I want to stress that we're really talking about serious misconduct that up to that point, we would want to use the avenues we had available to us. We have an Ombudsperson. We have a unit, a backup ombudsperson. We have Mohamed as the University Ombudsperson. We have department heads and deans. A lot of things are and can be resolved way before we get to, what I would consider to be, serious misconduct. People need feedback sometimes--

John Liechty: Right. And as a faculty who's been here 20 years, I don't think I really know how those systems work, per se. I haven't happily had been able to engage with them. I did go once to the Ombudsman, because I was really frustrated with an administrative situation. And then I waited six months and there was a review of that administrator. And so, that resolved the issue. But I wasn't sure how to go forward with some of the other concerns. And it was a situation where there was a clear power differential that if I charged forward with, it could jeopardize my standing in the University.

Mohamed Ansari: I also would like to point to benchmarking. We have looked at several policies from our peer institutions. And every one of them has been discussed. We have a subcommittee that was in charge of looking at all those policies and bringing a report to the committee. One that comes to mind, for example, in the process that we're talking about. Again, I don't want to give an example. But, it says, for instance, how to go about establishing the process. Is it a faculty process? Is it an administrative process? Is it a mix? We are all looking at all kinds of different approaches in order to shape the policy. But this discussion, as Kathy said, is extremely helpful for the Committee when we write our policy that you have to consider and hopefully will approve.
Chair Rowland: I think maybe we should move on to the next question.

Mohamed Ansari: I think so.

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: I guess maybe there's some distinctions that need to be made. But there is this concept of progressive discipline. So, I think that's one thing, that with certain exceptions, we should be endorsing is that somebody found with some serious misconduct, that there is a discipline. And then perhaps, the warning that the next time, it's going to be this. Clearly, there are some exceptions. And maybe we need to make sure those are quite clear. What exceptions could lead to immediate termination, rather than--

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost: We have a process for immediate, well not immediate termination. But, for--

Mohamed Ansari: For tenure line.

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost: Tenure line.

Mohamed Ansari: Yeah.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

Mohamed Ansari: Can we go to the next slide. Our last set of topics is appeal process. If an allegation of serious misconduct is substantiated, and the faculty member wishes to appeal, what should an appeal process look like? Again, we have had many discussions, and we know some avenues that could be used in the appeal process. But we wanted to be coming to you without giving you any examples so that we hear from you and your thoughts on what should be an appeal process.

Brian Redmond, School of Labor and Employment Relations: And this actually ties back probably to the previous question a little bit, as far as process goes. And we discussed this a little bit in the Liberal Arts Caucus earlier this month. We might consider professionalizing the Ombudsman process, rather than having it be retired faculty and informal. And it probably ties into the appeal process, as well. Is that it when somebody is more available and able to provide advice to faculty and administrators in this process more readily, I think it would be very helpful.

Mohamed Ansari: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Keith, in the back.

Keith Nelson, College of the Liberal Arts: Thank you for bringing this Forensic forward. I think it's really important. I think we have a process for this in the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee which deals with process and policy. And I think that one of the things they need are policies that are very, very clearly defined so that we-- and one thing they don't do is they don't look at things that are arbitrary or anecdotal. Which I would think would be some of the things we probably wouldn't want to consider as being serious, anything that might be down that road. And I would venture to guess we already have a pretty good process already developed for this and I probably don't need to develop anything new.
Mohamed Ansari: Thank you, Keith. So, you're suggesting [INAUDIBLE] is-- we have discussed that in our Committee, and I've served on a for six years. I quite agree with you.

Chair Rowland: Okay. We're coming to our final moments. Yes, please.

Chelsey Wood, College of Education: Students Senator. I'm backtracking way back to the first question. But I just feel like I would be remiss if I didn't say that serious misconduct would be-- and from the student perspective, an established pattern of discriminatory action maybe seen through the report biased website or something like that where good faith efforts of education weren't made. And their pattern was established and kept going and there was no action taken.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Are there any additional questions?

Kathy Bieschke, Vice Provost: Or comments?

Chair Rowland: Seeing none. Thank you, Mohamed. Thank you, Kathy.

Mohamed Ansari: Thank you all very much. Appreciate it.

[APPLAUSE]

Office Space

Chair Rowland: Moving on, we have another Forensic. This time, on office space which is a joint report. Joint in the truest sense with Faculty Affairs, entry University Relations, and University Planning. And the report will be delivered by Committee Chairs and special guest, Bill Sitzabee, Associate Vice President of Penn State's Office of Physical Plant. The report is available in Appendix G. Paula, you have the questions up. Thank you very much. So, the floor is yours. Let's gather some feedback.

Lisa Posey, Smeal College of Business: This report came out of some concerns that some faculty had over renovations that were going to be done to their buildings that were not something that they were comfortable with. And it was brought to the University Planning committee last year. And so, we decided to try to get a forensic so that we could get your perspectives.

We're not here to give any opinions or anything like that. We would like to get your perspectives on the record about if you've had any experiences or just, in general, what your thoughts are on what would be appropriate office space for faculty. Focusing on faculty. So, the first question what models for office space are currently available at Penn State? So, we know there's differences across campuses in situations.

Well, I think if we put them together and also have office spaces private shared and open spaces. So that's a little hint about the different kinds that we're talking about. Reflect an impact university's mission and there are any basic features of office space that generally-- that faculty generally share or need.

Chair Rowland: So, questions comments about office space. Please.

Kevin McDade, Penn State Shenango: We're just Penn State Shenango. We're just doing a renovation of our Science building. And I think it's important to share this, is that when asked about office space, we
weren't talking about size of the office and what was in it. But it's important that faculty have some private space because when we talk to students, we're part educator, but we're also sometimes part counselor at times. And sometimes, there's tears to be shed. Sometimes, that needs to actually happen not in cubicle form. So, I think that that's something that came out, and our administrators considered that. And that came into our planning. So, thanks.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

Lisa Posey: I just wanted to add that we have the Chief Facilities Officer here, Bill Sitzabee, if you have any specific questions that you wanted to ask him.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Enough said.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: Other side.

John Liechty: Hi. John Liechty. A few principles again. I apologize. Well, I mean I am rising. And I think this is very important. And I've reflected on it because I sit on the University Planning Committee. So, I was involved in the discussions that happened last year as people came. And there was basically a tussle between an administrator and has a vision of what the office or the facilities to be offered to the faculty would be, and what they would have.

And they were very concerned they weren't told. They were told they would get some kind of space, but it wouldn't be an office space. And so, when we reflected on it, we had the principles that came out. One of them was privacy, which we think is very important. Security is another one which you may frame in different ways, but I've been an academic in the game of creating knowledge, so to speak, for essentially 30 years.

And I draw a sharp distinction between administrative efforts, which I characterize mainly as things that keep bothering me and interrupting me at some random frequency that I have to respond to. And then, the contemplative effort I have to put in to create new knowledge, to read, to think deeply, to write, and assimilate what's happening. And those two for me don't work well together.

So, I have to have a place that's-- to borrow a word that we've been talking about, it's almost like a sanctuary, kind of a home, a place where I feel secure. I can go and I know it's there. That for me is a very important part of the process of being a scholar, creating new knowledge. It's also a very important part of the process of being an educator, to have a space where I can bring in and talk to people.

Also, we worried about the sense of community. If you didn't have a place for faculty to come and have some secure place, that they would not come as much. And that serendipity and informal interactions that build a community of faculty, students, and staff would be diminished. And those were mainly the points. And then the other thing we noted is that there is a website which has criteria that's put forward for the University on a number of different things for buildings.

And we noted that there was a policy or statement there. I'm not sure it's a formal policy, but it's certainly a guideline for nursing mothers who are members of the Faculty and Staff at the University. And they listed things that they felt they needed to have in the facility, which we all thought was very reasonable
and accommodated. And there's also things for the janitorial staff, that types of resources in parts of the building they thought they needed to have to do their job effectively.

And so, I feel, as a member of this Committee and a Faculty Senate, it's important for us to think about and make a stand as to what we would like to have as faculty members. Criteria of what we think is important for us. And I, personally after my years of trying to do the best I can at making a positive impact as a scholar, do not think the open source, lack of an office model, would help me or my colleagues create knowledge and help disseminate that. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Thank you. More comments. Annie you go first and then Shelley.

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: So, I happened to be Secretary of the Senate when this first arose and helped look into the background information. And I was actually stunned that we had policies, guidelines, what have you on maximum space, but nothing on minimum space. And I can tell you I've seen some pretty minimal spaces over the years.

I think as an administrator, which I am, I'm an assistant dean. I also know that I have very few tools that I can give to the faculty I work with, and very few resources. I mean, we want tuition to stay down for our students. We understand that we aren't going to get great big pay raises every year. But, if I can give my people a private, reasonably sized space, it seems to make all the difference in the world to their morale. And I just hope we can consider that and make sure we also have minimum standards as well.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

[APPLAUSE]

It's Shelley's turn.

Michele Stine, College of Health and Human Development: My concern about this open and shared space is from a disability perspective. We really need to be concerned about are there distractions and things that are preventing people from doing their job. Noise, lighting, interruptions. So, those really from a disability perspective, we need to be concerned about are we putting barriers in the way of people being able to do their jobs effectively?

Chair Rowland: Very good. More questions, comments? Ira and then--

Ira Saltz: Still Saltz, still at Shenango, as far as I know.

[LAUGHTER]

And, FERPA. We could have a student that were advising and start talking about grades, or even a student in the class. Well right now, you're flunking the class. I mean, that's supposed to be confidential information and we can't risk that being overheard by others, especially other students or whatnot. So, it seems to me that it's imperative to comply with FERPA that we do have private spaces.

**Teresa Lang, College of Engineering:** We've heard about a policy in our unit that restricts office space for non-tenured faculty so that, supposedly, they can't private offices, that they have to have shared offices. While I'm non tenure and greatly appreciate all the work that's been done over the last several years, this really seemed like a slap in the face to us to hear that you would have a policy like this. And I don't know where that comes from, or if it's something they're thinking about implementing across the University. But it's been a concern.

**Chair Rowland:** Bill, could you see that one?

**Bill Sitzabee, Chief Facilities Officer:** So maybe I can jump in just a little bit. First of all, there is no policy that I know of on the books to that nature. The only policy that's on the books right now is from 2002, and it's written as a guideline for space that has a maximum quote of 150 assignable square feet per faculty office. It doesn't talk about private, or shared, or open. It doesn't talk about minimum standards. But as we think about this, maybe I could just offer a few comments to help shape some of you are thinking.

Space is a big deal. And you look at space in terms of what it costs you. So, it's easy to say to somebody you want a bigger office. Who would say no? But they have to understand that the bigger office comes with some expense. The expense might be in terms of sustainability and our ability to lower our energy usage.

The expense might come in just pure cost to operate and maintain that space, to clean that space. So, what we strive for is maximum utilization of that space to the best extent possible. As you think about that and we talk about how we go about the process of doing space, when we go and renovate a facility, a major reconstruction, or a new facility we start off with a target. And in the case, we use typically about 120 square feet, assignable square feet for a target.

And then, we sit down with a group of folks that are representatives from the faculty, the department, the college, experts from my staff, architects and engineers that we contract with and we say okay. So, the box can only be so big. And we want some research, and we want some labs, and we want some bathrooms, and we want a kitchenette, and we want a lactation room. These are standards that we try to provide. And what can you provide and where does that space get allocated?

So, we start with that 120 and then we say okay. Do we need to edge it up or do we need to edge it down within reason? As a collaborative effort with that working group of teams that are defining that program space. We recently went through two projects that I did here in my short time. One with Henning, the Henning replacement in the Animal Science Building.

And we started out with 120 square feet and the faculty said through their departments and their representatives we really need more research space. The nature of our pedagogy is to do more research. And so, they were willing to concede that office space so that they could get more research space out of a finite amount of resources. So, as you talk about space, I think it's really important to understand that there are costs to it.

And you have to understand what those costs are, whether it's less research space, impacts on our energy, our long-term goals for sustainability, the operating cost of the facility. The initial cost to build that office is about 15% of the life cost of that office. And that's why we have to think about long term what's the right footprint. We have a lot of cases where faculty have two offices and they don't use them hardly at
all. It costs me about 65% to 70% of the energy cost to have that office there, whether it's being occupied or not. And that's where we have to think about some of the cost of that. So, sorry.

**Chair Rowland:** Thank you, Bill. Did I see a question from MediaSite? Okay.

**Anna Butler:** This question is from Cynthia Simmons from the College of Communications. And it's concerning swing space. When faculty are put in swing space, parking needs need to be part of the equation from the very beginning. In my opinion, moving into swing space is stressful. And those who are pre-tenure should not be made to move into swing space if it can be avoided.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good.

**Bill Sitzabee, Chief Facilities Officer:** Yes. So, a little whisper question is maybe define what swing space is. When we go to reconstruct a facility, we have to take the occupants out of the facility and put them somewhere so that we have time to go into that facility and reconstruct it. Swing space is, by definition, very temporary and suboptimal because we don't want to put the investment there. We want to put the investment in the long-term use of this space. In many cases, we try to look for creative solutions. For example, our task was to take down Hammond so we could build the new engineering facilities. But rather than try to swing those folks at the cost of millions of dollars, lots of disruption, suboptimal space, parking issues, and other things, we opted to keep them there long enough so we could build the new facilities and roll them right into their new facilities. So, we work very hard to minimize the impact of swing space. But the answer is that swing space is very temporary. Sometimes, it's six months. Sometimes, it can last a couple years, depending on the nature of the project. But I would reach out and say we need some understanding on that side.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Additional questions? Sure, right here.

**Maura Shea, Bellisario College of Communications:** So, I'm one of those swing spaces people, but I won't complain about Greenberg because it is what it is. Though the parking, getting kicked out at 3 o'clock for hockey is going to be a problem. So, like the place we get the park, whatever. Okay. Really, what I want you to think about is that yes, we give up something so that we get something else. But, one of the things I found over the past two years of swinging and moving, last year I shared offices. And what we found was half the faculty chose not to use that space, that sharing is just not effective for full time faculty. And even this year, students don't come to my office because it is where it is. It's that we're giving up that community that someone brought up that they may not need to be huge, but things like sharing privacy was certainly one of the things that was in the original plans for the new Willard office. That we said we can't have glass doors. I know they look beautiful with the rest of the open concept building. But, trying to take into account how faculty deal with students, in particular, and do our own work.

**Bill Sitzabee:** That's a really good point. While you have that, maybe you could just share since you're actively in the Willard project right now, is maybe share with the Senate how that process works and how you're able to give that information to the team that then brings the final result.

**Maura Shea:** I don't know what the final results may be. I was involved early enough that I saw an early plan. And I said I don't want all glass windows. It was all glass front for all the offices. I've been told it's been changed, but I have not been told to what.
Bill Sitzabee: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Very good. In the back. The gentleman violating fire code.

[LAUGHTER]

Please give him a microphone

[LAUGHTER]

Keith Shapiro, College of Arts and Architecture: I would think, to some extent, form should follow function. And our functions, generally here, are from what I can gather from PNT are research, teaching, and service. So one of the questions I might have for you is what's the relationship, or have you done any research on the relationship between office space or what we would call the arts, maybe studio space and productivity in terms of research and teaching at minimum?

Bill Sitzabee: Yeah, so actually it was Vitruvius that said form follows function. He was the guy that wrote that way back when. So, the reality is that every different type of pedagogy has really a different answer. It is hard for me to tell you this one size fits all. When I was teaching, I taught two very different courses. Contract law was a seminar course. Very open space. It was easy for me to operate in an open space. When I taught detailed construction courses, you had to have that more private time where you could get into the research aspects. Just my own personal example there, but I also having dealt with space across a lot of different areas, working with the folks with the Henning facility, Engineering facility, Wood facility, those are three different facilities currently underway.

And every single one of those pedagogies drive a different programmatic result. So, I would be remiss to say that we need to have a specific standard because it's going to limit our ability to do what's right by program, by facility. What we really have to do is let the professional designers do that in the process and work with the folks that are in the building to determine what's going to be the best fit for those folks doing that function. That's my recommendation.

Chair Rowland: Okay. Next comment in the back. And then we'll do MediaSite. Coming close to the end.

Bob Zambanini, Penn State Berks: Violating fire code back here, apparently. But anyway, I'm on the University Planning Committee and I've been part of these discussions about the office space for the last few months, going back into last semester. One of the things-- there were a lot of topics that were discussed. But the gist of the debate where it got into it was when the faculty were concerned about offices with privacy, et cetera, et cetera. I can understand that.

But I just want to add my own little experience. This is my 19th year teaching at Penn State. And my very first semester, I was in an office with a faculty member who was very, very research oriented, which is fine. However, I got the… my intent-- what I noticed from her was that when I ever had conversations with any of my students, that was not appreciated. And then it boiled over one day when she actually asked me to take my conversation out in the hallway.
And this was a legitimate—we weren't “bs….ing,” we were talking about course material from my course, and she asked me to go out in the hallway which that left a poor impression on me in my first semester here at Penn State. So, when the idea of having our own office came up, [LAUGHS] I jumped on that because with that impression in my mind. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Eric, did you want to take your chance?

Lisa Posey: I thought we were doing Media next?

Eric Novotny, University Libraries: And I had a whole speech written down, but most of what I had written down has already come up in terms of privacy, security, accessibility. So, I'll add the piece that perhaps is unique, which is that as some of you may know, the University library is doing a recent renovation transition two units to open offices. And if you have the chance, I highly recommend stopping by second floor, third floor, West PA T to take a look at these new open office spaces.

I think they will be interesting to you. They are completely enclosed in glass. We are advised, the librarians were advised. We refer to it internally as the fishbowl. We were asked not to knock on the glass because so as not to disturb our colleagues who are behind said glass. So, suffice to say that our administration has assured us that this is a process that will be reviewed in a year. But the initial feedback has been, shall we say, less than positive from the individuals I've talked to. So, this is not a hypothetical conversation for the libraries. You may dismiss the library situation as unique. However, most of the individuals affected have faculty status the same as the individuals in this room.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

Audience: [INAUDIBLE]

Eric Novotny: So, I wasn't privy to that. I will say that the people I've talked to in the affected units have given differing answers as to whether they were consulted or not. But there were definitely people who were surprised when they saw the new space they were moving into.

Chair Rowland: At this point, we have reached our time. Let's move on. So, moving on. And thank you for the discussion very much. Okay. Next item is Unfinished Business. We have no Unfinished Business.

[APPLAUSE]

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

Item I, Legislative reports. Please note, we use clickers for voting today. They provide a precise vote count, confidentiality for voters, and immediate results. Senators should have received a clicker before entering the auditorium. Please raise your hand if you need a clicker or if your clicker doesn't work. So, we have two legislative reports. Senate Committee on Committee and Rules Chair, Senator Victor Brunson, will present the reports.
Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Sections 6(f) Committee on Faculty Affairs and 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations (Tenure Flow Report)

The first of which can be found in Appendix D of our Agenda, which is Revisions to Standing Rules, Article 2, Section 6(f), Committee on Faculty Affairs and Revisions to Standing Rules, Article 2, Section 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations (Tenure Flow Report). So, Victor, the floor is yours.

Victor Brunson, Penn State Altoona: Thank you, Nicholas. So, these two reports are somewhat linked. They concern reports that at these committees have done, or at least in the case of Faculty Affairs, they have done for many years. And it is regarded as a mandatory report, although it has not, in fact, been at all mandatory. At least, as long as I have been on this body, which is closing in on 20 years now, there has been a tenure flow report.

And we are about to start, courtesy of IRC, a Promotion Flow Report on a regular basis. We regard these as necessary and they are awaited with considerable interest by the Senate. Yet, these are not mandatory. So, the proposal has been to make these mandatory reports. Since there are aspects of the tenure flow report that are of interest not just to the Faculty Affairs Committee, but intra University relations as well, it was decided that we should mandate that IRC be a co-sponsor of this report. That does not mean that--and we took great pains to try and wordsmith the language appropriately. It will continue to be Faculty Affairs that has the primary role in producing this report. So, you're not off the hook.

[LAUGHTER]

So yet, as an aid to that because misery loves company, we want to spread the joy of having to prepare these reports amongst the committees. IRC will not be spared. And so, we'll have to aid Faculty Affairs.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you for the presentation, Victor. Are there any questions? Okay. Seeing none. Are we ready to vote? Very good. Senators who are joining by MediaSite, you can cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B. Just as a reminder, we'll wait until the MediaSite votes are counted before we reveal the vote on the floor.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere. I have 11 accept.

Chair Rowland: Okay. Excellent.

Paula Brown, Senate Staff: House, we have 126 accept and 4 reject.

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

Chair Rowland: Very good. The motion carries. Our second report from CC&R is called Revisions to Standing Rules, Article II, Sections 6(f), Committee on Faculty Affairs and 6(j) Committee on Intra-University Relations (Promotion Flow Report), which can be found in Appendix E of your Agenda. Victor, the floor is apparently still yours.

Victor Brunson, Penn State Altoona: All right. So, this is where Intra University Relations gets to say payback rhymes with the word ditch. And gets to enlist Faculty Affairs aid in preparing the Promotion Flow Report. So, this is the Promotion Flow Report has yet to be delivered. We have only just started
preparing this. So hopefully, our first installation will come out this year, I think. Maybe. Indeed. God willing and the river don't rise. So, we hope that that will come out. And since we hope to mandate this, this will become a regular feature of the Senate year.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you for the presentation. Are there any questions for Victor? Are we ready to vote? Very good. Just as before, Senators joining by MediaSite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, please Press A. To reject the motion, Press B.

Anna Butler: Poll Everywhere I have 13 accept and one reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

Paula Brown: In house, we have 124 accept, 4 reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Motion carries. Thank you, Victor and everyone else. Okay. Moving on. Agenda item J. Advisory Consultative Reports.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

We have two Advisory Consultative Reports from Faculty Affairs, which appear in Appendices F and G in our Agenda. Both of which are Revisions to AC 76, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. The first is Revision to AC 76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities RE-- Ombudsperson and Gender Changes. Scranton, Senator Renee Bishop-Pierce will present the report and answer questions.

Revision to AC 76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Ombudsperson and Gender Changes)

Renee Bishop-Pierce, Scranton: Good afternoon. So, as Nicholas said, we are looking at AC 76, and essentially what this change to the policy is addressing, putting into policy what is already in practice of having an Alternative Ombudsman and also to address some gender inclusiveness issues that were in the policy. There was one issue where we also stipulated that individuals are elected by the faculty body, not appointed.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you for the presentation. Are there questions for Renee? Seeing none. Are we ready to vote? Very good. Those of you joining by MediaSite, just like before, polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, please Press A. To reject, please Press B.

Anna Butler: Poll everywhere I have 15 accept and one reject.

Chair Rowland: 122 accept. Six reject.

Renee Bishop-Pierce, Penn State Scranton: Well because of all the fantastic work that was done by our current Chair and our previous Chair, we had to go in and make some revisions to AC 21 in the definition
for academic ranks. And we needed to address the definition of faculty. And I want to point out that despite the best efforts of Michael Bérubé there's still an error in this report. There's a section that repeats. It is not his fault. He's worked very hard on this. There's still a section that repeats itself. So, we're going to need to strike the second time it repeats all full-time faculty. I don't know. After all those eyes that looked at it, we still manage to do it. I don't know.

Chair Rowland: Does that include the two between the end add and the add? A little lingering-

Renee Bishop-Pierce: I don't know how we did it and we got it passed Carey, too. I don't know.

Chair Rowland: Just including that two right there. Okay. So that is going to be struck. Any further presentation?

Renee Bishop-Pierce: No, I don't think so.

Chair Rowland: Is there any discussion? Are we ready to vote? Very good. Those joining in on MediaSite, it is polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, please Press A. To reject, please Press B.

This will just take a moment. We just have to run out the clock. Or can it be canceled? Did you pull up the right one? Have the votes come in over MediaSite? Yes. Let's run with this. We all know what we're voting on. No reason to spend any extra time.

Anna Butler: Are you waiting for Mediasite votes?

Chair Rowland: Yes, that is correct.

Anna Butler: Okay. On Poll Everywhere, I have 19 accept.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Paula?

Paula Brown: In house, 115 accept. 0 reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good. The motion carries.

[APPLAUSE]

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

Chair Rowland: That's beautiful. Just beautiful. I was going to say. Don't anybody get used to that. Okay. Next, we have our Informational Reports, appearing in Appendix H from the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. We have a presentation entitled Benefits Mentor. We respectfully invite to the floor Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits for Penn State's Office of Human Resources. And Amanda Dean from IBM Watson Health. We have allocated 15 minutes for this discussion.

Benefits Mentor

Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits: Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to thank Ira Saltz, who's chair of the Senate Committee for Faculty Benefits for requesting our invitation
today. It's hard to believe November 1 is Friday. 2020 benefits open enrollment, for those of you who are eligible for benefits, begins Friday. It runs for two weeks through 5:00 Eastern time on November 15, Friday, November 15.

For the first time this year, we have worked very closely with IBM Watson Health to introduce a third party decision support tool. Excuse me. Called Benefits Mentor. Benefits Mentor is available through Workday. So, if you authenticate through Workday and are linked directly to Benefits Mentor, Ira in the Senate Committee for Faculty Benefits thought it would be a great idea to demo this for this group. It is live up and running now. Benefits open enrollment starts on Friday.

So certainly, encourage you, even if you are 100% certain of the plan you want to elect for you and your family, take advantage of the tool. Share it with your colleagues. We have several communications, several announcements coming out. But we're really encouraging employees, all employees, to utilize the tool just to validate your election. And we have gotten a lot of feedback, certainly, since I've been here over four years saying I just need more information.

What makes the most sense for me? And I think as Amanda Dean will point out, it's actually based on your claim's history. That's securely behind the IBM Watson Health firewall. So only you have access to it. Again, once you authenticate through Workday, University has no insight, no view into any activity you do. The one thing I wanted to point out. Once you get those results from Benefits Mentor and say, hey, this is the plan I'd like, that doesn't mean you've enrolled in benefits. You still have to go through the process of enrolling in your benefits through Workday. So, with that, I'd like to turn it over to Amanda Dean and thank you for coming today.

**Amanda Dean, IBM Health:** Thanks, Greg. [INAUDIBLE] Sorry about that. As Greg noted, you'll get to the tool through Workday. You'll authenticate through Workday, then you'll authenticate through IBM. You'll see your own information. No one else will see your information. And it will take you directly to the tools welcome page.

So, it will actually welcome you by name. This is just a test account, so it says test. And it will give you some important information to know. There is the link to Workday. What the time period is for open enrollment, and then a note that after about 15 minutes of the inactivity, the tool will log out. But it will warn you before it does. They orient you to the tool. There is a progress bar at the top, so as you go forward in the tool, you can go back.

And then every page, you can print, as we know that some people want to have a hard copy as you go forward. So, if you say let's begin, it will take you to your family makeup. So, it seems to be loading a little bit slower. We pulled claims and eligibility through July, and then we have eligibility through the end of September. You'll see who you're covering right now with your family on this page.

If you just recently added a family member within the last month, it's more than likely that they won't appear on this page. So, you will need to go in and add them, which you can do by clicking on this link here. You can add a spouse. You can add a dependent. You can also remove people from your family, if you know that they won't be covered next year.

You can include them back in. This tool is really meant to help you model different scenarios, so you can come back and smile different family makeups based off of what your situation is. If you click on next, it
will then take you to a question regarding spousal surcharges. If you have a spouse that has coverage through their own employer, there is a surcharge that would be applied toward your premium.

I just want to note that this question only applies to your recommendation if you have a spouse and you click yes. While everyone will see this question, if you don't have a spouse and you click no, or even if you click yes, your recommendation won't be impacted. I'll just click no. Go to next. It will show you your past health care claims for the past 18 months. So, you'll see 2019 year to date first.

And then 2018 the full year 2018 on the following tab. It'll show the Penn State-- what Penn State has paid your premiums and what you've spent in out-of-pocket costs. The graph on the right is their top three categories of what your out-of-pocket costs went towards. But you can click on the view details to see a more in-depth breakdown of what you spent in the past 18 months.

If you have waived coverage in the last year or the last 18 months, or you are a recent new hire, you will not see any claims as we wouldn't have those available. And know that we loaded your history through July 2019. So, if you paid or incurred recent claims, it's possible that they wouldn't be reflective in the total. You will then click next. And it will take you to a page talking about what health care services do you need for 2020.

So, we find that it's easier to predict your coverage for next year, based off of your historical spend and use. So, it will take that claims history in making the recommendation. And we know that it's very difficult. It can be very difficult to determine how much care that you'll need next year. You may not be able to determine how many times you will need to go to a medical facility. So that's why we bucketed the care to three different groups.

So, at the top, you'll see some education around preventive, basic, and additional care. And then a video, in case you're undecided. At the bottom, it will show you who is in your family. And then based off of your claims, it will have assigned to a level. If you did not have any claims, it will use our normative benchmark data, which is an IBM product that we have that combines across our client base a large set of data that we can benchmark from.

So, it will-- if you had no claims, it will automatically set you to preventive. But you can change the level to either a basic or additional and then it will use the benchmark data to help estimate the costs for next year. Again, you can come back to this page often the model different scenarios. So, after you look through this page, you can click next.

And the next page is where you'll see your plan recommendation. So, at the top is just some education about your total costs and how you should use a spending account. But at the bottom is what plan is being-- what plans are being offered and what the best match plan is. And we know that what's important for one person, may not be as important for someone else. So, it does offer three different ways to sort your plan offerings.

We can either do it by total cost at the end of the year, out of pocket cost, or your premiums. If I clicked on the out-of-pocket costs or the costs to the doctor and pharmacy, it may offer a different plan as the best match. If you click on select view details, this will take you to a page with a lot more information and details about the plan.
So, this is where you can see— if you look at the medical coverage and prescription coverage tabs, it actually gives you the actual plan designs. So, here is where you'll see your deductible, your out-of-pocket maximums, any co-pays or co-insurances. Then on the summary level is where you'll see where what you would be spending. At the top for the best match plan, it will give you a percent savings.

And this is reflective of how much you're saving with the best match plan, compared to your previous plan. And it's dependent on how you pick how you sorted the plans. In this case, we sorted by the lowest out-of-pocket costs. So, the percent savings is this plan offers a 29% savings in total out-of-pocket costs, compared to the last plan. From here, you can say compare details, which is a good page to look at if you wanted to see more details regarding the plan and compare it to the best match plan.

It's a way to really make sure that the best match plan really meets their needs. So here, you can compare the overall costs, health spending accounts, drug and medical coverage. If you have any questions, a lot of these have drop downs so you can get a better definition of what that line item represents. From here, you'll either need to go back to choose a medical plan or you would say view plan details.

This view plan details will take you back to the plan details page. You can then select a plan. And this will take you to the final page. All right. So then, on the final page, it will show you what plan you selected as the best fit for you. It will also give you a link to Workday, which you'll need to access to actually enroll in your benefits.

You can print this page, in case you wanted to have it available when you enroll. And then, we recommend that you go to the upper right to log out before you try to access it again later. If not, you may get a log out screen. So, it's always recommended to log out properly, close out your browser, and then go back in again at a later time. That's really all I wanted to cover. Any questions?

**Chair Rowland:** Excellent. Any questions for our guest?

**John Nousek, Eberly College of Science:** And I apologize because I missed the very beginning of your presentation. But when I was making my choices, this seems to have focused very much on the out-of-pocket versus not out of pocket in a single year. But when I was making my choices over the years, I've been very much considered on the tax implications of the health savings accounts or whatever you call them now. And also, decisions like how long-- because some things don't pay off well at the beginning. But after several years, group thing. So, it's a-- there were multi-year decisions and things like my salary and benefits, my income tax considerations, that go into this. I didn't see any of those aspects in what you've been talking about.

**Amanda Dean, IBM Health:** So, with the recommendation, it is just based off of your medical and drug prescription claims at this time. I think in the compare plans, it does offer a row for the potential tax savings under a health spending accounts. So, it does make that recommendation as a step. We don't have specific information to make a more precise recommendation. So, we offer a range.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Additional questions? Ira, could you wait for a microphone? Can we go to Ira?

**Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango:** Right. If I may, in previewing, if I could. There is a screen that does recommend for those on a PPO plan how much to put into your flexible spending account. And it does talk about that I think the tax savings is addressed. Isn't it?
Amanda Dean, IBM Health: Yes. So, I think you're referring to the plan details page. Which, at the top, it tells you what you'll actually pay which is your out-of-pocket costs. And in the middle is how you pay for it. So, considering your spending account, it does tell you that potential range of tax savings. And this amount will also take into account employer contributions to the HRA. And then at the far right, it tells you an estimate of how much you could a lot to your FSA or your HSA.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Yeah. Go ahead.

Andrew Freiburg, College of Medicine: Do you actually know how many people end up signing up for the wrong plan?

Amanda Dean IBM Health: We are able to-- with next year, we would be able to do some analysis to see the plan migration. And this based off of your claims, we could make some assumptions that they chose the wrong plan. With the tool, we could look back. I think it would be something that we could look at going forward, since this is the first year with the tool.

Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits: Like, the claims history just goes back to 11/2018. So, there wouldn't be a chance to do any retrospective, in terms of your plan choice versus what the tool recommends. And as Amanda demonstrated on the one screen, if all you're worried about is how much I'm going to spend, it's going to push to you the best fit.

But there are some other things like, hey, I want to control the amount. I'll be willing to pay higher amounts in premiums, but I like the idea of that copay every time I go to see a doctor, every time I go see a specialist, every time I need [INAUDIBLE]. There may be others that say hey, I like the idea of a lower premium, but I'll take on more out-of-pocket risk. So, there's those levers there that you can make that decision as to which plans will best fit for you. But the one that the tool will push you is the lowest cost and then you can adjust from there.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Greg. Final question.

Gary Thomas, College of Medicine: I think that, in full disclosure, I used to work for IBM. And I think the Watson project is really interesting. And I find this software really interesting. As a doctor, in the past I've had some patients get good advice to switch insurance plans and then find that they can't come and see their favorite doctors. So sometimes there-- are all these plans equal, in terms of access to who they like?

Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits: Yeah, it's a great question. The question was the network. The network providers. They have not changed, regardless of the plan. It's the same Aetna network of providers. And for those of you who have been here for a few years who were part of the health care plan when it was the third-party administrator was Highmark, those networks are extremely similar, meaning there's a lot of overlap.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Additional questions for our guests? Josh.

Josh Kirby, College of Education: I was just wondering in future years, will more and more of our claim’s history be available? So next year will we have to [INAUDIBLE] the [INAUDIBLE] instead of the [INAUDIBLE]?
Amanda Dean, IBM Health: So, the tool as of right now, will only show 18 months of claims history. So next year, it would be 2019 full year and then 2020 year to date.

Greg Stoner, Senior Director of Compensation and Benefits: You just brought up an excellent enhancement.

Amanda Dean, IBM Health: Yeah.


[APPLAUSE]

Travel Safety Network (TSN)

Very good. Our next and final report is sponsored by a Senate Committee on Global Programs. It's titled Travel Safety Network and it can be found in Appendix I. Penn State's University Risk Officer, Gary Lansdale, and company, apparently, will be presenting the report. We have set aside 15 minutes for the allocation of this presentation and for questions.

Gary Lansdale, University Risk Officer: Okay. We know this is why you stayed this long is for this presentation. So, I'm just the closer. My colleagues from the Global Programs office are here to give you background. The reason that the committee and Dr. Rowland asked us to come was to answer questions about people in registering in the travel safety network. But it's important to understand that network first. So, Jennifer and Joe are going to talk a little bit about the network. And then, I'll conclude with things we've run into.

Jennifer Campbell, Global Programs: Hi everyone. I'm Jennifer Campbell from Global Programs. We're also going to be quick with our commentary here because we do want to leave room for questions. So, we'll move through this pretty quickly. So, what is the TSN? The TSN is a travel safety network. It's in fact, also a database. But it's actually a network of offices that are working together to combine our processes into one simple step of registration.

So why the TSN? Well, we found ourselves in 2014 through 2016 that we had faculty, staff, and students in infected Ebola countries, and we didn't know they were there. And that was problematic. By the time that they were able to identify air fare out of the country, they found that their own resources did not work. So, we no longer want to be in a position of reaction. We want to be in a position of proactive awareness of what's going on in our world.

So again, why the TSN? Many people think about the tragedy’s natural disasters, political unrest, terrorist attacks. But I will tell you and my colleagues will tell you. That most of the time, it's in fact this. If you need to see a doctor, if you get sick overseas, if you need good dental care because you have a root canal you need while you're on sabbatical overseas, these are really the main reasons why we're able to be very proactive in supporting you. And then also at the bottom, you'll see we have a provider that actually provides prescription equivalence for you. So, you can actually find out what does my particular prescription look like when I travel to a particular country.

Joe Thurston, Global Programs: My name is Joe Thurston. I work in the Global Safety Office within Global Programs. My office manages the travel safety net from day to day basis. So here to speak to that
today. Last year alone, the TSN supported close to 9,000 Penn State travelers traveling overseas for University affiliated travel. I’ve included a map here. Broken down by region, we can just see, in fact, where Penn State travelers are traveling to.

These 9000 travelers benefited from a wide variety of support that TSN offers. For example, first and foremost, access to 24/7 emergency assistance. You heard that correctly. Myself or one of my colleagues is site on call 24/7, 365 to support you in the event of emergency overseas. Access to automatic insurance enrollment. What I mean by this is that you're automatically enrolled by a United Health Core Global blanket coverage system for all faculty members and students alike. We'll talk about this in depth in a few.

And then access to expansive network of pre-approved medical facilities that the insurance company recommends. Additional benefits are that the TSN non-credit bearing trips, say ski club, for example, snowboarding club, going over for a week time for winter break. As well as education broad credit bearing trips are all enrolled in Smart Traveler and program, the step to the State Department. The state department will push an alert in the event of an emergency if this was to happen.

Access to specific travel resources, including trip planning, logistics, and risk analysis. What I mean by this is my office loves to consult with travelers before they go on their trips. If you go to a country you don't know much about, we're happy to consult with you make sure your plans are good in short for things that need to be handled. And then finally, export control regulations and customs compliance review.

This is done by the expert compliance office. Make sure that the liability is not there for you, as well as university before each other overseas. I'd like to mention that Penn State is not the only big 10 school that has this system in place or that requires their faculty members to register to travel prior to travel. For example, Purdue, Michigan, Maryland, Rutgers, Michigan State, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa all have a similar system in place.

This is also not unique just a big 10. Number of other universities, over 70 other universities with 110 health and safety professionals like myself have a similar system in place. Harvard, Yale, University Colorado, UC Berkeley all have systems in place like this. In terms of feedback, we receive regarding the TSN. A lot of it has been positive.

For example, one traveler wrote “it's nice to have Penn State support.” Another wrote “system is more streamlined than past versions.” And a third wrote, “glad to have international insurance coverage.” With that said, we have received some constructive criticism. We have listened. So, for example, faculty have asked for expert review for some restricted travel destinations.

Also, my office, Global Safety Office, will conduct a site visit to a location where faculty frequent. For example, I'm heading to Columbia, it looks like, in the spring to do a site visit. And make sure that Bogota, a lot of these major cities that faculty frequent more so than any are safe and have infrastructure in place to support you, the leader. And then we'll expect that process.

Next, the second question here. Questions as to why flight information and lodging information is needed. Well, starting tomorrow 10:00 AM when my Data Specialist is back in the office, this is no longer the case. All we ask is that we have our emergency contact information for you. ie, your phone number or email you'll be checking when overseas.
Third comment here is why do I need approval for travel. I think this is a miscommunication with our messaging, perhaps. There is not-- if you're not going to restricted country on a University's dangerous country list, you don't need approval for travel. The TSN is not an approval to travel. It is just a database registry of the travel itself.

I'd also like to note of the 227 petitions that we received for travel to restricted country this past 2018. We only denied one faculty member for travel to a trip to Lebanon. He just couldn't provide adequate justification of why this was important. Next comment we've received is the insurance information is confusing. I would agree. We have added information to the TSN confirmation receipt that gives you a quick link to click on. Gives you the whole what is covered, where to go, print the insurance card. One stop shop on the UHCG Portal.

Next, the TSN has too many forms. Again, I agree. 2015, we had 15 forms. We are now down to three. When I say three, I really mean a logistic form, which is a University contact number. You do the expert form, which is six questions. And then a little box pops up which we consider a form, which is a just electronic signature making sure that everything's good. You submit and you're good to go.

Finally, our system seems old and clunky. Once again, I agree. It is old and clunky. Thankfully, the TNS is coming soon. We are in negotiations right now with the software company that developed our old TSN. We have planned to roll this out in the next couple months. We'll see a timeline and go from there.

But it should be much more streamlined for you, the administrator, and everyone involved.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

Joe Thurston: So, I once described the TSA and as the IBS of travel registration programs. It is getting better. So, the piece that we hear the most about is when people think that they need approval. And the only countries where we are concerned enough or where there are restrictions are on either the US government's axis of evil countries, or what are called the OFAC restricted countries.

Countries where US citizens, including entities like the University, are prohibited from conducting business. Like North Korea and some of Iran, until recently. Sometimes comes, sometimes goes. Cuba, more or less. And places where there are actually bullets flying. And the reason-- these are not countries you can't go to. These are countries we want to talk some more about before you go. What is your plan to keep yourself safe in Pakistan, in Lebanon?

In other places where there is genuine danger. And we had a recent traveler who wanted to go to Somalia. Somalia. And it wasn't hell no, which was my first reaction, I must say. It was let's talk about it. And once we sat down with the faculty member, we got to yes. Based on the work that they had done, which they admitted was partly in response to the questions we asked. So that they were better prepared and had good answers and got answers from their hosts about who they were going to be with, what they were going to be doing, and under what circumstances they would be let loose.

These are the countries that are of concern to us. But we have had very, very, very few cases where we have just said hell no. So, in the policy for all of this, we've had between 2015 and 2018 we've had over 27,000 people taking trips. Of those, seven with the other issue that we run into is people who travel and don't bother to tell us. And we've had 700 of those. 700 trips, not 700 individuals.
These were situations the policy, TRO 1 says we're in the process of modernizing the policy and I'm losing track of the policy number. TRO 1 says if you don't register your trip in advance and we don't know where you are, you are at risk of not being reimbursed for your travel. Yeah. That would be a lot to me. So, we've had 700 people who didn't register until afterwards. In some cases, it was because they said they just didn't know.

Or they thought they had completed the process and hadn't back to Joe's points about it being a little clunky. So, of those 700, we resolved those with a first warning saying you need to register next time. There have been 46 trips for which there was a second warning. So, your verbal reaction tells me all about that. Of those, we may forebear despite advice from senior administrators, we gave them another chance.

And so, of everyone who has traveled of these 27,000 trips, there have been a total of two where the faculty member was not reimbursed for their travel because it was a third strike. And we looked at each of those situations. We spoke with the deans. We spoke with the financial officers. We alerted the senior executives, the provost, that we were about to say no. And we did.

So that's the important thing is I don't care what hotel you're staying at. We don't care what airplane you're using. We'd like to know that optional information is still valuable to us. If a plane goes down, we'd like to know that you weren't on it. So, it would be valuable for us to know that. Or if a plane is held hostage, we would like to know that. Has happened in the past. But it isn't mandatory.

What we're really interested in is where the heck are you, so that we can help you if there is a problem. If there is an earthquake in Chile, and you're in Santiago. If there is an Arab Spring in Cairo and you are there. We want to know where you are only so that we can react and assist you, and ask do you need help, and how may we be of assistance. That's what we're looking for.

That's why this policy is there. So that is why we have the travel policy. That is why we do what we do. So why we're here. We've had 86 travelers who have had serious medical conditions that we've assisted with. We've had 80 people-- we've had 80 in major international incidents, whether that was a political incident or a natural incident that we're monitoring and asking can we help you.

And in those 80 incidents, we've had 157 travelers whom we've checked in with. And in almost all cases, have found that they're just fine. So, this is like an insurance policy. It is there in case you need it. We hope you won't, but it's we can't help you if we don't know where you are. Finally, I can't help but mention that Jennifer Santiago, who is standing here with me, will be taking my place as University Risk Officer in 52 days.

[LAUGHTER]

As I retire but who's counting. It has been my pleasure to work with some of you frequently. Many of you, occasionally, over the last 16 years. I wish the University and all of you success. And let's be careful out there. Thank you. Any questions?

Chair Rowland: Annie, go ahead.

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Thank you. That was very helpful. I'm still confused. So, in the beginning, I got all excited because you kept saying, we don't approve. It's only for
these restricted countries. It's only for these restricted countries, which could make it sound to someone like me like you don't have to fill out all the forms and so forth unless you're going to restricted country. But then, we hear but you won't get reimbursed if you don't fill out. Which sounds like an approval process.

**Jennifer Campbell:** So, let me explain why we need the data. So, when we're working for blanket coverage with United Health Global, one of the main things they ask us every year is where are you going. And then they assess that data. Where are you going, how many days are you in a particular country. There's number of days for trips, there's where are you going, and they look at that and they bring back. So, we do need data on where our travelers are going, and that's just one reason why. The other one is to be, of course, proactive. You can be in France. It's not a restricted country. And yet, we had shootings and students impacted when the shootings happened in Paris last year. So restricted is for just a review process where everyone is things can happen in non-restricted countries. So, we still want to know--

**Ann Taylor:** So is it fair to say that everyone has to-- if you're doing international travel, everyone has to go to the travel safety network and fill out the forms. But if you're going to someplace like France, you're done. There's no approval.

**Gary Lansdale:** Correct.

**Ann Taylor:** Because there is a mis-- I had someone just yesterday. One of my staff is going to a totally benign place overseas and said and I'm not going to find out if it's approved or not till like a week before I get there. So, I think you still got misinformation.

**Gary Lansdale:** Well, we'll work on the communication piece of that. Thank you.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. More questions, Ira.

**Ira Saltz:** Okay. Again, thank you for this. So, if we're traveling internationally as a Penn State-- and when we're Penn State employee, but not traveling on business. Can we still go through the travel safety network and is it possible we can purchase the travel insurance?

**Joe Thurston:** Yes, to both questions. So, there's an option to register your trip as personal travel. And you get the same message if something happens say where you are. We look out for you because you're in our system. Also, there's a link on the insurance website on the TSN confirmation receipt that takes you to the insurance website. You click through if you want to extend your coverage, by any means. If you're extended for personal vacation, or whatever, you can also get that rate as well.

**Gary Lansdale:** So, let me just issue one clarification for when you are on Penn State business. In many cases, we have faculty who are invited guests to a seminar or a conference where the conference is paying for their travel expenses. That is still Penn State business. Even though somebody else's picking up the tab, you are still there wearing your blue shield. And so, we would take care of you as if you were doing your research or teaching your class. I just want to make that clear that if you want to go-- if this is how I spent my summer vacation, you are welcome, and it is optional. But even if you are traveling for a conference where somebody else is picking up the tab, that is still considered Penn State affiliated travel.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. [INAUDIBLE] Then John.
Karin Sprow Forte, Penn State Harrisburg: First of all, thank you for your work. I was a recipient of health care while I was overseas last year, and it works very well. Thank you. But you haven't touched on something that still is a little confusing. And that is technology export. And I'd like you just to talk for a minute, because we carry our computers all over the world. And I'm constantly trying to navigate your questions and what to do with that.

Gary Lansdale: Okay. So, there is a fourth member of our team, who is Wayne Mallory, who is the Export Control Officer. He is the one who is-- he is making the judgments about the law, in terms of export, what you're taking with you, your computer, your gizmo, whatever it might be. And Wayne is asking those questions in a very specific way.

Wayne is a lawyer and he asked them in a very specific way because of the way the law is worded. And I would say that if you have questions about his questions, you might reach out to any of us and we can put you in touch with Wayne. It is.

[INAUDIBLE]

Jennifer Campbell: Yeah, the questions are actually within the TSN process. So, as you answer those questions, they are reviewed by expert compliance internally, which is why we streamline the process into one process.

[INAUDIBLE]

Jennifer Campbell: No.

Gary Lansdale: Yeah, no. What he's say-- what Wayne, as a result of that, he might give you advice that it is against the law, but the law applies to the individual, not the University. So, you take your gizmo, you are the individually potentially at risk when you come back and are interviewed by the customs enforcement people about what you took with you.

Jennifer Campbell: It's a resource to inform you about maybe what you do or do not know around that particular technology.

Chair Rowland: Great. Last question is going to go to John and then we're going to finish up.

John Nousek, Eberly College of Science: Thank you. And a couple of the questions really dovetail well into my concerns. I really appreciate your answers to any tailor because it was unclear. So, the reality is we are obliged to fill in the TSN, even though some of the comments during this presentation suggested everything was optional. And with respect to the last question, I've been doing this from two decades where I had to worry about export control.

And the reality is, it's me personally as a PI of a project and me personally as a United States citizen to comply with the laws. Penn State, of course, has liability as well when I'm on their behalf. And so, you need to understand these things. It's not them that is enforcing it. You should already know the law. And you should take advantage of them, is what I'm saying. Now, to go to my particular question, which is you spoke about-- one of my factors, you say now though the hotel and--

Jennifer Campbell: Lodging.
John Nousek: Lodging. Thank you. Of Sorry, it was the travel, the air travel, as well as the lodging. You would like to know or so on, but it's not required. A big part of that in my mind is how much detail I give you about that is are you going to proactively contact me about events that I might not otherwise know about?

Gary Lansdale: Yes.

John Nousek: Okay

Joe Thurston: Absolutely, yes. So, if you were in a country and a plane went down, you may be in that region, you may be affected or could be a large scale that could spread. And you have to be contacted.

Gary Lansdale: So one of the reasons that the lodging information would be valuable is that in many cases, particularly if there is a complete infrastructure failure like an earthquake, or another kind of an incident where the government cuts off access to the cell phone towers and the internet, is the only way we might be able to reach you is by physically calling the hotel and asking are you there. And are you okay.

Chair Rowland: Very good.

Chair Rowland: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Report on Fall 2018 Commonwealth Campus Visits
Report on Spring 2019 College Visits

Chair Rowland: Okay. We have two additional reports from [INAUDIBLE] that were approved. And coincidentally, approved by Senate Council for presentation this time online. The reports document Officers Visits to the Campuses in fall 2018. This is Appendix J and UP colleges of 2019. Summaries appear in the Agenda, while detailed information is available on the Senate Meetings tab of Board Effects. Direct questions to pass the Secretary, Annie Taylor, or you can direct them to the Senate Office.


NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

None

Chair Rowland: Item M, are there any Comments for the Good of the University? Also seeing none.

COMMENTS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

None

ADJOURMENT
Chair Rowland: May I have a motion to Adjourn?

All: Motion.

Chair Rowland: All in favor.

All: Aye

Chair Rowland: Aye. The Senate is adjourned until December 3, 2019.
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