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The University Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, December 3, 2019, at 1:30 p.m. in room 112 Kern Graduate building with Nicholas Rowland, Chair, presiding.

MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Chair Rowland: Agenda item A, Minutes of the Preceding Meeting. The October 29, 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? Second? All in favor?

Senators: Aye.

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

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SENATE

Chair Rowland: Item B. Communications to the Senate. The Senate curriculum report, dated November 12, 2019, is posted on the Senate website, available for your viewing. It's wonderful reading, of course.

REPORT OF SENATE COUNCIL

Chair Rowland: Next, a report from Senate Council. Minutes from the November 12, 2019 meeting of the Senate Council are available at the end of our Agenda, which include the list of topics discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on that same day.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Rowland: Announcements by the chair. We have just three quick items to go over today. Today we have a logistical change to announce regarding the timing of future plenary meetings; a brief report from a recent meeting of the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities; and finally, the presentation of a certificate of recognition for a senator who has accomplished so much and is now retiring.

First item. As we enter another season of inclement weather, faculty making the trek to Senate meetings here at University Park must weigh the importance of their participation in our meetings against the potential for unpredictable weather and changing road conditions. The further away from University Park a senator is, the more challenging this equation becomes.

In light of this reality, senators over the years have requested that we start Senate meetings earlier in hopes of also concluding them earlier, which, of course, I think we're all in favor of.

[LAUGHTER]

While we've ended our meetings this year by 4:00 PM, this is only a modest consolation for senators who must travel three or four more hours to make it home once our plenary session concludes. So, after a
significant consultation with the Senate Office to ensure the feasibility of this change, we will, beginning in our January 28, 2020 plenary meeting, be starting Senate plenary meetings at 1:00 PM instead of 1:30 as we do now.

[APPLAUSE]

Did not expect that but thank you. In hopes of providing some precious additional travel time in the light of day for our faculty senators who drive the furthest to and from their home campuses.

This decision was not easy to make, in light of the reality that the current 1:30 PM time for plenary sessions is somewhat convenient for faculty members here at University Park, whose teaching schedules has them in class until 20 minutes past 1:00 PM.

However, in trying to strike a new balance between inclusiveness, convenience, and the safety of our faculty, pushing up the starting time of the plenary meeting to 1:00 PM in hopes of concluding our meetings earlier becomes an appealing option.

As you may recall, last year under Chair Bérubé's leadership, we held our September 2018 meeting-- so two years ago. Sorry. Good math-- plenary meeting at 1:00 PM. And the response was generally favorable. As such, starting again in our January 2020 meeting, and repeating thereafter, we will begin our plenary sessions at 1:00 PM. We ask that faculty make accommodations to the best of their abilities for their schedules and to accommodate the change. And I will, for my part, do everything I can to keep meetings on time and conclude as early as we can.

Next, a brief report from a recent meeting of the APLU, the American Public and Land Grant Universities. These are comments that I think our provost, Nick Jones, would have made. But we are not letting Nick deliver comments today. Not because we don't like him, but because in lieu of his normal comment period, he is delivering two annually mandated reports sponsored by our University Planning Committee. So, the brief report from the other Nick, I guess.

So, our Provost is one of four panelists to host an interactive panel on effective and fair policy and practices for addressing undue foreign influence in the conduct of academic research. As many of you already know, this is a topic of ongoing national concern in an area of sustained effort here at Penn State. In fact, to this point, in a separate APLU session, entitled Protecting U.S. Science from Undue Foreign Influence-- big surprise-- a Penn State website on international relationships and activities, hosted by our Senior Vice President of Research was openly touted as a source of best practices for public and land grant institutions.

It is essential for Penn State to strike the right balance between remaining vigilant with regard to outside influence, and, at the very same time, our ability to become an even more global 21st century land grant institution.

To wit, Penn State was the proud recipient of an award at the APLU annual meeting for enhancing internationalization at the institution. So, we've got both sides of this one.

It recognizes a number of ongoing efforts. I won't go through all of them. But to give you a couple examples, the University has created twelve new support positions located across the state to provide immigration advising and co-curricular programming for undergraduate international students at campus
locations. Additionally, thanks to a generous donation to the Office of Global Programs, Penn State is able to sponsor innovative international internships for students seeking global leadership experiences.

While internationalization and research security on the global stage are never ending endeavors, please join me in applauding the Penn State's recent national recognition to both of these ends.

[APPLAUSE]

OK. And now for what will be my favorite part of this meeting, I do believe. For the presentation of a certificate in recognition of Senate accomplishments, I would like to offer special recognition to a faculty senator who is leaving the Senate with a distinguished record of service, Dr. Mohamad Ansari.

[APPLAUSE]

Here. Come on up.

Well, most of many of you know Mohamad. To go over his true record of accomplishments would take half the afternoon. And, of course, we want to be timely. So, here are just a couple of highlights for you.

I'm going to read this very fast. So, please pay close attention. As a senator for more than a decade, Mohamad has held many roles. He was chair of Faculty Affairs. He was our Parliamentarian. He chaired the Senate's recent Self Study Committee. He served on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities for six consecutive years. He was an Academic Leadership Fellow. He was on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President for three years, a Senate Council representative for Penn State Berks for eight years. More recently starting in 2018, he was elected as University Faculty Ombudsperson. And perhaps most significantly, in 2015 and 2016, he was our chair. And under his leadership, we accomplished the following.

This I will also read quickly. Implementation of general education reform; creation of integrative studies requirements; update of general education learning objectives; recommendations for general education assessment; implementation of LionPATH; revision to AC25; and extending Emeritus. Boy, that one just keeps on giving. Right?

[LAUGHTER]

Revisions to the tenure clock for Penn State College of Medicine; revisions to AC21; establishing a third-tier level of promotion for fixed-term faculty; changes to faculty leave policy in AC23; faculty benefits principles for the design of Penn State health care plans; as well as Legislative and Advisory/Consultative reports on diversity awareness for the University.

He works so hard that even in retirement Mohamad will continue on as co-chair of the Special Committee on Addressing Allegations of Faculty Misconduct. So, for these reasons and many others, please rise if you are able, and join me in applauding Mohamad's many and diverse contributions.

[APPLAUSE]

Mohamad Ansari, Penn State Berks: Thank you. Thank you.
Chair Rowland: Yeah. Right in the [INAUDIBLE].

[LAUGHTER]

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you for having me.

Chair Rowland: Of course.

Mohamad Ansari: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: OK. Moving on. Comments by the President of the University. We respectfully invite President Barron to the floor. Dr. Barron, please address the Senate.

COMMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Barron: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Chair Rowland: Yes. Of course.

President Barron: So, one of the big topics that is very difficult to avoid these days and is typically being called the looming enrollment crisis, for which many people believe that there will be a true correction in the number and type of higher education institutions in this country because of enrollment issues that translate into budget issues. So, this is something that I think as more and more data appears is increasingly a serious problem that we have to think about.

So, I had it be my Board of Trustee presentation. It was a relatively lengthy presentation, and I just want to hit a few highlights here to make sure that I also gather your thoughts and questions.

So, first of all, we are Pennsylvania centric, in terms of our numbers. And there's been a decline in the number of high school graduates in Pennsylvania over a decade. It's about a 10% decline. It's significant. We only have five or six counties in this state that are growing. The rest of them, many with a double digit-- large double digit in some cases decline in what their population is.

Unfortunately, we have not only a decline in the number of high school graduates. But of those high school graduates, we have a decline in the percentage that are college bound. So, if you go back a decade, 71% of those high school graduates in Pennsylvania were college bound. And if you look a year or so ago, it was down to 65%. So, that's something of a double whammy that there are fewer high school graduates and a smaller percentage of them are interested in going to college.

Well, we add to that a couple of different factors. One is that we have a high school graduation cliff that is coming up. During the recession people stopped having babies. And so, we project that that larger decrease in the high school graduate population-- because we know who was born in the state-- is coming in the time frame of 2025, 2026, where we expect to see the decline be even sharper.

We also see that of that birth rate, the mix of students is very different, a substantial decline in the number of white students, and the largest increases being in terms of Hispanic students and Asian Pacific Island students. So, we see, as part of this demographic change, also a change in that population, the distribution of the population.
We would be making a mistake if we didn't start to worry about international student populations. In the United States in a single year the international student population dropped 6.6%. So, we get complimented. Thank you for what we've done on the international side of things in terms of research. And also, we just got listed as one of the top 15 schools for hosting international students.

So, many, many different components there. But nonetheless, all of us are feeling the fact that this country appears to be less welcoming to international students.

And the other part about this is a change in the wealth characteristics of our students. So, along with that mix that I've described are many more first in family students that do not have financial capability. And if we look in the state of Pennsylvania, and we map students by their income, we see that the college bound increase is only in students that are relatively well-off. And in most of the other characteristics, which are where the student population is growing, declines in student population for income levels that are substantially lower.

So, in my mind, all of these things mean significant changes in higher education. If you like reading The Chronicle, today they had an article about Is Vermont a forerunner for what is going to happen? Because they've seen not only multiple colleges close, but other colleges nearby even being dragged into the mix with the perception that they also must be in decline.

And I see this within the state of Pennsylvania, where people look at me and they go, well, you're having enrollment problems. Aren't you? And so, this tends to become a mantra that's self-feeding in a lot of ways. So, I do think that, in some ways, Vermont is signaling what significant demographic changes mean for colleges.

So, what is the protection here? Well it is interesting that if I take all of those same issues and I look at public flagships, they're not experiencing those declines. And as a matter of fact, they might be viewed by some students that are qualified as being a safe harbor in a time of considerable stress, particularly among small privates.

What you see in that process is that three things make a tremendous difference, the brand of the institution, the selectivity and quality of the institution, and the financial stability of the institution. If you can deliver on those three things, that you're recognized as an institution with some educational heft, your brand and the quality, you are still going to draw those students, especially students of college educated parents. And if your finances are robust, you can manage different upturns and downturns in what's going on.

OK. So, in my mind, I think in the University's mind, and the Board is now having a fair amount of discussion about this, there's probably no time more important than having us become more strategic about this particular topic and our enrollments. And that means, what are we going to do to increase the size of the pool of the students? What are we going to do to yield a larger number of students from the pool that we have and make us more competitive? What are we going to do about increasing retention rates? Every student that you can retain is a student that you don't have to recruit.

It's interesting to see the headcount of the Commonwealth Campuses declining at a level that is just marginally better than what the headcount changes are in the PASSHE system. But if you then look a little bit closer, you realize Commonwealth Campus faculty are teaching world campus classes. There are more and more students that are there for three and four years, more students, more effort to focus on
retaining those students, and less associate degrees, for which you might be in competition with a community college that can do it less.

Deliberate strategies here. But this notion of retaining that student becomes incredibly important. And whatever we do that is focused on excellence in student success. Because that's the other thing that you're starting to see in this whole focus on this enrollment looming crisis is this notion, yes, well, not only is that place in bad shape, but their graduation rate's only 39%. This is not a good deal. OK? So, being a good deal in that sense that we get our students to the finish line becomes incredibly important.

We do see a lot of things that this institution is doing that really work to address this. Targeting states that have growth in population makes a difference. Replacing the border state focus for our campuses so there's in-state tuition for border states, plus Virginia, which doesn't quite border the state of Pennsylvania-- but we're not going to be concerned about that particular geography. We're looking to reach a set of students that are making a decision. Doing whatever we can to become a more transfer-friendly student so that this becomes easier for people. Having the common app, which dramatically changed the ease at which someone can apply to come here.

Diversity and inclusion. You cannot look at those demographics and think that this is some sort of advertising campaign about this University. We have to take the diversity and inclusion focus here that helps us attract these students even more seriously than before. There are a lot of things on that list. And if you're interested, you can go look at that Board presentation, for which the folks at this University have made a pretty comprehensive list.

The other thing that's interesting to me is that Rob Pangborn's office then took a look at where it is that students that apply here, are accepted here, and don't come here, where do they go? And they're the flagships across this country. A few privates that are in there that have a similar level of selectivity. But it's the Big 10 schools. It's ACC schools. It is flagship institutions. That is where we're competing.

If you pick just a segment of it, like Illinois, and you look at the students that were accepted here but went on to Illinois, for which there were 472 of these students in that particular case, only 90 some of them were actually in-state, Illinois students that applied to come to Penn State and decided to stay in-state. The rest of them were out-of-state and international students.

So, this tells us exactly who our competition is. And our competition is institutions that have a brand that approaches the quality of the Penn State brand. In my mind, this makes all these demographic changes. And that notion of brand makes One Penn State 2025 even more important. Not only does it change the number of people that can come in. But it is focusing on that brand strength that preserves the fact that a Penn State degree is a Penn State degree, is a Penn State degree, no matter where you are within Penn State.

You're also going to start to see a number of things that hopefully will turn out to be quite interesting because we need to model this more effectively. We need to take our history of what our demographics and revenues are and start to project against the demographics of the future what the revenues for tuition might be like five, six years from now. And make sure that we understand where it is that we sit within that demographic focus.
And if we do pilot programs, and do access and affordability programs, what is likely going to be the impact of having somebody in a seat, paying tuition, versus an empty seat from out-of-state, versus an empty seat, in terms of what that balance is?

You are going to see in some extent, and I'll do my best to brief you on this, a first strategic discussion on the Board on what is an appropriate level of reserves for this institution to be robust. Because one of the things you see for those that are struggling is they have no way to invest. And they have no way to manage whatever the ups and downs are in terms of enrollment. And this is an institution that I don't believe, from my knowledge, has ever had that discussion about what is a level of reserves that is appropriate to make sure that we're robust to changes in state funding, and robust changes in enrollment, or robust in terms of the changes in the types of enrollment.

We'll start to have the first discussions from the Board in terms of if you're going to make an investment in access and affordability, what's the best bang for the buck? Is it to freeze tuition and save everybody $180 a semester? Or looking at these demographic changes, does this institution have to be one in which we invest considerably more dollars in those students that can't afford to be educated and may drop out, or end up with a lot of debt for which they do not pay back?

And again, we've never really had a strategic discussion on all the things that we do, from open doors, freezing tuition, and everything else, what is the most impactful way to make sure the student comes in the door, isn't afraid of what our price tag is, has a great education, and gets out that door and goes better?

You will see a considerable amount of effort for which this institution tries to do budgeting not on the annual delta, but in the three to five-year sense. And the agreement we have from the Board is that when we save money-- and you may have noticed that the SERS legislation passed both the chambers unanimously and were signed by the governor that allows us to buy down unfunded liability and dramatically decrease our SERS contribution, which has been going up $10 million a year for the last few years. In a decade it's gone up $100 million. That we will be able to buy down that unfunded liability.

And the Board has agreed that when we find those cost savings, we basically will create two pools. One is on access and affordability. Important to decide what's the best investment there, whether it's a tuition at delta or an investment in need-based students, or whatever. And the other half of it will go towards innovation, to make sure that this is an institution that is always thinking about the next thing to do.

So, I've probably been longer winded than I usually am. But I think this is key. It is basically that we need to be strategic in this area, to really be thoughtful about those different areas.

And our brand and its quality's success are absolutely key, as is ensuring that we have the financial stability to be able to manage in what many people are viewing as a looming crisis in the U.S. for higher education, because we have too many institutions and too few students.

So, I'll end there, and happy to take any questions or thoughts on this. But hopefully you will see as an institution that we are thinking far ahead of this crisis as a way to make sure that this institution remains robust.

But thank you. Happy to answer questions.

Chair Rowland: Yeah. Questions for the president? State your name and unit, please.
**Rosemarie Petrilla, Penn State Hazleton:** Petrilla, Hazleton. Good afternoon, Dr. Barron. And just a couple comments. My role at the Penn State campus is a program coordinator of an associate degree, the PTA program.

**President Barron:** Yeah.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** And if I think back to when I became program coordinator in 2001, we were experiencing-- and we're also very susceptible to changes in health care. And a lot of community college programs had closed. And Penn State sustained our programs. There's been a proliferation of those programs. And we're coming up on a potential challenge now.

But some of the things that I did to grow that program at the time was to define pathways from associate to other degrees. So, we have an agreement with Misericordia University where someone could start at Penn State Hazleton. And it feeds our RHS programs and our liberal arts, and now hopefully HPA. And then have those articulation agreements.

That grew my transfer enrollment so that it became where we were half traditional and half transfer students. So, I think there is opportunity there. And I also can't tell you how many Penn State students who earned their four-year degrees in Kinesiology and Exercise Science who then come back and stay another year and a half or two years to get a degree in PTA because they can have jobs. I think there are pathways. And I'm always thinking about, identify those pathways so they're not going six years, and they're going four years, and our exercise science people or athletic trainers are more marketable.

So, I think there's a captive audience within Penn State. If we can just identify those pathways and make it more efficient. And I think it fits the vision of 2025 as well.

And I think collaboration with other institutions. They love to get our students because they've proven themselves within that. So, I think there are some opportunities there as well.

**President Barron:** Yeah. I could say that I'm not afraid of the future. I just want to be deliberate about it.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** Agreed.

**President Barron:** I want to see what's happening, which we do see. There's not a lot of choice when the birth rate is clearly declined, and the number of high school students is declining over much the country. And their interest in going to college is declining that we need to be deliberate.

So, having pathways that go from that associate degree to other degrees, that's exactly the type of deliberateness that makes a difference.

**Rosemarie Petrilla:** And how well we market them, because I can maybe identify those pathways. But I'm probably not the person to put it on the website in the best way.

**President Barron:** Uh-huh.
Rosemarie Petrilla: And I can't tell. When I get them in my door, I usually get them in once they come talk to me. But how many people are actually hitting that website? And can we reach out? Other institutions ask them to put their name and contact information in, and right now we're not doing that.

President Barron: Yeah.

Chair Rowland: Other questions for Dr. Barron?

Ann Taylor, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences: Taylor, Earth and Mineral Sciences. You mentioned world campus as a way we can help attract those enrollments that we need. I'm jumping ahead a lot to a report that will come up later from our list committee, where we look at email accounts and when they expire, and so forth. And I know when we've talked about One Penn State 2025 in the past, you've recognized the importance of letting students keep those email addresses so that we can continue to contact them.

And the world campus poses a particular problem, because those working adult professionals are very apt to step out from their studies. And they lose their access account. And then we don't have an easy way to-

President Barron: Get back to them.

Ann Taylor: To get back and pull them in. And yet, they very much likely want to continue their studies. They just had to step out for a while.

President Barron: Yeah.

Ann Taylor: All of this to say I was surprised that this latest policy that's going to be coming out from our IT arm of the University still says that students who, if you graduate, you get to keep a Penn State account, but not if you don't graduate. And I'm just wondering if that's something you do want to continue to look at, because we're going to lose those students who step out.

President Barron: OK. Thank you. I will think about that. Because I've talked to a number of students who stepped out, and not just world campus, and talked about how difficult it is to get back in. We can't afford it. No. We can't afford that.

Chair Rowland: There's a question from Mediasite.

Delia Conti, Penn State Fayette: This is a question from Delia Conti from Penn State Fayette. Demographics and enrollment issues are often felt most at the campuses. What do you see as the role for the campuses in these changing times?

President Barron: OK. So, I agree. And part of the thing that we've seen is a change in focus. So, this idea of Discover Penn State from adjacent states' in-state tuition directly goes to enabling campuses to attract a student without having to consider that out-of-state tuition is too great a barrier.

The notion of more campuses having degree opportunities that allow students to stay and get a degree, even if the headcount changes in a negative way, that's a revenue increase that allows you to be more robust.
And I have to say— and you've provided one example— a lot of the power of the campuses is how personal they can be with a student. And being personal is often a ticket to retention. And so, if we look at the graduation rates that occur there, the room for being able to promote a greater retention level for those students with a very positive outcome on the revenue side for the campuses is just having those students not want to go somewhere else.

And I think there's lots of ways to mine that data. I have a few examples when I start to look at why students have left after a year but might go to another place. I think being able to mine that data and saying, OK, we can reverse that trend. Because if you're reversing that trend by 500 or 400, or whatever it is, that has a huge impact on the revenue side of things. So, I think there is a lot of room in these areas on the campuses for things we've done and things we should think about that make the campuses much more robust, even though they have a catchment area, and that catchment area is in decline.

Quite frankly, I think even the launch boxes in communities can help with recruiting, because people start being innovative and entrepreneurial. And they're right there. And Penn State's right there helping them. And here's your degree right there next door as well. So, all of these things, I think, start to make a difference.

And if there are dollars that are there for innovation, speaking broadly about innovation, I would say the one thing that the other institutions around this state do not have, they do not have dollars to do the things that allow them to adjust and to move forward. So, I think there's a lot we can do. We just have to be deliberate about it. But thank you for the question.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Other questions for the president? In that case, thank you Dr. Barron.

President Barron: Thank you. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

Chair Rowland: Very good. Next item. Comments from the Executive Vice President and Provost. We respectfully invite Provost Jones to the floor. Dr. Jones will present two special information reports today. Both are sponsored by the Senate Committee on University Planning. The reports are allotted 15 minutes each for presentation and discussion by Senate Council.

The first report is budgeting at Penn State. Very good. Thank you.

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

Provost Jones: Before I begin, where is Mohamad sitting? Oh. Yes. I heard, and you all heard from Nicholas that it was indeed Mohamad Ansari responsible for the implementation of LionPATH. I just want to be clear. [LAUGHTER] Every now and again, we get a break. Yes.

[LAUGHTER]

So, good afternoon. It says I have two presentations, but I really have three because the first is a part one and a part two on budget, talking first about the University, the institutional budget. And then second, the implementation of the recommendations of the strategic budget task force. And then I'll talk about strategic plan implementation progress.
I think what I'll do is I'll actually pause at the end of the University budget presentation, because that's very specific and very quantitative, to see if there are any questions, and then move on to part 1B.

So, this is probably my most formal presentation of the year. And I have a script that I will do my best to stick to here. So, today I will share information with you regarding the University's operating budget for the current fiscal year, and upcoming changes to our strategic budgeting approach, as I just said. After my presentation, I'm happy to take any questions you may have.

**Special Informational Report: Budgeting at Penn State 2019-2020**

OK. So, I'll begin with the operating budget presentation. Penn State's total institutional operating budget is about $6.8 billion for the fiscal year that began July 1, 2019. That's up from approximately $6.5 billion in 2018-2019. This pie chart shows sources of Penn State's revenue for the 2019-2020 fiscal year.

Education and general funds, which include tuition and fees, the general support portion of the state appropriation and indirect cost recoveries provide 36.4% of our operating revenue. The education and general budget, or E&G, is a subset of the general funds budget.

The hospital and clinical revenues of Penn State Health, again, exceed education and general funds. This year it's by about 3%. Overall, it's nearly 40% of the total budget.

Auxiliary enterprises and restricted funds activities are largely self supporting and externally funded. They also provide reimbursement to the University for the general funds-based services that support all units.

General funds for agricultural research and cooperative extension, the College of Medicine and Penn College include their shares of the state appropriation, indirect cost recoveries, tuition and fees, and federal funds for agriculture.

The 2019-2020 E&G permanent budget includes an additional $35.4 million in income, indicated by the blue bars, compared to 2018-2019. The tuition rate increases, presented in more detail on a later slide, provide $17.6 million. The $4.7 million increase in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's annual appropriation incorporates the 2% growth approved by the General Assembly last June.

Additional income of $13 million comes principally from an increase in indirect cost recovery and the continuation of the plan to gradually phase out the E&G appropriation transfer to the College of Medicine.

An additional $100,000 comes from the student-initiated fee. Indicated by the green bars are expense increases, which include $32.5 million for salaries, $8.1 million for health care and retirement benefits, $9 million for strategic investments, $16.5 million for facilities related needs, $2.5 million for insurance, $2.2 million for student aid, and $1.1 million for student-initiated activities. This growth is offset by targeted cost savings of $35.5 million, indicated by the red bar.

The additional $35.4 million in income in 2019-2020 reflects that we have no increase this year in Pennsylvania resident undergraduate tuition rates, with other rates up 1.95%. The additional expense changes include salary merit increases of 2.5%, capital plan funding, with just under $9.5 million of operating budget debt service, and $80 million in direct capital funding from the University contingency,
priorities and strategic investments totaling $9 million, and no additions to facilities maintenance or student aid budgets.

Of the total expense savings, $9.3 million was identified when the Board of Trustees approved the budget. An additional $10 million in cost savings have been recovered through an across the board 1% reduction in the E&G budget borne by all units. And yes, that leaves $16 million to go.

As the commonwealth's annual appropriations have declined, Penn State has become more reliant on tuition revenue to fund core expenses. In 2001-2002, the state appropriations shown on this bar chart in green made up 31.4% of general funds. By 2018-2019, those had declined to about 13%.

As a result, tuition and fees, shown in blue, have increased from 62.1% of income in 2001-2002 to 78.7% in 2019-2020. The chart shows the commonwealth's appropriation since 2001, including this year's total of $337.2 million. It also shows what the appropriation would have been annually if it had been adjusted for the Consumer Price Index, or CPI.

The CPI adjusted appropriation, estimated this year at $487.2 million, is shown on the ascending blue line in this chart. You can see that the appropriation was cut substantially in 2011-2012. The 2% increase approved by the general assembly for this fiscal year brings the appropriation closer to the very levels of funding we saw annually from 2001-2002 through 2010-2011.

The 2019-2020 appropriation breakdown shown in the far-right column on this slide includes the general support line of $242 million, nearly $55 million for agricultural research and extension, $26.7 million for Penn College, and an estimated $13.4 million for the Hershey Medical Center from state and federal medical assistance funds.

In late 2018, we submitted to the Commonwealth our appropriation request for 2019-2020. That request included a 6% increase in the general support appropriation. Ultimately, the approved appropriation increase of 2%, along with targeted cost savings, allowed us to keep tuition flat this year for Pennsylvania resident undergraduates.

This chart shows the changes in resident and non-resident undergraduate tuition increases at Penn State compared to those of our Big 10 peers, all of whom have had higher levels of support from their states. The chart shows rates from 2010-2011 through 2014-2015, compared with 2015-2016, through 2019-2020, and the CPI.

Our resident undergraduate tuition rate changes were lower than those of other Big 10 institutions from 2010-2011, through 2014-2015, about 8% for Penn State versus 13% for the other Big 10 publics. In the past five academic years, this gap has widened, with our increases of about 5% well below the nearly 15% overall among our Big 10 peers, as well as lower than inflationary growth of 9% as measured, again, by CPI.

Our non-resident undergraduate tuition rate changes were lower than those of other Big 10 institutions, from 2010-2011, through 2014-2015. That has changed in the past five academic years. But our increases are only slightly higher, about 1%, than those at other Big 10 universities.

Overall, our undergraduate tuition rates reflect Penn State's commitment to affordability for resident and non-resident students. This slide summarizes the lower division resident and nonresident tuition rate,
increased percentages, and dollar amounts per semester. Pennsylvania resident tuition rates for lower division students at University Park and at the Commonwealth campuses remained flat in 2019-2020 as they were in 2018-2019. The aggregate increase for non-Pennsylvania resident undergraduates is 1.95%.

The numbers on this slide summarize by category the E&G cost savings and revenue changes over the past five fiscal years, plus the current year and their percentages of the total. On the savings side, health care costs, including those post retirement, account for 15.2% of the 37.7%. Regarding revenue changes, tuition rates for non-Pennsylvania residents accounts for 23.5% of the 62.3%, more than double the amount of the next highest category, in-state tuition.

This slide shows the same five-year data in pie chart form. The revenue changes by category are shown in shades of blue on the left, with cost savings by category in shades of orange on the right.

I will hit my pause button at that moment. That concludes the formal budget presentation, before I talk about the strategic budget task force. And I'm happy to take any questions on the budget before I move on, if there are any.

**Chair Rowland:** As noted, Dr. Jones has agreed to field questions. Do we have any?

Well, save them for later.

**Provost Jones:** OK. That's good.

OK. So, I will now shift to our Strategic Budget Task Force Implementation. Faced with outdated technology, changing demographics, and public demands for increased financial transparency, we are gearing up to change the University's budgeting approach, which is at least six decades old to make the process more efficient and transparent.

I've shared bits and pieces of this with you previously. And now I have an opportunity to flush this out in a little bit more detail.

In January, David Gray, Senior Vice President for Finance and Business, and I launched a Strategic Budget Task Force. Members represented areas across the University, including the Faculty Senate, Research, Commonwealth Campuses, and academic colleges. Over a six-month period, the task force examined Penn State's current budget processes, benchmarked best practices, and scrutinized financial tools. In a report delivered over the summer, the task force recommended changes in three categories. Overall budgeting approach, operating approach, and capital planning.

The changes include a shift to multi-year budgeting approach with a bottom up approach that takes into account opportunities for efficiencies, funding of strategic priorities, and appropriate allocation of resources to fulfill the University's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service.

Budgeting of all funds, and participation in a regular centralized process to review budgets. Elimination of the permanent and temporary categories in the general funds budget. And establishing clear principles and categories for carry forward balances to roll into subsequent years.
As we move forward to implement these changes, we've established working groups in four key areas, budgeting approach, multi-year planning, salary and job classification, and capital planning. Those four groups will report to a new executive budget committee.

The executive budget committee was established to oversee the work to operationalize the recommendations adopted from the strategic budget task force report. David Gray and I serve as executive sponsors. And University Budget Officer, Mary Lou Ortiz, serves as chair of the committee. We have several other members in place, with hiring in process for a Communications Manager and a Business Analyst.

Led by Andrew Reisinger from the University Budget Office and Jeff Smith from Outreach and Online Education, the Budget Approach Working Group will focus on specific approaches to budgeting that will be adopted by the University. The working group will address recommendations related to budgeting all funds, permanent and temporary budgets, carry forward funds, and fringe benefits.

Led by Patty Cochrane, representing the Commonwealth Campuses, and Kurt Kissinger, representing Finance and Business, the Multi-year Planning Working Group will focus on adopting a five-year budget planning process for the University and its many subunits. This group will address recommendations related to multi-year budgeting and non-general funds, including auxiliary gifts, endowment income, and sponsored research.

Led by Greg Stoner, representing Human Resources, and David Rose, representing Auxiliary and Business Services, the salary and job classification working group will focus on human resource policy and process changes, such as standing versus fixed-term positions and job classifications, and address salary related topics.

Led by Sue Wiedemer from the Office of the Corporate Controller, and T. Mark Miller of the Office of Physical Plant, the Capital Planning Working Group will focus on aligning the capital planning approach with the new budgeting approach. This group will address recommendations related to capital plan development and those at the intersection of operating and capital costs.

So, these committees have just been launched. And their work is beginning. So, there's not much progress to report at this point. But they are up and running.

So, at that point, I welcome any questions or comments you may have on, I guess, either of the prior two presentations.

Chair Rowland: Questions for Provost Jones? Yeah. Ira.

Ira Saltz, Penn State Shenango: Saltz, Shenango. You were talking about the carry forwards. I'm just wondering what your office has observed. I remember way back I learned the theory of bureaucratic behavior was to make sure you spend every dime in your budget, otherwise someone's going to look at it and say, oh, they don't need their whole budget, and so we can take from them. Have you had any notices about carry forward? Or has there been any hesitation on the part of deans to have carry forward, out of concerns that if they can find money that they don't have to spend, they may lose that money?

Provost Jones: Well, I think in all candor, I would say that is a constant concern of the deans and the chancellors, that we are looking for opportunities to pinch any reserves that they may have. And I will
say in passing-- I'm sorry, Mary Lou, I have to tell this story-- that we did begin a process a year ago of escrowing funds. So, if we felt that a unit had too much carry forward, we scraped some of it centrally, and basically gave a promissory note back to the unit. So, it was still their funds, and they could draw on it. But we just wanted to manage those amounts centrally so we could put it to more use.

And I just happened to notice last week, in an email I was writing to one of the deans that instead of talking about escrowing, I talked about escrewing.

[LAUGHTER]

And I'm concerned that if I did that a year ago, that's probably what got the resistance up.

But seriously, I think the notion of budgeting requires us to think simply like this. That at the beginning of the budget year, you have an opening balance, which is the ending balance from the year before. You then have a bunch of things that you would like to be investing in over the course of the year. And as a result of doing that, and truing everything up, and being a little bit up in some areas, and a little bit down in others, you will have an ending balance. That ending balance will carry over to the next year.

We will look at the beginning and ending balances, as well as the budget request in making allocations of central resources to unit. So, we're taking a step back and bringing the carry forward approval process and the budgeting process together in a harmonious way.

Previously, they were somewhat separate, disconnected processes. We're just really bringing them together. We want to make sure that every dollar the University has is being put to work in the most effective manner. That's really all that's going to happen here.

So, I don't think people need to be concerned about funds being taken or not allocated. It really is just having conversations about ensuring that institutional resources are most efficiently put to work for the benefit of the mission.

Special Informational Report: 2019-2020 Strategic Plan Implementation Progress Report

Chair Rowland: In that case, without further ado, presentation number three.

Provost Jones: Technically two.

Chair Rowland: Right.


So, this is a little change of pace, but obviously related. Taking a look at where we stand in strategic plan implementation. There's a lot of exciting things to share.

So, in November-- this is really a wrap up of some things that I've shared with you in prior meetings less formally. So, in November of 2018, the Board of Trustees committee on governance and long-range planning approved extension of the current strategic plan through to 2025. And in the February 2019 meeting of the Board, the full Board concurred with this approval.
Extending the life of the current strategic plan helps enable important initiatives to grow and thrive, drive more progress in critical areas, build momentum around some of the ideas that have come up in the first five years of implementation, and also enables us to support emerging signature initiatives.

Because you're all aware through four completed RFP cycles in two years, 265 proposals were submitted, with 43 selected for funding. Just over 16% of proposals are funded so far.

Well, I won't read the numbers down there. The bullets, you've read them already. But you get a sense of the flow. It was a pretty consistent participation and submission rate and funding rate through those first four cycles.

This is a summary of the four RFP cycles. We awarded more than $9 million. The bar chart shows the number of funded projects by thematic priority and supporting element and the amount of funding in each area. And so, you get a sense that obviously transforming education and stewarding our plant's resources were the largest recipients. And then others below that. Infrastructure and support are sort of lagging a little bit, because that really is driven to support some of these emerging thematic areas.

This is something that we've not shared before. But it really speaks to the impact that the seed grants have had, and if it sounds like I am declaring success-- I am declaring success with this effort. In the first two cycles we invested about $4.6 million across the University and have received already as spin offs from those projects, $9 million in external funding.

Three completed seed projects alone brought in nearly $8.5 million, the Public Humanities Initiative, the Integrated Data System Solutions for Health Equity Initiative, and the UN Global Consortium for High Performance Buildings.

There are a number of other projects that are due to wrap up soon. And we are optimistic that they too will generate external support to sustain themselves. Unfortunately, with some of the budget challenges we have this year, we've hit the pause button on cycle five of funding. But we are hoping that we will be able to see our way clear to continue this program because of the success that it has had to date.

One Penn State 2025. You all know about this. This is one of the signature initiatives associated with transforming education theme. And it represents an ambitious rethinking of our fundamental approaches to learning and student success. Its evolution and its success depends on substantial partnerships across the University, including with the Senate. And we very much appreciate the Senate's willingness to take this on this year as one of your priorities.

As you know, the five guiding principles, you've heard them before. They're listed behind me. I won't read them. But I think with these five guiding principles driving this effort, we are really poised to great success. And I can tell you that anyone outside the University with whom I share the vision for One Penn State 2025 is just blown away by the scope and potential impact of this program.

You know about the Consortium to Combat Substance Abuse. This, of course, is part of the enhancing health theme, and draws on expertise of researchers, educators, and practitioners to combat currently the opioid crisis through data driven, evidence-based innovation. We are developing and implementing programs, policies, and practices to prevent and treat addiction and all of its spillover effects. The plan here is to hire over the next four years 12 new tenure track faculty across the University to support the
consortiums work. And we held back in April of this year the inaugural conference. And that was a big success.

A couple of three other signature initiatives, the Humanities Initiative, which we hope will position Penn State as a national leader in the humanities, part of the advancing the arts and humanities theme. The Center for Immersive Technologies, focused on truly transformative technologies, such as virtual and augmented reality, part of the driving digital innovation theme. And the Consortium for Integrated Energy Systems, which is a visionary proposal to build capacity in energy research and education, obviously part of stewarding our planet's resources.

So, we're at a critical point right now as we transition from the first five years into the next five years. We have ongoing conversations and engagement with the University Faculty Senate and the Board. We are working on building on the momentum of the plan and continuing the work, as I said at the beginning, rather than start it over, and continued commitment. And support of seed grants and implementation of signature initiatives across the thematic areas continues.

All budget units who participate in the strategic planning process have been asked to reflect on existing plans by November 1. Those reports are largely in and are currently being reviewed. By year's end, units will receive back, from us, results of institutional plan assessment analyzed by strategic plan committees, iterated version of the institutional strategic plan based on that analysis, and guidance on their planning process, including how to enter content into our new strategic planning system called Newventive.

We're moving to a standard template for all unit level plans. And we will learn more about collective impact and evaluate progress more effectively. Unit planning processes will begin in January of 2020. Draft revised plans will be submitted by July 31, 2020. That's a revised date, Daniel. Right? Yes. It was a little earlier than that. We pushed it back as a result of discussion at the last implementation committee meeting.

And after feedback is given on plans, integrated units will then move to implementation of their revised plan. So, this is a pretty exciting period. And I think you will be interested to see some of the results coming out of Newventive as we pull everything together and can share it with you, because it really does show in, I think, a fairly novel way how the plan is really having an impact for the University. So, I think that's it. Happy to take any questions or comments on strategic plan implementation.

**Chair Rowland:** Are there any questions for Provost Jones. One on Mediasite. We'll take that one first.

**Anna Butler, Faculty Senate Staff:** This question is from Nicole Williams, College of Medicine. Will the salary and job classification committee address multi-year contracts for fixed-term faculty if budgets will be multi-year?

**Provost Jones:** So, I think actually the best way to answer that question is that question is going to be rendered moot by the disappearance of permanent and temporary funds structures.

In the past we have had restrictions on what appointment types can be linked to what budget types. So, for example, for a standing position or for a fixed-term, multi-year position of four or five years, you needed permanent funds. And if you had only temporary funds available, then the maximum contract length could be three years.
With the notion of permanent/temporary funds disappearing, there's nothing to connect those two. So, what is going to be done, most likely, is that appointments that make sense will be supported by the unit budget. So, what we're taking away is really the connection between the appointment types and permanent and temporary funds, because they are going away. And So, that, I think, actually gives units considerably more flexibility in how they make appointments.

There will be a need for standing appointments moving forward. There will be a need for fixed-term, multi-year appointments moving forward. There will be a need for fixed-term, one-year appointments moving forward. We're not taking away the ability to do that. It's just the linkage of those appointment types to permanent or temporary funds that will be rendered moot by the transition we're making.

**Chair Rowland:** Okay, let's go over here.

**Andrea Sillner, College of Nursing:** Sillner from the College of Nursing. I just wanted to tie together some of President Barron's comments with your comments as well that address both the competition across our Big 10 universities, and also budgeting and strategic planning. And a large portion of the budget presented Penn State Health and some of their revenue sources.

So, I wondered if you could address an area, which I think is one of our weaknesses when comparing ourselves to some of our Big 10 competitors, which is health care and health care facilities, particularly when thinking about the University Park campus.

And I know that Penn State Health has recently acquired and expanded to the east, such as in the Harrisburg area, or Penn State Berks and Allentown. And I didn't know what your thoughts were or what the future was for Penn State Health locally, in terms of mergers and or acquisitions with Mount Nittany Health or Medical Center, for example, or where you see Penn State Health going locally in the future.

**Provost Jones:** So, I'm walking over to my boss to handle the response.

[LAUGHTER]

**President Barron:** OK. So, first of all, people who have been here for a long time realize that there is a much greater presence of Hershey Medical Center and Penn State Health in our community. And my own perspective of being here 20 years, and being a dean, and going away for a decade and coming back is that the health care is much, much stronger.

Now, there is also the fact that the health care across the entire state of Pennsylvania is changing rather dramatically, as places like UPMC have coupled their insurance, and providing, and picked up hospital, after hospital, after hospital. The competitive environment has changed rather dramatically.

Penn State Health is operating in the same way of expanding its footprint in order to create what I would call a whole group of pyramids where, locally, there's a certain level of care, and then at some distance from that, a more complex care. And then finally, the very high-end care that's Hershey Hospital. So, you can look at all of these things as feeders that help support an entire system.

So, Penn State is now very actively looking at how to expand that footprint to ensure a very robust college of medicine and a very robust hospital system while providing the best possible care.
We have a partnership in Penn State Health with Highmark that did not exist before that allowed for substantial investment, and for us to begin to tie some of these things together. And I think you will see Penn State being more aggressive in the marketplace through that part of it.

Now, here is Mount Nittany, as a standalone entity. There are fewer and fewer of these standalone entities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, because they tend to be more costly and less competitive.

So, our view of this is, how do we partner with Mount Nittany to make sure that we have the best possible health care within this particular region, and also to make it as affordable as possible.

Now, you have multiple players here. And so, we can't go say, well, this is the way it should be. And you guys should do this, this, and this. We're not doing that. But I would say, we probably are in the most collaborative position with Mount Nittany in terms of how we may be able to partner, how to make the Regional Medical School campus stronger, how to attract the best physicians to this area. I've seen a lot of change over a decade that's an improvement. We're still working at it.

And so hopefully, as this whole landscape evolves where there are fewer and fewer providers, and the care is being coupled with insurance products, for example, that you'll see that we're active in this type of partnership and focus. We're spending a lot of time thinking through it.

And I personally think that it makes a big difference to attract faculty and staff to have good health care, and have it reasonably priced, because, of course, we pass on the health care costs to our students. It's not being supported by the state of Pennsylvania. We pass that cost on to a student. So, we want you to have the best possible health care, without us passing too great a cost onto students.

So, I don't know whether that really is helpful, as much as just to say we're actually paying a lot of attention to this, and a lot of conversations going back and forth.

Chair Rowland: Very good. We'll take the Mediasite question.

Anna Butler: This question is from Vinita Acharya, College of Medicine. When we achieve the One Penn State 2025, will the curriculum and syllabus for courses be the same in all campuses? Will all campuses follow the same study materials, like textbooks and any third-party materials used?

Provost Jones: No.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: I approve this message.

[LAUGHTER]

Provost Jones: I think the intention is to provide frameworks, forcing functions, so that things are optimally aligned. The intention is not to create a cookie cutter environment where everything has to look the same. We want to leverage the strengths that exist across the institution. But I will say, and it is Senate policy, that a Penn State course is a Penn State course. If a Penn State course has a particular course number, then, by definition, 80% of that course content should be consistent. But even that doesn't
require that different faculty members teaching the same course at different locations have to use the same materials. Just the learning outcomes must be consistent at the 80% level. So, no intention to force everything to be the same.

Chair Rowland: Very good. One last question for the provost? Maureen?

Maureen Jones, College of Health and Human Development: Maureen Jones. Health and Human Development. So, I'm very proud to be a part of a Senate that's making changes when it comes to fixed-term faculty. Appreciate the change from budget models, because I hope that continues the conversation to get us closer to what you shared today. And just wanted to reiterate that I hope we can help improve the stress and anxiety levels of fixed-term faculty in feeling that they have long-term positions, and folks that are doing well, contributing to our University. So, I'm hoping that as you move the budget model and you start to look at those standing positions, that they continue to engage with us in conversations that make it better for fixed-term faculty to feel secure here at Penn State in their roles and the contribution they give to the University.

Provost Jones: Sure. I would say that I anticipate that being an outcome of this process. I think, despite the great advances we've made with AC21, I think, across the University, from time to time, we still potentially would find ourselves in positions where a unit budget executive would like to offer a longer term contract to a promoted fixed-term faculty member, but he or she is unable to do so because they don't have the permanent funds in their budget to enable that. Constraints like that are going to be released. And those decisions will be made for philosophical and business reasons, rather than driven by budget model constraints. So, I think obviously this is bigger than the fixed-term faculty issue. But one of the positive outcomes, I believe, will be that part two of the implementation of AC21 will be facilitated where some of the remaining constraints for multi-year appointments are released.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you, Provost Jones.

Provost Jones: Thank you very much. Happy Holidays.

[APPLAUSE]

FORENSIC BUSINESS

Senate Input on One Penn State 2025’s Goal of Curricular Coherence

Chair Rowland: Our first item of business is forensic, sponsored by curricular affairs, entitled Senate input on One Penn State 2025's goal of curricular coherence. The report can be found in Appendix E. Before we start the forensic today, I'd be remiss not to underscore the significance of this discussion about curriculum. If you've been on the Senate for a while, then you well know that this is not the first time that we've had a discussion like this one. We may have called it by another name in yesteryear, most recently, for example, curricular integrity rather than curricular coherence. But this is not at all the first discussion of its kind on the floor of the Senate. Nor do we hope that it is anything close to the final discussion of its time.

To this end, two additional sources of input have been mustered for the discussion, both today, and also to extend the discussion into the future. First, upon entering, you should have received a half sheet of paper, upon which you should feel utmost free, abundantly free to pen your anonymous thoughts about
curricular coherence and what it means to you. And these sheets will be collected and entered into the feedback stream as it moves its way back to curricular affairs. Also, upon the conclusion of this meeting today, a discussion board will be made publicly available on the Senate website to continue the discussion. So, please, go back to your units and spread the word that this discussion is all inclusive.

Please encourage use of the public discussion board, and if public discussion boards are not for you, you can also just write me. My name is Nicholas. My email is njr12@psu.edu. I will be happy to accept all feedback, solicited and unsolicited, on this discussion.

So, with that, we've got 20 minutes allocated. So, please, take it away.

**Michael Bartolacci, Penn State Berks:** And I can assure you we have no handwriting analysts on our committee.

[LAUGHTER]

**Mary Beth Williams, Eberly College of Science:** OK. Thank you, Nicholas. So, thank you for pointing out the sheets that you grabbed on the way in. We really would like your input and comments. And I want to especially invite the students to also provide us with their input and comments. You are important representatives, and your feedback and input in curricular matters is very important.

So, again, we want to open this as the first discussion among faculty senators and your constituents to talk about curriculum, the heart of what it is we do here at the University. And I want to encourage you to go back to your home constituents and invite them to participate in this conversation. For framing, very briefly, before we open up these questions to this body, we had been asked, what do we mean by curriculum when we ask questions about curricular coherence? And by curriculum, we mean all the components of the undergraduate degree that we ask our students to complete as part of their learning at Penn State. And so, it includes our majors, our minors, our certificates. It includes the Bachelor of Arts requirements, which many of our students are completing. It includes general education, the University requirements, which are separate from gen ed, the USIL, and the writing across the curriculum, and first year seminar requirements. Right? And it includes electives in the situations where students have them, because they don't all have free electives as part of their studies. So, we're really talking about the entire curriculum for undergraduates.

And as we think about those components, we think about how they work together, horizontally, course to course, and how they work together as students progress in their learning over time. And that progression may be within a single course or within a single program, or for all of these components as they work together in their time at Penn State. And so, with that, I really want to turn the floor to you. I don't want to guide you through question by question. You have a series of questions that we asked you.

**Ira Saltz, Shenango:** Saltz, Shenango. I remember back when I was DAA, we got to sit in on an ACUE meeting. And at that meeting at the time, then President Spanier was talking about that there were eleven different business degrees at Penn State, and that he was talking to a parent once, and saying, well, if
Penn State has eleven different business degrees, what does it mean to have a business degree from Penn State?

And from that I guess it led him to the conclusion that maybe we need to have just two, one for Smeal and one for everyone else. But the fact that he didn't know the right answer isn't the reason that we needed to go that far in extreme.

And here's what's happened. I teach the Principles of Macroeconomics. I get all the first-year Business students in that class in the fall. I've had 25 to 30 generally. This year I've had six. And the reason is we basically are no longer attracting students into Business.

And the reason is MATH 110, which is a calculus course. And it isn't that they don't want the rigor, because there are other rigorous courses and other rigorous courses, we can put it in its place. It's that they know it's worthless. It's that they know they don't need it. And our advisory board unanimously told us we don't need it. But as one campus, we can't change it.

We've assessed the curriculum. We're doing our assessment. We've caught upon these weaknesses. But we can't address them. And so, this notion that everyone must have identically the same degree is leading to, one, the killing of our business program, and two, it leads to the least common denominator. Strengths that may exist at one campus because of the faculty they have can't be put into the program because not everyone has the same expertise.

We're missing opportunities. And we have different demographics, and different students, and different needs at different campuses. We don't need to be so extreme.

OK. That's what I wanted to say.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Rowland: Well, it's a great way to start, Ira. Thank you.

Mary Beth Williams: Yeah. No. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: All right. Next question.

Mary Beth Williams: Yes.

John Liechty, Eberly College of Science and Smeal College of Business: Hi. My name's John Liechty. I am jointly at Eberly and Smeal. And I would like to echo Ira's comments. I think there's a couple of points we should think about when we start this discussion. So, the fact that we have this point of curricular cohesion as an aspiration suggests we don't have curricular cohesion at the University, at least now at the level some people would like to see it. Otherwise we wouldn't be having the discussion. I think that's kind of self-evident.

And as I've thought about this, one of the things that comes to mind is-- it's exactly what Ira was saying--there's a lot of diversity in the campuses and in the student bodies that we attract at these different campuses. And there's different needs that these students have. And I think it is challenging to think that
we can come up with one course-- I understand what Provost Jones is saying. And that's part of our legislative policy that exists.

But degree programs are different. Right? And so, I think this is perhaps the most challenging thing to think about this whole program is if our degrees are not the same, and our goal is to make them the same, then who's going to change. Right? And who's going to dictate the change? And how are we going to coordinate what that change is going to be, what the uniformity is going to be? And if you have a diverse student body who have different needs, and diverse faculty with different strengths, and you're going to try to coordinate all of that, what is it that we're missing?

We already have a committee that you bring degree programs to. It's peer reviewed. It's evaluated by people across the University. And then they say, yea, nay. They ask for changes. And a bit like writing a paper. And you get something that comes out. But everybody says, OK, that's something we can stand behind as a Penn State degree.

So, if that mechanism isn't giving us what we need, then I can only think the mechanism that would be replacing it would be one that says, take all the degrees, bring them in, reshuffle them, and make them into one degree. So, some kind of overarching coordinating committee, which I think will be extremely cumbersome, will be acrimonious potentially between the campuses, and will leave us with a great deal of inflexibility.

So, I'm in favor of us providing the best education we can, helping those students where they are when they come to us as best we can to be as well prepared to leave after four years to make a positive impact in the world. I'm much more in favor of that than I am being able to say to people, you come to Penn State, you get the same degree, regardless of who you are, or where you are, where you come in. I think we have a greater strength in our diversity that we can offer the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania than that offering. Thank you.

**Isabella Webster, College of Information Sciences and Technology:** Isabella Webster, College of IST. I think you can look at this from two different facets. You could kind of look at it as degree cohesion. Or you could look at it as course cohesion. I'll touch on course cohesion.

Looking at courses like MATH 110, MATH 140, MATH 141, you don't have uniformity across University Park, let alone uniformity across the Commonwealth. You have students-- this is very typical at UP-- who will get a C or a D in 140, 141, or opt to drop the course, and will take it at a Commonwealth. And it is substantially easier. The grading is much easier. The structure is different. And in many times the curriculum is different. And what you come out of the course knowing is not the same.

And so that doesn't look like curricular cohesion to me. And if students don't have the ability to go to a Commonwealth and take it over the summer, that is a barrier to education for a lot of students. So, making those courses in such a fashion that they're not only fair, but uniform in terms of what you're learning. And so that's an example where you don't see a lot of success there.

But then you can look at courses that have implemented uniform curriculum or used open educational resources. Psych 100 is one that's currently going on. As you see, there's a similar textbook, similar set of slides, similar lecture outlines. And so, you have, across all sections, a very similar experience. And you're not seeing those mass discrepancies based on professors. And so, in terms of course to course cohesion from a student perspective, that's what I would say it looks like. I won't touch on
degrees, because I don't have as many thoughts there at the moment. But those are some, from a student perspective, in terms of what things actually look like in how students approach this. So, thank you.

**Chair Rowland:** Thank you. More comments? Yeah. Renee in the front.

**Renee Borromeo, Penn State Mont Alto:** Renee Borromeo, Mont Alto. I'm in the Physical Therapist Assistant Program. And I know Rose has spoken to this to some people about the same thing. We, I would say, would be kind of a mini pilot study on curricular cohesion. We were encouraged-- we were kind of demanded-- to get our program together. And our program is a two-year program, five campuses, fifteen full time faculty. So, it's very small.

It took us over two years of many, many hours of meetings. We basically revamped every course. My point is, this is a great goal. And I think we did end up with some improvement maybe in our programs. I mean, it's debatable. We're still assessing whether it was actually an improvement or not. But I think it needs to be recognized that this is a lofty goal, that it isn't going to happen easily. And it's very time consuming and very difficult.

I mean, I think we were actually a very small, fairly cohesive group to begin with. And I look at some larger programs and think, good luck. Because it's just a lot of work. And I think it should be recognized that there perhaps needs to be release time, extra compensation, something to do it just because the number of hours that we spent was a lot. And I guess that's my only point, is just to be recognized that it's going to take a lot of work.

**Mike Bartolacci:** OK. By the way, those of you who don't know me, I'm Mike Bartolacci from Berks. I just want to point out some complicating factors we all should be thinking about. Adjunct faculty, especially at the campuses, sometimes they're hired at the last minute to teach a course. How do you get curricular cohesion at the course level, with someone is hired at the last minute to fill in? You need an extra section, or somebody is left at the last minute.

Accreditation bodies. Look closely at different factors. Smeal, for instance, AACSB. College of Engineering, it would be ABET. There are several complicating factors we all should be considering with respect to cohesion across the University. I just wanted to throw those factors out there.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Josh?

**Josh Kirby, College of Education:** Josh Kirby from the College of Education. I can answer or I can respond to the idea of managing a program, and the coherence within a program, and within the system that we're given to manage a program with. We are not able to do that on a systemic level in any way.

The strategy comes into you must change each course one at a time. And if there's any co-dependencies or any interconnections among those courses, then sometimes you even must consult with higher powers to figure out what order should I submit my course changes in order to be able to ultimately achieve the internal program, single faculty curricular coherence that we seek? I work in a technology-oriented program. We also are heavy on World Campus. And so, we have a lifecycle, being technology, and being a competitor within a crowded marketplace to update, refresh, revise our courses on a three year or less cycle. And that may also mean that we must update, revise, and refresh the entire program on a three year or less cycle, just because even in my field alone, the field itself keeps changing its name.
So, we really struggle to try to follow all the rules that are necessary to manage a program. And I would hope that a curricular coherence model would include a method for someone that serves as a manager of a program, a coordinator, to actually sit down with a human across the table and say, this is where we ultimately want to go. And I want to submit a single package to show you everything fully disclosed, all upfront of where we want to go, instead of dragging this process out into what literally becomes thousands of individual steps to accomplish a program transformation pivot, shift, whatever you want to see.

Mary Beth Williams: In a more or less continual fashion for you.

Josh Kirby: Absolutely. Yes, please.

Chair Rowland: We'll take that Mediasite question, please. And then we'll [INAUDIBLE].

Anna Butler: This question is from Susan Fredericks from Penn State Brandywine. In this era of intercultural awareness, will the USIL and other cultures be able to be name changed to more inclusive of globalness, rather than exclusive of other cultures?

Mary Beth Williams: So, that's a great question. We actually have a charge to our USIL subcommittee right now to consider.

Mike Bartolacci: My subcommittee.

Mary Beth Williams: Mike's subcommittee. To consider the global competency language that came from Rob Crane's proposal that was on this floor a year ago? Two years ago? Yeah. So, we have that charge with the committee right now. So, thank you for bringing that up.

Chair Rowland: Michele.

Michele Duffy, College of Health and Human Development: Duffy, HHD. While our daily lives live in courses, programs, and sets of requirements, if we think a little bit more abstractly about this perhaps, the one thing I haven't really heard is the focus on student learning and what we hope objectives are to meet upon graduation, and what kind of students we'd like to turn out. So, however that fits into this conversation, I think that must be part of the conversation on curricular coherence, because it's a University coherence.

And just a couple notes about the last question. Renee started to say something on this too. I think what faculty need is time and release, not just for a semester or a course, but over time to be able to actually let things percolate and brew in a useful way.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Yeah. Rose.

Rosemarie Petrilla: Petrilla, Hazleton. As part of that revamp of the PTA curriculum, it's difficult, because we have programs where there's eight students, and then there's programs where there's 47. And the instructional methodology, they have one classroom lab where they can go in and out of those topics and cover the material so much quicker. And after just going through my third accreditation, and finally making it beautiful and wonderful, I had to change it. With first time pass rates of over 95%, graduation
rates greater, beating national averages. And now, I don't know what it's going to be. And it's costing us more. We must hire more people at Hazleton to implement this new curriculum.

**Chair Rowland:** OK. Additional questions? Yeah, please.

**Jacob Moore, Penn State Mont Alto:** Jacob Moore, Penn State Mont Alto. I was just going to say, so I'm not a program director. Mont Alto does not have a four-year engineering program. And by necessity, the students are moving around. And I think the most important thing, at least from my perspective, is we have enough coherence that there's flexibility. Students can move from World Campus, the Commonwealth campuses, University Park, be able to move around without it being so disconnected that it's essentially just different colleges. So, that's, I think, the central thing that I want out of the coherence in this.

**Chair Rowland:** We're approaching our final moments here. So, we'll take one more question.

**Erin Vose, University Park Undergraduate Association:** Erin Vose, UPUA. I would say that from the student perspective, one of the main barriers to a coherent curriculum could actually come more from an advising perspective. For example, for students in less structured majors, such as liberal arts, there is a lot of flexibility in what the major can look like. And therefore, through different advisers, students may get different perspectives of what they should be taking. And therefore, their degree might say the same name, but because of the different avenues that they're told to take, and different classes they're told to take, they might be actually getting a completely different experience, and maybe not the experience that's particularly right for them, but just based on what different advisers know. So, I think more coherency among some advising perspectives could really add to a coherent curriculum.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. We are at time now. Is there any burning question that's left? OK. Seeing none. Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Chair Rowland:** OK. As we move on, item H, unfinished business. We have none, thankfully.

**LEGISLATIVE REPORTS**

**Chair Rowland:** Moving on, Legislative Reports. Please note, we will 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 your clicker does not work.

Keith's does not work. We have three reports from the Senate Committee on Committee and Rules. The first is revisions to Senate Constitution Article 2, Membership, Section 5. This involves including a Senate representative from the World Campus Student Government Association, and it is found on your Agenda in Appendix F. CC&R Chair Victor Brunsden, who is already up here, will present the report. Please note that this report is a change to the Senate Constitution. So, it may be discussed today, but it will be voted on at the next meeting.
Revisions to Senate Constitution, Article II – Membership, Section 5
(Including World Campus Student Government Association)

Victor Brunsden, Penn State Altoona: Thank you, Nicholas. One of the things that has become abundantly clear is that the experience of students in the World Campus is sufficiently different from those students who take courses in residence at one of our physical locations that they were not being adequately represented by the previous gaggle of student organizations.

That sounds somewhat disparaging, but I mean no disparagement to them. We serve many different kinds of students. They have different kinds of needs. So, now that there is a World Campus Student Organization, it is only natural that the Senate include some representation from that organization on the Senate. That is what this legislation is designed to accomplish.

Chair Rowland: Any questions for Victor?

OK. Good. Seeing none. We will vote on this next time. Please take a close look at this, as it is a change to our constitution.

Revisions to Standing Rules: Article II, Section 6(o)
Committee on University Planning (Sustainability)

Second report is also from CC&R, titled "Revisions to Standing Rules, Article 2, Section 6o, Committee on University Planning." This is about including sustainability in their duties. You'll find this in Appendix G. As part of the standing rules this time, we'll vote on this report today.

So, Victor, do you want to make some comments on this report, please?

Victor Brunsden: So, as part of the focus that we, as an institution, are making on sustainability, we need to incorporate this focus in the Senate. So, University Planning was the originator of this legislation. Thank you to them for all the work they did on this.

So, what we have here is some legislation that formalizes that. So, I hope that you will, in fact, accept this legislation. It's not a particularly huge change, but I think it is a significant one.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Questions or comments for Victor?

Yes, please.

James Jaap, Penn State Greater Allegheny: Jaap, Penn State, Greater Allegheny. I just wanted to know, Victor, why you decided to go with the triennial, as opposed to annual and biannual for the other two.

Victor Brunsden: That was something that University Planning recommended. There are going to be other committees, also with a focus on sustainability. So, there will be future modifications to their standing charges. Having every committee report out every year on something with sustainability would kind of unsustainably bury us.

[LAUGHTER]
Chair Rowland: Also, here Lisa is the chair of University Planning. I think there's also a more technical answer.

Victor Brunsden: Yes.

Lisa Posey, Smeal College of Business: Posey, Smeal. There is a three-year large report that's done that's a national kind of a thing. So, we would then have a summary of that report. So, they're assessed. And then they're benchmarked against other universities and things like that. So, it's using that and all the information. And then we would get a summary of that.

Chair Rowland: Right. Which is funneled through the Sustainability Institute.

Victor Brunsden: Yeah.

James Jaap: Yeah.

Chair Rowland: Any further questions? And/or comments?

Very good. Seeing none, are we ready to vote? OK. For those of you that are joining by Mediasite, you may cast your vote on polleverywhere.com. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: I must ask for your patience. We have many senators on Poll Everywhere today.

Chair Rowland: I had noticed.

[LAUGHTER]

Anna Butler: OK. On Poll Everywhere, I have 20 accept.

Chair Rowland: Very good. On the floor.

Paula Brown, Senate Office Staff: In house, we have 105 accept, 8 reject, 2 not counted.

Chair Rowland: All right. The 2s lose. Motion carries. Very good.

Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article I, Section 1: Officers

Next item. This is the last one that's legislative today. This is also from CC&R, Revisions to Senate Bylaws, Article 1, Section 1, Officers. It's found in Appendix H. Victor will again present this report.

Also note, this report is a change to the Senate Bylaws. So, it will also be voted on the next meeting, along with the proposed change to the Constitution.

Victor Brunsden: So, there are two issues that this report addresses. One is that once we elect a secretary or a chair elect, that senator is no longer available to carry out the ordinary work of the standing committees. For some small committees, this can result in something of a loss of expertise.
What's more, should the officer come from a smaller unit-- and this change is directed mostly at the smaller units-- it is optional. So, for larger units that might even have trouble getting people to run as senators, you do not have to avail yourself of it.

But for the smaller units, that means that they no longer have a voice in their work of various committees. And since the work of this body is done in its committees, this is a real issue. So, all this is designed to do is to allow for any unit that has a senator become an officer; they can appoint an alternate to help in the further ordinary standing committee work of the Senate. That is the idea.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Questions for Victor? Galen?

Galen Grimes, Penn State Greater Allegheny: Yeah. Grimes, Greater Allegheny. Victor, just looking at this, you say they can appoint an alternate. How long would that alternate serve? One year? Or the entire time that the person might not be available as a senator? Which in the case of a chair elect, would be chair elect, chair, and then immediate past chair.

Victor Brunsden: For the term of that officer. So, for the secretary, it would be one year. For the chair elect, that would be three, or the remainder of their term.

Chair Rowland: Good question, Galen. Thank you. Yes, please.

Julie Gallagher, Penn State Brandywine: Gallagher, Brandywine. I just had a quick question of clarification. So, you said the person would be appointed. But if it's a three-year term, it seems that the campus, particularly smaller unit, might want to have a say in that representation. And so, is there a possibility if that person moves into an office position that the unit should have another election, rather than an appointed position? Potentially for something for that length of time.

Victor Brunsden: The practice for senator elections at this point is that-- so you have one or more positions open. You get candidates. We mandate that there be at least three candidates for every two positions. Hopefully two candidates per position. So, that the next highest vote getter becomes the runner up or the alternate for that position.

So, the alternate would be that person that received the next highest vote tally. That's all. They would have actually run for an election.

Chair Rowland: Ira, would you like to make a comment? Would you give Ira the microphone again, please?

Ira Saltz: Saltz, Shenango. And I'm just sort of reading what it says here. "The units from which the chair elect and secretary were elected may provide elected alternates." I see. The word "alternate" is purpose. But to me, this sounds like maybe the unit could hold another election.

Victor Brunsden: They could. But the procedure for providing alternates uses this sort of language elsewhere in our bylaws and constitution.

Ira Saltz: OK. I mean, then the wording of this-- may provide elected alternates-- could maybe be interpreted by some units to mean, oh, we now elect an alternate senator.
Victor Brunsden: And there may be circumstances where that has to happen. I mean, this does arise on occasion, where somebody is elected senator, and then they'd leave the University for whatever reason. The runner up, who would otherwise become the alternate is unable to do so, for whatever reason. And then a new election has to be held.

This does not mandate that a unit hold an election. One would hope that they would contact the Senate office for guidance.

[LAUGHTER]

I hope that's not too much to ask.

Chair Rowland: Additional questions or comments. Yes, Josh.

Josh Kirby: Kirby from Education. The discussion about alternates is making me very self-conscious, because my unit actually elects an alternate senator. That person is listed as that role. It has nothing to do with who's the second-place vote getter or anything like that. So, do I need to go and explain 20 years of precedent was wrong? Or how does this work?

Victor Brunsden: We should send your unit immediately to alternate jail. [LAUGHTER]. No, Josh, that's OK.

Josh Kirby: Oh, OK. Good.

Victor Brunsden: Yeah. The alternate police will not be coming for you.

[LAUGHTER]

Joyce Furfaro, College of the Liberal Arts: Hi. Furfaro, University Park, Psychology, Liberal Arts. I assume this is the same procedure that we already have in use when somebody goes on sabbatical, or senator goes on sabbatical, and we have an alternate step in for them. So, it would be the same language, and just to clarify.

Victor Brunsden: Yes. Yeah.

Joyce Furfaro: Thank you.

Chair Rowland: If the unit so chooses.

Victor Brunsden: If the unit so chooses.

Chair Rowland: The unit can elect not to do that.

Victor Brunsden: Yes.

Chair Rowland: Didn't mean to use election right there, but I did.

Further questions? Lisa, please, go ahead.
Lisa Posey: Posey, Smeal. You mentioned about the committee work and how they no longer have representation. But when it comes to the plenary sessions and there's legislation, are they getting overrepresented, because the officers also vote, and then they would vote. Or is there something else happening there with that?

Victor Brunsden: No. They do get to vote in the plenary. This is a good point. And it actually caused us a great deal of thought. The thing is is that while you could argue that perhaps there is a degree of overrepresentation, let's face it. It's at most two people per year. These people are likely to come from very different units. And there is less cohesion across units, I think, than many of us would imagine.

Altoona, for example, has six senators. I know that while we do see eye to eye on many things, we don't see eye to eye on everything. And so, we do vote differently. I think that would be true of the alternate as well.

I do know that depending on the officer, sometimes they refrain from voting. So, it is a real concern. But we are just adding one extra person, usually, from a unit to the Senate. And we have 200 faculty senators, a fair number of student senators. So, I don't think it's really tipping the scales that far in any one direction.

Chair Rowland: Also, if this went into action, I do think that, generally speaking, officers would opt not to vote, if they knew a vote was being cast in their place.

Michael Bérubé, College of the Liberal Arts: You're going to vote.

Chair Rowland: I'm not voting. There's no voting in this zone here.

Other questions? Very good. Seeing none, let's move along.

ADVISORY/CONSULTATIVE REPORTS

Advisory/Consultative Reports. The first report is from the Senate Committees on Faculty Affairs and Intra-University Relations. It's titled revisions to AC25, Emeritus Policy, formerly HR25. It is Appendix I of your Agenda. Chairs Renee Bishop-Pierce and Maureen Jones will present the report and field some questions.

Revision to AC25 Emeritus Policy (Formerly HR25)

Maureen Jones, College of Health and Human Development: She's super eager is all I'm saying. Renee's a little bit too eager to not stand on that side is all I'm saying. So, this should be an easy one for us. Accidentally, when we looked at the change of rank and title in the emeritus policy, folks with a non-terminal degree are excluded in the language for this policy, and would, therefore, at the second rank or higher, not be eligible for emeritus.

So, our suggestion is that we just simply add-- and if you'll scroll to the very bottom for me.

There's lots of great language that was created ahead of this. However, the bottom line is that there are three things we want to add is the opportunity for an assistant clinical professor, assistant research professor-- gosh, she's good, right? Assistant teaching professor with a non-terminal degree to be eligible,
because they would then be at the second rank or higher. Just the same as folks with a terminal degree. No changes here at all. It's all then equitable and includes everyone in this conversation about achieving emeritus status.

Chair Rowland: OK.

Maureen Jones: All right. Good. We're out. No. I'm just kidding.

Chair Rowland: Questions for Maureen?

Maureen Jones: Nicholas is paying attention.

Chair Rowland: OK. I see no questions already. Yeah.


Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Chair Rowland: Is that microphone working?

Maureen Jones: It is the combination of any of those ranks.

Unidentified Senator: [INAUDIBLE]

Maureen Jones: Right. So, you must hold those ranks as a chunk. And then you also always may then push it up the ladder if there's any questions, to get a review of that. Am I correct in that?

Chair Rowland: Yeah. It does say hold any of the ranks for five years. So, you could be an associate professor of sociology, like I was, and then a full professor. As long as you've had those two for five years, you should be eligible, at least on account of that criteria.

Yes. Roger?

Maureen Jones: [INAUDIBLE] appointed to the president. Things like that.

Chair Rowland: Kathy, did you want to comment directly? Yeah. Kathy, please.

Maureen Jones: Oh.

Kathleen Bieschke, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: I think that there is a way in which there are exceptions that can be made by the president. And in those cases where there is some wonkiness in terms of changing of AC21 that basically prevented somebody from achieving that rank, we would just take that under consideration.

Chair Rowland: That should dissolve over time too, as we stay in these ranks. And I hope we don't change them soon.

[LAUGHTER]
Roger, last comment.

Roger Egolf, Lehigh Valley: My comment's probably not necessary now with the verification.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Thank you. Are we ready to vote?

Maureen Jones: I was going to ask that. Yes.

Chair Rowland: Are we ready to vote?

Maureen Jones: Thanks, Kathy, for that one.

Chair Rowland: All right. Let's move to vote now. To accept this motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere I have 20 accept and one reject.

Chair Rowland: OK. Good.

Paula Brown: In house we have 98 accept, 7 reject.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Motion carries. Thank you, Maureen. You may be seated. But Renee, you're not off the hook yet.

Revision to AC76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Our second Advisory/Consultative Report is from the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, Revisions to AC76, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. This is Appendix J. Chair Renee Bishop-Pierce.

Renee Bishop Pierce, Penn State Scranton: Great. Thank you.

Chair Rowland: It's all yours.

Renee Bishop-Pierce: OK. So, the current version of AC76, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, doesn't specify procedures for situations-- sorry to be saying this looking right at you here-- involving the Executive Vice President and Provost.

[LAUGHTER]

These revisions provide policy whereby if the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities determines that the Executive Vice President and Provost is the subject of the complaint, the Executive Vice President and Provost will recuse themselves, and the role be assumed by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

It's a fairly straightforward-- I don't know. Can you [INAUDIBLE]. It's just section G. [INAUDIBLE].

Chair Rowland: Since the report apparently is also afraid of the Provost--
Renee Bishop-Pierce: There we go. They're in bold right there. So just Section G was added. And it's pretty much exactly what I said. If the Executive Vice President and Provost is the subject of the complaint, and that is determined by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, then the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs would then resume those responsibilities.

Chair Rowland: OK. Good. Any questions for Renee? Are we ready to vote?

Very good. To accept this motion, please press A to reject. Please Press B. I know there's going to be at least one reject.

Anna Butler: On Poll Everywhere I have 20 accept.

Paula Brown: In house, 102 accept, 3 rejects, one not counted.

Chair Rowland: One not counted. [INAUDIBLE] didn't click.

Very good. The motion carries. Thank you very much, Renee.

Email Policy

OK. Our last Advisory/Consultative Report is from the Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. It is titled the Email Policy. It can be found on Appendix K. Roger Egolf, the floor is yours for a brief presentation. And then Roger will field a question or two if they arise.

Roger Egolf, Penn State Lehigh Valley: Thank you. The new email policy was developed administratively, but with a lot of consultation from the LIST Committee. The original policy that came out wasn't quite to our liking, and we made our wishes known. And the administration worked very well with us in order to modify it. Specifically, in the category of retired faculty, which were going to lose the regular Penn State email address in the original version. And with Senate consultation, the administration agreed to grant the retired faculty that do not have emeritus status, the same email privileges as emeritus faculty.

There were a few other changes made from the original. For example, groups that are moving to the newer non-regular Penn State email, the WeAre or the MyLion type accounts, will have email forwarding from their previous email address.

So, if a faculty member who leaves, not a retiree, but a faculty member who leaves, their emails will still be forwarded to them. So past students looking for recommendation letters, et cetera, will still have access to their former faculty. So, LIST highly recommends that you vote to recommend this policy to the president.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Questions for Roger? Yes, Annie?
**Ann Taylor:** Taylor, EMS. You heard me speak about the current students. And I feel very strongly about that. But I wanted to ask as well why we are differentiating with MyLion.psu for staff who are retired, and WeAre.psu.edu for students who are retired? We're not doing that for faculty who leave. It seems very odd to me that we would differentiate. Once you're a Penn Stater, you're always a Penn Stater. And I think our current students, even if they step away, our staff, our alumni, would be so proud to be able to keep their @psu.edu. And I would hope that the goodwill and the retention for our current students would be worth whatever the expense is to just make it very simple.

Surely, we can tag them behind the scenes if we need to do so for our purposes, which would make a lot of sense. But I'd love to be able to see a day where you could go to LDAP, you could go to the directory and look up someone, and as long as they've been part of our family, they're still showing up as an equal member of that family.

**Roger Egolf:** I don't disagree with you. However, there were several reasons why the administration wanted to move in the direction they're moving. Some of the issues were security related. And others were cost related.

And I do feel that the administration worked well with us in coming to a compromise. That isn't to say it's the absolute best policy that could ever exist. But it's a reasonable compromise, in my opinion.

**Chair Rowland:** Other questions, please.

**Elizabeth King, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences:** Hi. King, College of Earth and Mineral Sciences. I just want to reiterate what Annie said about the current students. I teach in a master's program online at World Campus. And I can't tell you how often we do lose students because of them losing their email address. And I understand that sometimes they provide a secondary email that we can use. But we don't always have access to that. And it's just been year, after year, after year.

And then, as Annie said, when we heard about the Penn State 2025, we got really excited that that was going to be a solution, and it would just really help us if we could reconsider letting students keep that email address while they're still Penn State students, if they haven't graduated yet. Because they may have stepped out. They may only take a couple classes a year because their employer only pays for a couple classes a year. There are a lot of situations. It's not that they are taking multiple years off.

**Chair Rowland:** Mr. President, would you like to respond, please?

**President Barron:** I'm just curious whether they can pause. A World Campus student, just like a-- the policy has the current students being able to pause and keep their emails. So, isn't it easier for some mechanism to have the World Campus students just pause and keep it? Renata has her hand up there too.

**Chair Rowland:** Let's go with Renata.

**Renata Engel, Vice Provost for Online Education:** Thanks. I can comment on this. Renata Engel, World Campus. So, a couple of things. There are really two separate issues here. And I'd like to just sort the two out.
And President Barron, I agree with you. There is a policy around adult learners that enables them to stay active. But there have been some odd things that have been happening in terms of being able to ensure that that happens. It would address many of the things we think about for current students who step away.

And so, I think there are places where we are looking now to, let's say, make sure that the things that we have wanted to do and have been in practice or in policy before, continue to stay. And part of it is hitting that ability to pause, stay as a student.

So, there are some issues that are associated with students who are current students who step away. And then there are people who graduate. And I do think they are two different issues. And so, while I think this policy is addressing one aspect for the faculty, the issue for the alumni is another one we probably want to look at in the future, but these are two separate issues, I think.

Chair Rowland: You want to go ahead, then we'll [INAUDIBLE].

Ann Taylor: Taylor. EMS. Yes. And obviously, I knew Renata would-- thank you for making a more official clarification. I guess I just want to speak for the students. We hear again, and again, and again how difficult we make it for our students. Yes, there are ways they can pause. Yes, there are ways they can do a leave of absence. There are all sorts of things like that. To us and to our business offices, these seem easy. But our students tell us when they do try to return, I mean, many go away stomping their feet and say, forget it. Institution X doesn't make it this hard for me to come back like Penn State.

And many, when it is time for them to step away, they don't realize they're stepping away. And So, they don't realize they should have paused. They should have taken a leave of absence. So, I think we can do a better job of thinking about what it's like from the student perspective, and making it easier for them, and not easier for us.

Chair Rowland: Very good. Isabella, and then a final comment in the back.

Isabella Webster, College of Information Sciences and Technology: Isabella Webster. College of IST. In student Senate today we came to the understanding that students could keep the @psu.edu if they paid the $800 or so Penn State Alumni Association fee. Is that a part of this? Is that incorrect? But based on list today, that's the understanding we came to.

Roger Egolf: I don't have that understanding.

Isabella Webster: Is there any circumstance under which students can keep @PSU.edu, as opposed to transitioning to @WeAre.PSU.edu?

Roger Egolf: Well, until they transition, they keep it. But no. There's no way of paying in order to keep the regular Penn State email address for alums.

Isabella Webster: Does that differ at all based on LIST acquiring G Suite?

Roger Egolf: No. In fact, there's going to be a report next month on G Suite. And G Suite is not going to include the email or calendar portions of G Suite.
**Isabella Webster:** OK. Then given that, I would simultaneously like to echo everything World Campus has been saying on behalf of any students that will eventually become alumni. It's very, very challenging to continue communication, even with forwarding services. And then the distinctions between MyLion and WeAre, or any of these. I'm not quite sure, unless we're repurposing email addresses, what the use of doing all of this is, from a student becoming alumni perspective.

**Chair Rowland:** Mr. President?

**President Barron:** So, my suspicion is, a lot of this is going to have to change again with One Penn State 2025. Right? Because you're not leaving being a student. And so that certainly will make a difference.

And I agree, for any student, not just World Campus students, you step aside, and we make it painful to come back. So, we ought to be able to find a way to fix all that.

I also insisted that people should be able to keep their email address when I was president of Florida State University. And they also insisted upon changing the name of the email server. And part of that was to manage populations. Because one is someone who is there and is active. And others are people that are somewhere else and requires a different type of management.

Plus, so many of the things, the entry point we have into different systems is your email address. And so now, all of a sudden, you have the same email address. Now, they're managing access points, as opposed to simplifying it by having a different email address for which you now know you do not have access to all of the different things. So, it's a very different management structure for someone not here versus someone here who has access to many things. So, the very simplest thing to do is to keep an email, forward it, but to be able to manage who is here and has access to particular types of information, as opposed to trying to manage someone and saying, oh, it's the same email address. But now that password, we have to not include that to be able to have access. So, it is a management device in a lot of ways.

But I do think if we actually go to a One Penn State 2025, we'll have to figure out a way around this, because you will be able to keep taking classes if you want. And hopefully, that makes the World Campus problem where students completely disappear in the process. So, this will require an evolution. But I'm not at all surprised that they need to manage the databases in a simple way.

**Chair Rowland:** That's the primary reason.

**President Barron:** That's the primary reason. Yes.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Dave, do you still want to make the last question, comment? Yeah. Go ahead. Go ahead.

**David Smith, Division of Undergraduate Studies:** David Smith, Division of Undergraduate Studies. So, in the section there it says students. Right? Partway down, students on official leave have access to their email. So, what we're doing there is actually asking the student to take an action. I think we are painfully aware when students aren't here, we know they're not here. And so, to me, it's really how do we ensure that we can continue to communicate with students. That becomes really critical without sort of making them take that action. We should take the action to ensure that we're continuing to connect with
them, particularly if we want to increase the graduation rates, and ensure that we're connecting with students who stop out, often for financial reasons, first and foremost.

We have a University retention schedule for records, for instance. And we keep records for three years from point of graduation, seven years from point of last activity if they haven't graduated. Right? I think there are creative ways that we could think about, how we maintain access for some period of time the student has stepped away so that we could actively try to encourage them to return.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. It's been a productive discussion. Are we ready to vote?

Very good. To accept the motion, please press A. To reject the motion, please press B.

**Anna Butler:** On Poll Everywhere, I have 17 accept and 7 reject.

**Chair Rowland:** OK.

**Paula Brown:** In house we have 72 accept, 32 reject.

**Chair Rowland:** Good. The motion carries. Thank you.

### INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

**Chair Rowland:** Moving on. Informational Reports. On your Agenda you will see three reports marked with an asterisk. These reports were approved for presentation on the web only. So, they will not be discussed today. I would encourage you to read them carefully and direct your questions to the chair of each committee.

**Mid-term report from the Task Force on Curricular Process Reform**

Appendix L, you will find Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, Mid-term Report on the Task Force on Curricular Process Reform.

**Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Academic Year, 2018-2019 (Division I Athletics at University Park)**

Appendix N, you will see the annual report of the Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

**Software License Management**

Appendix O is the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology, Software License Management.


Our first presentation is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits and the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits, and it's titled 2018-2019, the Annual Report on the Status of Benefits Changes. It appears as Appendix M. There has been 15 minutes allocated for presentation and discussion.
And apparently, Greg Stoner and Renee Borromeo will be presenting this together.

**Renee Borromeo, Penn State Mont Alto:** Thank you, Nicholas. And we'd also like to thank Ira Saltz and the University Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits for sponsoring this report from the Joint Committee on Insurance and Benefits.

Please note that the report summarizes medical and prescription drug plans and costs for 2018. Data for 2016 and 2017 are provided in charts for referencing changes over a three-year period. We attribute some of the decreased medical and prescription drug spend in 2018 to active negotiations between Penn State and medical and prescription drug third party administrators Aetna and CVS Caremark. In addition, on average, Aetna's negotiated rates with providers have decreased, and administrative fees have also decreased.

Finally, plan design has contributed to changes. Particular attention to the guiding principles of affordability of health care for Penn State's lowest paid employees was one of the goals of the four-tiered structure of the deductibles under the PPO plan, and of the increased HSA seed money in the PPO Savings Plan. We will be happy to answer any questions regarding the report.

**Chair Rowland:** Very good. Questions for Renee? Maybe even Ira? And possibly Greg Stoner? Wow! Seeing none, thank you for the presentation.

[APPLAUSE]

**University IT Modernization Efforts**

Our last presentation, sponsored by the Senate Committee on Libraries, Information Systems, and Technology. It's titled IT Modernization Efforts. It can be found in Appendix P. 15 minutes have been allocated for the presentation.

Our speaker today is Don Welch. There we go.

**Roger Egolf:** I will Introduce him.

**Chair Rowland:** OK. Thank you, Roger.

**Roger Egolf:** Today's presentation on IT Modernization will be given by Don Welch, who is the Interim CIO and Vice President for Information Technology. Don?

**Don Welch, Chief Information Officer and Interim Vice President for Information Technology:** Thanks, Roger.

As you know, we're looking at upgrading the way we do IT across the University, trying to keep up with what we want to do to accomplish strategically. You heard a bit about the strategy that we're implementing across the University, as well as some of the budget challenges and changes that we're making. So, this is our program to keep up with those.
Strategically, One Penn State 2025 will have a lot of difficulty being successful without some increased capability and capacity from IT. The same is for almost all of our strategic initiatives. We're going to need additional capacity. We're going to need bring in new capabilities.

Right now, the way we are organized, we have very distributed IT. We have a lot of duplicated services. Our data, which is the lifeblood of any organization nowadays, is spread all throughout the University. And we don't know necessarily-- by knowing, I mean, the governance-- who can have access to the information, under what circumstances. And so, we need to be able to, number one, govern that information, and number two, be able to make sure that information makes it into the right system so that the right people can understand it, and take action on it.

So, to help meet those needs, we've got three efforts, three pillars of effort that we are doing under IT modernization. The first one is to increase that capacity and capability where we've identified needs throughout the University. The second is to optimize or reduce costs for the institution.

Part of what we have to do is meet some goals from the University to reduce the University's budget overall. You saw some of the challenges that we're facing. And the University is counting on a reduced IT spend to help meet some of those goals. And then we have to reduce risk, both the cybersecurity risk, and the availability, and the performance of our systems.

So the combination of having duplicated systems throughout the University, a lot of old systems, systems that don't necessarily have all the right systems for business continuity and disaster recovery, don't necessarily have redundancy and skills to cover for those systems, set us up with some amount of risk for our IT that we want to try and address.

So, these are the projects that we've got underway to advance the University's mission right now. A lot of those are analysis, as we look for ways that we can invest in key technologies or capabilities to help set that foundation so we can achieve the One Penn State 2025 and other aspects of the strategic mission.

Controlling costs. Right? So, we have a goal of $15 million to reduce from across the University. We think that we spend about $250 million a year on IT across the University. That is a somewhat debatable account, depending on what aspects of research computing, what individuals who have an IT job family, and don't necessarily do all IT work, and visa-versa, people who are not in an IT job family, and are doing IT work. But we think it's about $250 million. So, $15 million is significant, but it's not a crippling amount that we'll be losing.

The key for us is that we want to try and make these reductions in a way that will have the least impact on the University's mission and mitigating the risk. I talked about the security and the operational risks of our IT infrastructure.

So the way we are going to allocate these costs across the University, rather than allocate them by some arbitrary formula per unit, per headcount, per IT spend, which would be difficult to identify, what we want to do is allocate these costs, these givebacks in accordance with the opportunity for units to take central IT services to mitigate the costs.

So, for example, Enterprise Active Directory program. We had over 90 instances of Active Directory. Active Directory is what validates your password when you log into a system.
Not only was that a huge security risk that we had essentially our key password spread all throughout the University. But it was also an annoyance. You had to know which system you were logging into to use which password, because we had different password policies on each of those Active Directories. And then, on top of that, the cost.

So that project is ongoing this year. It's almost complete. This is where units have migrated to Enterprise Active Directory, our one single directory system. Those units will be decommissioning, if they haven't already decommissioned their Active Directory instance.

Part of the give back from the unit will be calculated based on how much the units were or should have been spending on their Active Directory instances. Therefore, the cost giveback should have a neutral impact on that unit's mission. That's our goal. Every unit's a little different. But that's how we're trying to do these costs, the cost cut allocations, so that we can minimize the impact on the mission.

So, we're going to be doing two services this year. Those cuts will have those calculated. They'll be going out in December in draft form. During January and February will be the chance for feedback on either a specific instance for a unit, or on the model that we're using overall. We've got a number of other services that are underway. Some units have already migrated there. Those recovery cost cuts will be allocated in years two and three.

So, this is basically the way we will allocate those units that were running those services themselves, where we'll use the formula which has been validated by internal audit to calculate what they should have been spending on those services, and then allocate those givebacks based on those calculations.

So, the first year is underway. So, as I said, those givebacks are due to the budget office in early February. Next year and the following year, we will have a similar process to identify givebacks. Send them into the University Budget Office. Units will know what those givebacks are about six months before they impact their budget. So hopefully they can plan for that. But they will be allocated in accordance with the services that we were running. So hopefully, they should know it. And knowing that they've got these services they can decommission; they should be able to absorb those cuts.

So, our goal is to minimize the impact on the mission of the University through these cuts to help make us be a more efficient and effective IT organization. If we were going to build new capacity, we have to have a firm foundation of technology to build that on. We don't have that right now.

By sending you units to move off duplicated services onto centralized services, we think we can build a better foundation to be able to build that capacity faster and less expensively, and to optimize those so that the units are focused on what's important to the unit, and not on running services that are a commodity.

Any questions?

Chair Rowland: Questions for Don?

Don Welch: I know it's late.

Chair Rowland: It's probably just because it was a wonderful presentation. Thank you very much, Don.
Don Welch: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

NEW LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS


COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GOOD OF THE UNIVERSITY

Chair Rowland: Are there any comments or recommendations for the good of the University?

Is it true that we have someone on Mediasite? Yes. OK. Please read.

Anna Butler: This comment is from Dr. Robert A. Zambanini Jr, Penn State Berks. "I would like to take this time to acknowledge the retirement of one of the largest non-teaching influences on me in my 19-year career here at Penn State. During my time here with the University, Dr. Mohamad Ansari has been more than a friend to me. He has been a confidant for, a colleague with, and an inspirational figure to me. He has been a constant steady force for me whose comradeship will always be remembered. As you head into your retirement, Mohamad, I would like to conclude these public comments in the presence of the Penn State University Faculty Senate by simply saying, "May you have a beautiful retirement, good king."

Chair Rowland: Woo.

[APPLAUSE]

Very good. Well, that was inspiring.

Well, our next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 28, 2020 at 1:00 PM. Reminder. 1:00 PM.

ADJOURNMENT

May I have a motion to adjourn?

Unidentified Senator: So moved.

Chair Rowland: All in favor?

Senators: Aye.

[Gavel]

Chair Rowland: The Senate is adjourned until January 28, 2020.
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